Like countable coaches, volunteer coaches may provide technical and tactical instruction to student-athletes and may make and assist in making tactical decisions relating to their sport. But NCAA legislation limits benefits volunteer coaches may receive and how they interact with prospects.

**BENEFITS**

- SDA may provide the following to volunteer coaches:
  - Two complimentary tickets to contests in their sports.
  - Meals incidental to team activities and during prospects’ official visits.
  - Compensation for working ASU camps or clinics.
  - SDA apparel incidental to coaching duties.
  - Reimbursement for parking associated with practice or competition.

- SDA may not provide any benefit not listed above. For example, volunteer coaches may not receive:
  - Any compensation beyond camps/clinics.
  - A cell phone or computer.
  - Complimentary tickets to other SDA contests.

**RECRUITING**

- Volunteer coaches may:
  - Receive phone calls from prospects.
  - Email prospects after the permissible date (see Recruiting 101).
  - Work for local sports clubs (but only if approved by the Compliance Office).

- Volunteer coaches may not:
  - Contact or evaluate prospects off campus.
  - Make phone calls to prospects or their parents, legal guardians, or coaches (except relating to camp/clinic logistics).
  - Be involved with any prospect-aged team (other than an approved local sports club).
  - Provide lessons to prospects (except in women’s golf).

In addition to the restrictions above, volunteer coaches may not scout opponents off campus.

*Note: Football and basketball may not use volunteer coaches.*

**SPOT THE VIOLATION**

The University of Argon men’s fencing team uses one volunteer coach during the academic year. The coach wanted to earn extra spending money for Christmas presents, so he gave private lessons to high school students during winter break. A few months after the lessons, the volunteer coach attended a local fencing competition to see how they were progressing.

Violations on page 3.
Baylor University was recently penalized by the Committee on Infractions for impermissible contacts and evaluations in football. The violations were a result of two bad decisions. First, Baylor's compliance office provided the coaches an "ill-advised" interpretation (according to the COI). In response to a coach's question, the compliance representative agreed that, if coaches turned their backs during a track meet and did not watch a particular prospect compete in that event, the coaches would not have to count the meet as an evaluation for that prospect. Second, based on that interpretation, the coaches decided — without asking — that they could attend track events for the sole purpose of being seen by two prospects (because they no longer needed to evaluate the prospects to know they wanted them) without having to count the event as evaluations for those prospects. The coaches indicated they believed they had found a "loophole" in the legislation. Because the coaches failed to log evaluations for the two prospects, the football staff exceeded the permissible number of spring evaluations.

Additionally, the coaches had impermissible contacts with one prospect who was a junior. On one occurrence, the coaches parked their truck at a track meet on the infield near the long-jump pit and sat on the tailgate close to where the prospect was competing. Their goal was to be seen by this prospect. The prospect noticed the coaches and approached them. A brief exchange (what the coaches unsuccessfully tried to argue was a "bump") occurred. On a second occurrence, the coaches watched the track meet from the infield rather than the stands. This prospect saw the coaches and a brief "fan like" (as the coaches described it) exchange occurred. As was the case with their seat by the long jump, the coaches had again positioned themselves in a location where it was likely they would have an encounter with the prospect. For that reason, the encounters were determined to be contacts. Notably, part of the evidence used in the case was a photograph of the coaches standing with the prospect after the meet that someone sent to the enforcement staff.

The penalties included one-game suspensions and a 12-week off-campus recruiting ban for the two coaches. Also, the entire football staff was prohibited from attending future track meets.

**KEY TAKEAWAYS:**

1. If coaches attend prospect events like track meets or wrestling tournaments, coaches must count their attendance as evaluations for all prospects who they observe or are recruiting whether or not the coaches actually see the prospects participate in any events.

2. At prospect events, coaches who put themselves in locations where contacts with prospects or their relatives are likely, must count any encounter with prospects or their relatives as contacts even if the interaction is minimal and unrelated to recruiting.

3. There is no such thing as a recruiting legislation loophole.

**QUOTES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS:**

1. On the coaches’ argument that the encounters were permissible bumps: “[T]he assistant coaches positioned themselves in locations where contact with [the] prospect was possible, even likely. This is precisely a situation contemplated by the [in-person contact] bylaw as “prearranged” and therefore a contact, regardless of the duration or substance of any conversation that may occur. Impermissible contacts are a serious matter to the membership and have been recognized as such by this committee.”

2. On the coaches’ argument that their exchanges with the prospects were not recruitment: “The assistant coaches characterized their interactions with [the] prospect at meets as “fan-like” exhortations that did not exceed greetings. In making such assertions, the assistant coaches ignored the obvious: they are not fans. They are subject to rules relating to evaluations and contacts that do not apply to spectators.”

3. On the coaches’ argument that they believed they had found permissible loopholes: “The assistant coaches could have easily avoided these violations if their main focus had been on complying with the bylaws rather than finding ways around them. The panel is . . . disappointed that the coaching staff at the institution was more interested in finding “loopholes” to exploit than abiding by the rules regarding evaluations and contacts.”
# PROSPECTS TRAVELING TO AND COMPETING IN THE AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Rule</th>
<th>In-person contact (including during an unofficial visit) may not be made with a prospect from the moment the prospect reports on call until he or she is released by the “appropriate institutional authority” (e.g., coach), except during an off day in a tournament.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>An SDA basketball coach cannot have contact with a prospect during the entire day of competition (before or after).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>When a football prospect participates in an athletics event on campus outside a contact period, an SDA coach cannot contact the prospect until the calendar day after the completion of the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“On Call”</td>
<td>There is no exact definition of “on call” – generally the term relates to whether the prospect showed up at a location at the direction of his or her coach. Other common examples include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beginning travel to the competition locale at the direction of a coach/administrator;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Receiving travel expenses from the team; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arriving at the competition locale at a time set by the coach/administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of On-Call Status</td>
<td>To better determine a prospect’s on-call status, provide the Compliance Office with written verification from the coach/administrator as to the time the prospect will be on call and why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>If an entire club team travels together to Phoenix the day before competition, no prospect on the team can visit ASU and meet with an SDA coach that day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But, if a prospect travels to Phoenix the day before competition on his or her own and not at the direction of his or her club coach, the prospect can visit ASU and meet with an SDA coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>The competition contact restrictions only apply to prospects and not to parents/legal guardians. So parents could visit ASU at any time (except during dead periods).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLI Signees</td>
<td>All contact restrictions described above are lifted once a prospect signs an NLI with ASU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The volunteer coach violated NCAA recruiting and tryout legislation when he gave prospects private lessons. Further, by attending the off-campus fencing match, the volunteer coach engaged in prohibited recruiting activities. Only countable coaches may recruit off campus.
Please note this table has dates that run until January 31. Many of the periods run past January 31. Visit the [NCAA Recruiting Calendars website](https://ncaapostseason.co/) for full recruiting calendars.