

WHEN ATHLETICS ENGULFS ACADEMICS: VIOLATIONS COMMITTED BY UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA BASKETBALL

Frank J. Ferraro

INTRODUCTION

The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, is where approximately 38,000 people go to experience all that an institution of higher education has to offer. The highest priority for the majority of the students there, and at universities across the country, is class work because it is education to which they have dedicated their time and money. However, for a select few, the gym is where they focus most of their energy. This is because these few are college athletes, and they are often afforded free tuition in exchange for their dedication to a sport. The university seeks out these athletes in order to bring national recognition and profits in the form of ticket sales and television revenue to the university. For the athletes, participating in a college sport keeps alive the hope that they will get the chance to continue to play at the professional level. The coach has the duty to function between these two factions in order to serve the needs of both.

As an employee of the university, the coach is bound to support the goal of educating the student because this is the primary function of the university. The coach, however, must also ensure that their athletic program stays competitive. This is for the sake of the athlete who wants to win in order to play at the next level. The need to win is also because the coach is ultimately the one that will be held responsible for the success of the athletic program. The student-athlete cannot be fired, but the coach can. So therein exists the tension between academics and athletics with which a coach is faced. Many collegiate athletic coaches deal with this tension by ultimately upholding the values of academics, even if it comes at the expense of their winning record and a few more gray hairs. But other coaches use the power that they wield over the athletes and their support staff to manipulate the system and maintain their winning records. Sadly, for the University of Minnesota, no coach has exemplified this pattern of abuse of power as clearly as the former men's basketball coach, Clem Haskins.

This is a study of the failures of the University of Minnesota, basketball program as it functioned under Clem Haskins from 1993-1998. Haskins was at the helm of the Golden Gophers men's basketball team from the 1986-87 season through 1997-98 season. Although there are no substantiated findings of any wrongdoings early in his tenure, it is clear that he used his position as head coach from 1993 to 1998 to impose his will on his players and staff, manipulating those around him academically, monetarily, and legally. This work will first focus on the improprieties within the basketball program, exposing who was involved and at what level. The consequences of these wrongdoings will next be explored by examining the sanctions imposed by the NCAA as well as the university itself. Finally, this study will attempt to explain why the problems of coaching misconduct and academic dishonesty exist and the ways in which universities and the NCAA can deal with these issues.

Although this work focuses on the University of Minnesota, it is important to remember that those in positions of power within athletic departments have compromised the integrity of many universities. There have been major infractions reported by the NCAA since 1995, spanning a variety of sports. [EN 1] And for each violation that is unearthed by the NCAA, there are likely numerous others that have gone unpublished, either because of collusion on the part of

the university and its athletic department, or because there is insufficient evidence to support a charge. If not for the efforts of one “whistleblower” and a few fervent journalists, it is likely that the violations committed by the University of Minnesota would not have been uncovered, at least not to the extent to which they were. Fortunately the information about the misconduct at the University of Minnesota was revealed and can be explored.

II. THE MISCONDUCT

The University of Minnesota men’s basketball team was the primary subject of both the University’s internal investigation and the NCAA Infraction Report. In general, the wrongdoing involved violations of NCAA bylaws governing academic fraud, extra benefits, academic eligibility, unethical conduct and lack of institutional control. [EN 2] Amongst this backdrop of transgressions, three individuals stood out. These individuals were the focus of the investigation and subsequent sanctions imposed by the NCAA. They were: Jan Gangelhoff, the former office manager in the University of Minnesota Academic Counseling Unit, academic counselor Alonzo Newby, and men’s basketball coach Clem Haskins. [EN 3] However, the Committee On Infractions acknowledged that many of the violations found were the result of both active participation and oversights on the part of the administration and the faculty. [EN 4] This fact is important to keep in mind because one would be misguided to think that the problems at the University of Minnesota would have been solved had the three primary actors in this drama been removed. In order for Coach Haskins to manipulate multiple facets of the university system there needed to be compliance within the university structure on many different levels. The University Senate acknowledged this fact when it unanimously approved changes in the oversight of intercollegiate athletics at the school. [EN 5] Because of the extensiveness of the institutional involvement and the variety of the problems at the University during Haskins’ reign, it is most effective to begin at the point at which these violations were exposed and work backward.

On March 10, 1999, an article in the St. Paul, Minnesota, *Pioneer Press* broke the story regarding possible academic fraud at the University of Minnesota. [EN 6] George Dohrmann was the reporter at the helm of this story, which at first began as nothing more than a story about the climate of working in the athletic department. Dohrmann talked to one of primary players in this story, Jan Gangelhoff, for three months before the office manager of the Academic Counseling Unit, who had resigned a year earlier, first revealed her role in the academic misconduct at the school. [EN 7]

The NCAA Infraction Report states that Gangelhoff “was involved in preparing approximately 400 pieces of course work of various lengths, including theme papers, homework assignments and take-home exams, for at least eighteen men’s basketball student-athletes.” Gangelhoff’s work included typing, composing themepapers, completing homework assignments and preparing takehome exams. [EN 8] The subjects of these papers ranged from acid rain to Native American relations to premenstrual syndrome. [EN 9] Gangelhoff was not employed by men’s basketball and was not a tutor, meaning that she should have had no interaction with student-athletes. However, the basketball program utilized her to do the work for the players who were struggling academically, and in return she received favors from the program. [EN 10] Her involvement in this coursework was arranged primarily by the academic counselor Alonzo Newby, who identified for her the student-athletes who needed to be helped during study hall sessions or at her home. [EN 11]

Newby served as the go between for student-athletes and administration for many of the illicit acts committed at the University. Newby would begin his manipulation of the academic life of the student-athlete by steering them toward specific courses. Newby had an excellent “sense” of which instructors would be most likely to give the players passing grades. Correspondence between Newby and other unnamed sources illustrates that Newby’s primary focus was on the ease of the class work. In one memo to Coach Haskins, Newby explains to the coach that an instructor “is not requiring class attendance for the two pharmacy classes. I need your help in motivating [the player] to take advantage of this opportunity.” In another writing, Newby stated that an instructor was only requiring players to complete ten-page papers, “not fifteen as she required for others” and only two book summaries. These summaries claimed Newby, “would be accepted based on what is in each book’s preface” and not based on what the book actually said. He would then slot players into these less challenging courses, regardless of whether it hurt their chances of graduating. [EN 12] Another account indicates that star guard Bobby Jackson was enrolled in an independent study in which the only assignment was for Jackson to type the word “basketball” into a database and list the articles that appeared. [EN 13] This lack of legitimate coursework is illustrated in the titles of some of these courses themselves.

The courses in which the student-athletes were enrolled, often at the bequest of Newby, included “Orientation of Leisure and Recreation”, “Active Wellness: Individuals and Communities”, “Plants Useful to Humans”, and “Sport Facilities”. [EN 14] It is clear that these courses were not particularly challenging nor were they sufficiently tailored toward a specific undergraduate degree. If this level of intrusion into the athlete’s academic sphere did not prove sufficient to maintain the athlete’s eligibility, Newby would use his influence to manipulate administrators within the university.

There are a number of instances in which Newby made improper demands on faculty and staff. On one particular occasion, Newby asked a professor to allow a student-athlete to make up an incomplete in order to remain eligible. A memo written by Newby describing the incident stated that the student did not attend class and did not even pick up the text for the class. Nevertheless Newby asked that the professor give the student more than the “second and third chances” he had already received. At Newby’s request, another professor allowed an athlete to submit a term paper to make up the points that he needed to pass the course. The athlete ultimately received a “B” in the course even though the professor suspected that the player did not write the paper. [EN 15] During final exam week, Newby confronted an instructor, accompanied by a player and one of his friends, to “ask” that the athlete be given a grade of “Incomplete” and extra time to complete the past-due assignments with the expectation that the athlete would receive a “C” in order to remain eligible to play basketball. The NCAA report states that the professor agreed because she felt intimidated. [EN 16] Newby extended his influence to administrative departments as well.

Newby used his position to get academic advisors to backdate student-athletes registration forms to allow them to drop courses past the mandated due date, thereby ensuring that a “W” would not be placed on the students’ transcripts. He also made grade-base changes for students so that a student could avoid receiving a letter grade and instead be judged on a “Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory” basis. [EN 17] All of these actions were taken by Newby to ensure that the athlete would remain eligible in spite of the academic rules of the university and the rules imposed on players by the NCAA.

As academic counselor, Newby also worked behind the scenes to ensure admission for recruited players who would not otherwise be eligible to enroll in the university. In one account,

deemed by the NCAA violations committee to have been “particularly serious because the student-athlete was, by all accounts, quite talented and immediately contributed to the success of the team,” Newby arranged for the new recruit to complete correspondence coursework after he learned that the player needed eight additional credits to be eligible to enroll. Newby arranged two independent study courses for this athlete and enlisted Gangelhoff to complete the coursework. Had the athlete not been given this improper academic assistance, the NCAA Infraction Report states that he likely would not have met the admissions requirements and would have enrolled elsewhere. [EN 18] This wrongdoing, and all of the others that Alonzo Newby was involved in, whether revealed or not, were for the benefit of Clem Haskins.

The findings reported in the NCAA Public Infraction Report work to illustrate how those involved in the improprieties committed were directed by Coach Haskins, to whom they felt a sense of duty. The Infraction Report states:

In practice, if not in formal reporting lines, the head coach supervised the academic counselor and directed his activities. For example, [Alonzo Newby] wrote in a memorandum to [Clem Haskins], “(the director of athletics academic) is technically my boss, but the reality is that I report to you and am fiercely loyal to you.” The secretary reported her observation that the head coach knew everything that the academic counselor did and...“there was very little, if anything, that went on in men’s basketball that the coaching staff did not know about.” [EN 19] It seems apparent from early on in Haskins career at the University of Minnesota that he was going to dominate the basketball program with a ‘win at all costs’ attitude.

In 1989, the university expressed concern about the changing of grades for basketball players. Haskins responded by writing a letter to the university president, stating that, “High academic standards that the university establishes make it difficult for the marginal student to excel” and “It is difficult enough to competitively recruit on the par of other Big Ten schools without unnecessary pressure of excessive academic standards.” Haskins also asserted in this letter that, “It isn’t necessary for any program to be placed under constant scrutiny,” referring to a “concentration camp” atmosphere around men’s basketball. [EN 20] These statements indicate that Haskins disapproved of the academic standards established by the university and favored a system that relaxed the supervision and requirements for the “marginal student” athlete. Given this, it is not surprising that Haskins operated the basketball program under his own set of rules. In spite of his obvious desire to have power over the program, Haskins initially denied having control over those implicated in the scandal, denying that he had any involvement in the wrongdoings.

Clem Haskins issued a series of denials following the release of Gangelhoff’s story by the *Pioneer Press*. [EN 21] The day the story broke, Haskins was in Seattle with the team for the NCAA Division I Men’s Basketball Championship. Haskins told four players that they would be interviewed about the allegations made by Gangelhoff and that they should say that they had done all of their own academic work and that Gangelhoff hadn’t done any work for them. He told one of the players to claim that he had only gone to Gangelhoff’s home for occasional dinners if he was confronted with questions about his relationship with the secretary. [EN 22] Coupling his own denials with those of his players, Haskins then went on the offensive.

Haskins initially asserted that the investigation was motivated by racism on the part of the institution. Haskins, an African-American, told university investigators, “Anyone that was an athlete, particularly an athlete of color, you have a strike against you. If you are a basketball coach, particularly a minority coach, you have a strike against you. I came in as a black man, I leave as a black man. That was a strike against me. This campus is very, very racist, don’t let

nobody kid you, across this campus.” [EN 23] These allegations of racism were furthered by the fact that it initially appeared that the majority of the accused in this scandal were black men. [EN 24]

Haskins also attempted to distance himself from Jan Gangelhoff. On more than one occasion after the allegations surfaced, Haskins asserted that he was not acquainted with Gangelhoff. He referred to her as “that woman” in a locker room meeting the day after the story broke. Realizing that this was a futile stance to take, Haskins then described Gangelhoff as “part of the family” when interviewed by the university. [EN 25] These types of admissions became more prevalent for Haskins as the allegations began to unfold and it became more and more difficult for Haskins to plead innocence.

The release of further information by the ‘whistleblower’ in this scandal, Jan Gangelhoff, made it particularly difficult for Coach Haskins to continue his pattern of denials. Because Gangelhoff was not an employee of the athletic department, she was compensated for doing the student-athletes work through other means. Gangelhoff was given a trip to Hawaii with the men’s basketball team. Also, Haskins paid her \$3,000 from his personal funds. [EN 26] The bank records of this transaction ultimately proved to be Haskins undoing, as he could no longer deny his role in the scandal. The trail of payments that Haskins made to others involved in the misconduct eventually revealed itself through the course of the investigation.

Details of payments that Haskins made to players emerged. Gangelhoff claimed that she once drove Courtney James, a basketball player at the time, to Haskins office where he paid James an undisclosed sum. [EN 27] Haskins gave another athlete \$200 during the Christmas season and yet another athlete was paid \$220 so that he could pay his rent. Perhaps the most disturbing payout was made to Alonzo Newby. From 1993 to June 1999 Haskins paid a monthly car lease for Newby without the knowledge of the university. Haskins began making these payments after the university refused to provide a courtesy car to Newby. [EN 28] Here again Haskins created his own rules in order to ensure that he could maintain control over those around him, thereby fashioning his own system within the university structure. Unfortunately it appears that Haskins not only sought to operate above the rules of the university, but above the law as well.

Since 1993, at least four of Haskins’ players were accused of domestic or sexual assaults. Haskins response to these charges was often that he was more capable of determining the players’ guilt than were the police. [EN 29] Haskins questioned the honesty and abilities of campus police and university medical reports, referring to “white” police and “white” hospital staff members in order to suggest that the allegations were motivated by racism. When one athlete was accused of forcing a woman to engage in unwanted sexual contact, an accusation that had been made about this athlete more than once, Haskins told university police that he’d deal with the player himself “in a very strong manner”. When the woman declined to press charges, the case was closed. In other incident, Haskins confronted a woman seeking a protection order against Courtney James after he slapped and threatened her. In the confrontation, Haskins called the woman a liar and disputed her story. [EN 30] These examples show that Haskins was all too involved in what should have been legal matters between the victim and the accused. His interference indicated to his players that their illegal acts were not severe enough to warrant police action and sent the message to victims that their pleas would likely fall on deaf ears. Clem Haskins seemed to believe that in his tightly controlled world of men’s basketball, the wrongs committed by he and his players could be covered up and justified in the name of the ultimate goal, winning.

The light shed on the numerous violations described above quickly unraveled the stranglehold that Clem Haskins had on the institution and forced the University of Minnesota to control its athletic program to reestablish the integrity of the school.

III. THE CONSEQUENCES

The University of Minnesota responded promptly to the allegations made by Jan Gangelhoff on March 10, 1999, in the *Pioneer Press*. The day following the release of the story, four of the players implicated, Miles Tarver, Kevin Clark, Jason Stanford and Antoine Broxsie, were declared ineligible to play in the opening round game by the university. [EN 31] The Golden Gophers subsequently lost that game to Gonzaga, a little school from Spokane, Washington. [EN 32] The university then hired an independent firm to conduct its own investigation. [EN 33] As a result of this firm's findings of rampant misconduct within the athletic department, the University of Minnesota imposed sanctions on itself prior to the conclusion of the NCAA investigation. Some of these sanctions included: a one year post-season ban, reduction of athletic scholarships, reduction in the amount of recruiting, a return to the NCAA an amount equal to 90 percent of the monies it received from the Big Ten Conference for participation in the 1994, 1995, and 1997 Basketball Championships. [EN 34] Perhaps more importantly, the University of Minnesota reorganized the structure of its system to prevent further misconduct.

The system of accountability under Coach Haskins was restructured to establish a competent system of supervision. The men's basketball coach was immediately prohibited from having any contact with his athletes' professors in order to discuss their progress. The new director of academic counseling was put in charge the basketball team's athletic advisor, taking this responsibility away from the coach. The athletic directors no longer report to the vice president for student development, but to a lawyer with close ties to the president of the university. Also, the university's general counsel's office was given the responsibility of the NCAA rules-compliance functions. Another important change came through placing the examination of all student-athletes transcripts and academic progress under the control of nine tenured faculty with no athletic connections. [En 35] With these changes in place, the university then sought to remove Clem Haskins and Alonzo Newby from their positions.

In June of 1999, Haskins contract was bought out for \$1,500,537 because there was no direct evidence at the time that linked Haskins to the fraud. Once the records of Haskins payouts to Gangelhoff and Newby surfaced, the university filed a suit against Haskins to recover the money paid in the contract buyout. The suit asserted that Haskins committed fraud, deceit, and breach of an employment agreement. [En 36] The case was eventually brought to a mediator, but the public nature of all of these allegations brought a separate criminal inquiry into the basketball program by the Justice Department. [EN 37]

The University of Minnesota fired academic counselor Alonzo Newby on June 10, 1999, for refusing to testify in the independent investigation conducted by the university. [EN 38] Newby also did not respond to a letter of official inquiry sent to him by the NCAA. Because of his failure to respond, Newby waived his right to appeal the findings made against him in the Public Infraction Report. [EN 39] It was ultimately this report and the sanctions imposed on the University of Minnesota by the NCAA that most severely restricted the university and the major players in this case.

A statement made by the NCAA Infractions Committee clearly summarizes the nature of the violations committed by the University of Minnesota and explains why harsh penalties should be imposed:

The numerous violations found by the committee are among the most serious academic fraud violations to come before it in the past 20 years. The violations were significant, widespread, and intentional. More than that, their nature—academic fraud—undermined the bedrock foundation of a university and the operation of its intercollegiate athletics program. By purposeful acts of commission, and, through the absence of effective oversight, serious acts of omission, these violations damaged the academic integrity of the institution. The immediate and direct consequence to the university was that its men’s basketball team competed very successfully with ineligible student-athletes in each year from 1994 through 1999. [EN 40]

The severity of these violations demanded that the NCAA impose a litany of penalties designed to punish the University of Minnesota and send a message to all other NCAA member institutions.

The NCAA determined that, if either Clem Haskins or Alonzo Newby sought employment or affiliation in an athletically-related position at an NCAA member institution during the seven year period spanning from October of 2000 to October of 2007, they and the university with which they were seeking employment would have to appear before the Committee on Infractions to consider whether the member institution should be subject to “show-cause” procedures. These procedures could limit the athletically-related duties of Haskins or Newby at any such institution for a designated period if the NCAA deemed that there was cause to impose such limitations. [EN 41]

Although Jan Gangelhoff left the University of Minnesota the year before the investigation into academic impropriety began, her high level of involvement necessitated that the NCAA impose sanctions upon her. Gangelhoff was precluded from seeking employment or affiliation in a position involving athletics for a period of five years, unless she and the institution appeared before the NCAA in a “show-cause” proceeding. This proceeding would involve an assessment of her fitness to work in the position and could limit her duties as they relate to athletics. [EN 42]

The most stunning penalty imposed by the NCAA was the vacation of team records and the individual records of any student-athlete who engaged in academic fraud. The University of Minnesota was stripped of the 1997 Big Ten title and forced to take down the banner from their NCAA appearance in the 1997 Final Four. The team records for the 1993-94 season through the 1998-99 season, in which they were charged with violating NCAA rules, were altered to indicate zero wins and zero losses. The record of Clem Haskins, however, was altered to reflect each win after the 1993 season as a loss, reducing his win-loss total from 240-165 to 111-294. [EN 43] Haskins also had his 1997 award for Big Ten Coach of the Year stripped from him. [EN 44] Former Golden Gopher guard Voshon Lenard, who played for the university from 1991-1995, was stripped of the 1,161 points that he scored in his final two seasons. This ultimately cost him his place on the school’s all-time scoring record. [En 45] 1997 Big Ten Player of the Year and Defensive Player of the Year, Bobby Jackson, had these titles stripped from him by the Big Ten Conference. [EN 46] Two other Golden Gopher starters had their individual records altered as a

result of their involvement in the scandal. [EN 47] These penalties may perhaps be the most effective because they eliminate the achievements earned through the improper benefits afforded through the academic fraud committed by the players and facilitated by the institution. All of these sanctions are in reaction to the misconducts revealed by the investigations, and while necessary, it is more beneficial to the health of athletic programs nationwide to explore some proactive approaches to preventing contravention of the NCAA rules.

IV. PREVENTATIVE MEASURES

It is extremely difficult to comprise a way in which universities can ensure that the rules that they set out for their institutions, as well as the NCAA rules, will be followed. There are a number of factors that make prevention so difficult. First, many universities that have significant athletic programs are some of the nations largest schools. With a great number of people operating in all facets of university life, it is difficult for any institution to monitor the behavior of everyone. Trust and honesty become essential components of a successful university, and, as is indicated by the situation at the University of Minnesota, the absence of these components on the parts of only a few within the institution can result in a catastrophe on a large scale.

Second, the dynamics of power and money are at work within athletic programs on the university level. The power that a coach can wield over not only his players, but other students and faculty, can distort the role of the coach and his ability to think of himself as merely one piece in the life of a university. The money that the university receives from athletic events can be staggering. Sales of tickets to sporting events can contribute greatly to the financial success of universities. Also, many major corporations sponsor university teams and contributing vast sums to the university. Likewise, television revenue can bring in thousands of dollars for universities that have a strong following. This need to remain popular amongst the fans ultimately motivates coaches and administrators to pursue the most talented athletes regardless of their credentials because television audiences want to see all-star caliber players on the playing field. With all of these power forces at play, it is difficult to imagine ways in which to keep a university honest. However, a few methods have been suggested.

The Knight Commission, directed to propose reforms for college sports, proposed that schools should be barred from conference championships and other postseason games if they did not graduate at least half of the students who play in each sport. [EN 48] This would have greatly affected the University of Minnesota under Clem Haskins, as the graduation rate for players under Haskins was among the worst in the country. From 1991 through 1995, only 17 percent of Gopher's men's basketball players earned degrees. [EN 49] This alternative may be rather unfair, however, considering that a number of athletes leave school prior to graduation and statistics regarding graduation are not calibrated to account for these departures.

The members of the Knight Commission also recommended a new distribution formula for television revenue from the men's NCAA Division I basketball tournament that does not allocate money based on victories. The current formula gives \$750,000 to a school for each win in the tournament. Along with this suggestion, the commission advocated the creation of a watchdog group to monitor the largest of college sports programs. [EN 50] These steps could prove beneficial in the prevention of rules violations because they increase the accountability and decrease the monetary incentive to cheat.

The National Alliance for College Athletic Reform (NACAR) has also made recommendations to improve the integrity of college athletics. One recommendation is for

faculty to challenge the NCAA's claim that college athletes are amateurs and focus on addressing the special educational needs of athletes in the college sport industry. A NCAA Compliance Officer has responded to this suggestion by saying that to remove the amateur designation from college athletes would do nothing to improve the quality of their education. [EN 51]

The NACAR has also advocated the creation of a task force to outline steps faculties can take to reestablish the importance of education. They have also suggested that all universities should file an annual financial report outlining the sources of income for those in the athletic department. The response made by the NCAA to these suggestions was that they were not directed at the problem, which, as they see it, is the integrity of those within the university system. [EN 52]

Finally, the NACAR recommended that the money for endorsement rights paid by apparel companies should go to the university and not to the coach, where it currently goes. The NCAA Compliance Officer responded to this suggestion by pointing out that universities are already aware of the monies paid to coaches by apparel companies, so there is nothing currently underhanded within the system. The effectiveness of all of these suggestions is questionable because, as stated earlier, the dynamics of the problem is such that there is truly no quick fix. [EN 53]

Ultimately, the tendency amongst college coaches to manipulate the system and break the rules of the university and the NCAA may only be curbed by the fear that someone like Jan Gangelhoff will emerge to expose the improprieties. The fact that the NCAA and the University of Minnesota responded to the allegations with swift and firm action will hopefully send the message that there is nothing to be gained from running an athletic department in the style of Clem Haskins.

[EN 1] National Collegiate Athletic Association, *Major Infraction Cases* (Nov. 11, 2001), at <https://goomer.ncaa.org/wdbctx/LSDBi/LSDBI.home> (last visited May 5, 2003) (searched under University of Minnesota, Twin Cities for Major Infractions).

[EN 2] Committee on Infractions, *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, NCAA PUBLIC INFRACTION REPORT (2000), at <https://goomer.ncaa.org/wdbctx/LSDBi/LSDBI.home> (last visited May 5, 2003) (searched under University of Minnesota, Twin Cities for Major Infractions and found Public Infraction Report for Men's Basketball).

[EN 3] Paul McEnroe and Chris Ison, '*U*' Program Found Easy Instructors; Memos Document Effort to Keep Players Eligible, STAR TRIBUNE, November 21, 1999, at 1A, available at LEXIS, News Library, Sports File.

[EN 4] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, *supra* note 2.

[EN 5] Randy Furst, *A Chronology of Academic Scandal*, STAR TRIBUNE, October 24, 2000, at 10A, available at LEXIS, News Library, Sports File.

[EN 6] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, *supra* note 2.

[EN 7] *All Things Considered: Sports Writer George Dohrmann of the St. Paul Pioneer Press discusses the Story He Wrote on Academic Fraud at the University of Minnesota and About Winning the Pulitzer Prize*, National Public Radio radio broadcast, Apr. 10, 2000, available at 2000 WL 21470352.

[EN 8] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, *supra* note 2.

[EN 9] Sam Farmer, *A Losing Record for NCAA Whistle-Blower Basketball: Friends and Jobs Lost, Tutor Has Second Thoughts About Confessing She Cheated for Players*, LOS ANGELES TIMES, Mar. 30, 2001, available at 2001 WL 2473910

[EN 10] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, supra note 2 (The NCAA Infraction Report states that Gangelhoff received a trip to Hawaii from the athletic department as well as a payment of \$3,000 from Clem Haskins personal account. These violations will be explored more fully later in this work.)

[EN 11] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, supra note 2.

[EN 12] See McEnroe and Ison, supra note 3.

[EN 13] *Magazine Says Faculty Also at Fault in Minnesota Hoops Scandal*, UNIVERSITY WIRE, June 16, 1999, available at LEXIS, News Group File, Beyond Two Years.

[EN 14] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, supra note 2.

[EN 15] See McEnroe and Ison, supra note 3.

[EN 16] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, supra note 2.

[EN 17] *Id.*

[EN 18] *Id.*

[EN 19] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, supra note 2.

[EN 20] See McEnroe and Ison, supra note 3.

[EN 21] See Furst, supra note 5.

[EN 22] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, supra note 2.

[EN 23] Chris Ison and Paul McEnroe, *'U' Report to NCAA Shows Failure to Act; Officials, Coaches Deny Responsibility for Incidents in Basketball Scandal*, July 15, 2000, at 1A, available at LEXIS, News Library, Sports File.

[EN 24] Jay Weiner, *Investigating the 'U': A Year Later*, STAR TRIBUNE, March 10, 2000, available at 2000 WL 6963621.

[EN 25] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, supra note 2.

[EN 26] *Id.*

[EN 27] Jerry Zgoda, *Gangelhoff Adds New Claim About Money*, STAR TRIBUNE, April 11, 1999, available at 1999 WL 7493086.

[EN 28] See *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, supra note 2.

[EN 29] See also, Randy Furst, *A Chronology of Academic Scandal*, STAR TRIBUNE, October 24, 2000, at 10A, available at LEXIS, News Library, Sports File (stating that 'U' athletic officials intervened in the investigations into assault and sexual misconduct charges of athletes in order to negotiate agreements in cases that were never submitted to prosecutors).

[EN 30] Chris Ison and Paul McEnroe, *'U' Officials Intervened for Athletes*, STAR TRIBUNE, May 21, 1999.

[EN 31] *See* Furst, *supra* note 5.

[EN 32] Lori Robertson, *Body Slam (Expose of Basketball Program at Univ. of Minnesota)*, 21 AMERICAN JOURNALISM REVIEW, May 1, 1999, available at 1999 WL 11980027.

[EN 33] *See* Furst, *supra* note 5 (A 2,500 page report was produced following the investigation, which cost the school upwards of \$2.2 million dollars).

[EN 34] *See* *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, *supra* note 2.

[EN 35] *See* Weiner, *supra* note 24.

[EN 36] Jack Thompson, *Minnesota Files Suit Against Haskins Over Contract Buyout*, CHICAGO TRIBUNE, Sep. 12, 2000, available at 2000 WL 3707771.

[EN 37] Randy Furst, *Judge Grants Stay in 'U' Suit Against Haskins*, STAR TRIBUNE, May 5, 2001, available at 2001 WL 9624590.

[EN 38] *See* Furst, *supra* note 5.

[EN 39] *See* *University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Public Infractions Report*, *supra* note 2.

[EN 40] *Id.*

[EN 41] *Id.*

[EN 42] *Id.*

[EN 43] Jeff Shelman, *The History of Gophers Basketball is Continuing to be Rewritten*, STAR TRIBUNE, Nov. 7, 2000, available at 2000 WL 6996509.

[EN 44] Jeff Shelman, *'U' Losses '97 Conference Title; Haskins, Jackson Stripped of Honors*, STAR TRIBUNE, Nov. 22, 2000, available at 2000 WL 6998712.

[EN 45] *See* Shelman, *supra* note 43.

[EN 46] *See* Shelman, *supra* note 44.

[EN 47] *See* Shelman, *supra* note 43.

[EN 48] Associated Press, *Panel Targets Schools with Poor Graduation Rates*, (June 26, 2001), available at <http://espn.go.com/ncaa/news/2001/0626/1218872.html> (last visited May 5, 2003).

[EN 49] Jeff Shelman, *New Report Puts Haskins in Bad Light: Team's Graduation Rate Among the Lowest in the Nation*, STAR TRIBUNE, Sep. 11, 2001, available at 2001 WL 9636252.

[EN 50] *See supra* note 48.

[EN 51] Joseph T. Wells and Richard B. Carozza, *Corruption in Collegiate Sports*, 57 INTERNAL AUDITOR, April 1, 2000, available at 2000 WL 15978671.

[EN 52] *Id.*

[EN 53] *Id.*