I. CASE SYNOPSIS

St. Francis College Brooklyn (St. Francis Brooklyn); head women's basketball coach; and NCAA enforcement staff agree that from May 2018 through August 2019, the head women's basketball coach, two assistant women's basketball coaches and the director of athletics had impermissible communications and in-person contacts with three women's basketball student-athletes of another NCAA Division I institution without first obtaining written permission or authorization through the notification of transfer process. The head women's basketball coach also provided these three student-athletes with impermissible inducements. Additionally, the parties agree that the head women's basketball coach violated head coach responsibility legislation and the institution failed to monitor the head women's basketball coach's relationship with the three student-athletes.

On May 21, 2018, St. Francis Brooklyn hired the head women's basketball coach as its head women's basketball coach and, upon acceptance of this position, she resigned from her role as a head women's basketball coach at another NCAA Division I institution.1 Subsequently, between May 24, 2018, and August 22, 2019, the head women's basketball coach initiated four impermissible phone calls and sent 249 impermissible text messages to then head coach's former institution women's basketball student-athletes (student-athlete 1, student-athlete 2 and student-athlete 3). Specifically, she initiated one phone call and sent at least 67 text messages to student-athlete 1, initiated two phone calls and sent at least 182 text messages to student-athlete 3 and initiated one phone call and sent multiple text messages to student-athlete 2.2 The content of the text messages revealed that the exchanges, while impermissible, consisted of cordial conversations. The three student-athletes remained at the head coach's former institution, although one of the student-athletes subsequently became a graduate assistant coach at St. Francis Brooklyn after exhausting her collegiate eligibility at the head coach's former institution.

In addition to the impermissible communications, the head women's basketball coach had 11 impermissible in-person contacts with and provided impermissible inducements to three student-athletes between June 2018 and February 2019. Specifically, June 2, 2018, while traveling on vacation prior to beginning duties at St. Francis Brooklyn, the head women's basketball coach initiated contact with student-athlete 1 and her father in student-athlete's 1 hometown of Chicago, during which she purchased lunch for student-athlete 1 and her father. On June 3, 2018, while on the same trip, the head women's basketball coach initiated contact with student-athlete 3 and a friend in student-athlete's 3 hometown of Midland, Michigan, during which she purchased dinner for student-athlete 3 and her friend.

---

1 The head women's basketball coach employee agreement with St. Francis Brooklyn became effective June 18, 2018.

2 Due to limited phone records, the parties were unable to determine the total number of text messages sent to student-athlete 2.
On September 1, 2018, student-athlete 1 and student-athlete 2 traveled to Brooklyn, New York, to attend the 2018 Brooklyn Labor Day Parade. That evening, the head women's basketball coach had impermissible in-person contact with and provided an impermissible inducement to them when she paid for their dinner. Additionally, on September 9, 2018, she and one of her then assistant women's basketball coaches visited the head coach's former institution while in the area for a recruiting trip and had impermissible in-person contact with student-athlete 3 outside the playing field of a women's soccer contest. A then assistant director of athletics at the head coach's former institution was present during the brief contact.

On December 8 and 9, 2018, the head women's basketball coach impermissibly visited with the three student-athletes on St. Francis Brooklyn's campus and in the locale of the institution. The student-athletes initiated the visit, reaching out to the head women's basketball coach prior to their trip, and she agreed to host the student-athletes while they were in town. During the visit, the student-athletes viewed the athletics facilities and offices at St. Francis Brooklyn. Additionally, while they were on campus, the director of athletics and an assistant women's basketball coach had impermissible contact with them. The director of athletics acknowledged that the head women's basketball coach introduced her to the three women's basketball student-athletes from the head coach's former institution. That evening, the head women's basketball coach purchased dinner for the three student-athletes and went sightseeing with them in New York City. The head women's basketball coach permitted student-athlete 2 and student-athlete 3 to stay overnight at her home and she provided them with breakfast the following morning.

Subsequently, in February 2019, the three student-athletes again visited the head women's basketball coach in New York City when they were in town for a hair-styling appointment for one of the student-athletes. The student-athletes initiated the trip, notifying the head women's basketball coach in advance, and she agreed to host the student-athletes. Specifically, the student-athletes arrived the afternoon of February 16, 2019, and attended a St. Francis Brooklyn men's basketball game. Following the game, the head women's basketball coach purchased dinner for them and went sightseeing with them in New York City. That same night, she allowed student-athlete 2 and student-athlete 3 to stay at her home and provided them with breakfast the following morning. Additionally, prior to the student-athletes’ departure from New York City, the head women's basketball coach allowed student-athlete 1 and student-athlete 3 to attend a women's basketball team scouting video meeting and have impermissible in-person contact with two then assistant women's basketball coaches.

On or about February 26, 2019, the enforcement staff notified St. Francis Brooklyn's compliance staff that it had received information concerning impermissible contacts between the head women's basketball coach and women's basketball student-athletes at the head coach's former institution. Subsequently, on March 7, 2019, the enforcement staff sent a letter of inquiry to the institution requesting copies of the head women's basketball coach's phone records, which included impermissible communications with the three women's basketball student-athletes. As a result, the enforcement staff initiated an investigation and conducted interviews that confirmed the impermissible communications as well as the in-person contacts and impermissible inducements.
Regarding head coach responsibility, the head women's basketball coach failed to report the on-going impermissible contacts or seek guidance from the athletics compliance office about the permissibility of her interactions with her former institution's student-athletes prior to the enforcement staff contacting St. Francis Brooklyn. During her interview, the head women's basketball coach explained she did not think the communications were contrary to NCAA legislation due to her "close" preexisting relationship with the three student-athletes. She described and the student-athletes interviewed confirmed that her approach to coaching included developing a close relationship with her student-athletes, which transcended her leaving her prior institution. She also believed the legislation prohibiting contact with the women's basketball student-athletes was based solely on whether the student-athlete intended to transfer. As a result, the head women's basketball coach did not attempt to conceal her contact with the student-athletes and was, in fact, forthcoming once notified by the enforcement staff and learning that she had violated rules.

Finally, the institution and enforcement staff agree that the institution failed to monitor the head women's basketball coach's relationship and communications with the women's basketball student-athletes from her former institution. As discussed above, in December 2018, the director of athletics met the three student-athletes when they attended a St. Francis Brooklyn men's basketball game during a trip to New York City to visit the head women's basketball coach. Further, the director of compliance saw the three student-athletes at the men's basketball game wearing the head coach's former institution clothing. However, because they did not believe it was impermissible for a coach's former student-athletes to visit the coach as long as the interactions were social and not of a recruiting nature, neither the director of athletics nor director of compliance detected, reported or took action to deter the violations. Further, after the enforcement staff notified the institution of potential impermissible communications between the head women's basketball coach and the women's basketball student-athletes from the head coach's former institution in late February and early March 2019, the institution failed to prevent further text communication between the head women's basketball coach and the student-athletes. The head women's basketball coach acknowledged in an email to athletics administration that she had ongoing electronic communication with the three student-athletes during the spring and summer of 2019; however, she continued to have electronic communications with the women's basketball student-athletes from the head coach's former institution until requested to cease by the enforcement staff in September 2019.

The parties agree that the overall processing level for the case is Level II and that the case should be properly resolved as Level II–Standard for the institution and Level II–Standard for the head women's basketball coach. The parties believe negotiated resolution is appropriate due to the agreement on the facts, violations, level classification and penalties.
II. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS

A. Agreed-upon findings of fact, violations of NCAA legislation and violation levels.

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 13.2.1 (2017-18 and 2018-19), 13.1.1.3 (2017-18 through 2019-20) and 13.2.1.1-(h) and 13.7.3.1 (2018-19)] (Level II)

The institution, the head women's basketball coach and enforcement staff agree that from May 2018 through August 2019, the head women's basketball coach, two assistant women's basketball coaches and the director of athletics had impermissible communications and in-person contacts with three student-athletes of another NCAA Division I institution. The head women's basketball coach and representatives of the institution engaged in the impermissible communications and contacts without first obtaining written permission or authorization through the notification of transfer process. Additionally, the head women's basketball coach also provided impermissible inducements to the same three women's basketball student-athletes. Specifically:

a. Between May 24, 2018, and August 22, 2019, the head women's basketball coach called and text messaged student-athlete 1, student-athlete 2 and student-athlete 3 as follows:

- The head women's basketball coach initiated a telephone call with student-athlete 1 once and text messaged her at least 67 times.
- The head women's basketball coach initiated a telephone call with student-athlete 2 once and text messaged her multiple times.
- The head women's basketball coach initiated telephone calls with student-athlete 3 twice and text messaged her at least 182 times. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.1.3 (2017-18 through 2019-20)]

b. On June 2, 2018, the head women's basketball coach traveled to Chicago and had impermissible in-person contact with student-athlete 1 and her father. In addition, the head women's basketball coach provided student-athlete 1 and her father with a meal during the impermissible contact. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.1.3 (2017-18)]

c. On June 3, 2018, the head women's basketball coach traveled to Midland, Michigan, and had impermissible in-person contact with student-athlete 3. In addition, she provided student-athlete 3 and her friend with a meal during the impermissible contact. [NCAA Bylaws 13.1.1.3 and 13.2.1 (2017-18)]

d. On September 1, 2018, the head women's basketball coach had in-person contact with student-athlete 1 and student-athlete 2 following their attendance at the 2018 Brooklyn Labor Day Parade. In addition, she provided them a meal
during this impermissible contact. [NCAA Bylaws 13.1.1.3 and 13.2.1 (2018-19)]

e. On September 9, 2018, the head women's basketball coach and one of her assistant women's basketball coaches traveled to the head coach's former institution and had in-person contact with student-athlete 3 outside of the playing field of a women's soccer game at the head coach's former institution. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.1.3 (2018-19)]

f. On December 8 and 9, 2018, the three student-athletes visited the head women's basketball coach on the institution's campus and in the locale of the institution. During the impermissible contact, the three women's basketball student-athletes viewed St. Francis Brooklyn's athletics facilities and offices. The head women's basketball coach took the student-athletes sightseeing in the locale of the institution and paid for dinner. That same night, she allowed student-athlete 2 and student-athlete 3 to stay overnight at her home and provided breakfast the following morning. In addition, the director of athletics and one assistant women's basketball coach had impermissible in-person contact with the three student-athletes. [NCAA Bylaws 13.1.1.3, 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(h) and 13.7.3.1 (2018-19)]

g. On February 16 and 17, 2019, the three student-athletes visited the head women's basketball coach on the institution's campus and in the locale of the institution for a second visit. The three women's basketball student-athletes arrived at the institution's campus the afternoon of February 16, 2019, and watched part of a men's basketball contest. Following the men's basketball game, the head women's basketball coach took the student-athletes sightseeing in the locale of the institution and paid for dinner. That same night, she allowed student-athlete 2 and student-athlete 3 to sleep overnight at her home and provided breakfast the following morning. In addition, two assistant women's basketball coaches had impermissible in-person contact with the three student-athletes. [NCAA Bylaws 13.1.1.3, 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(h) and 13.7.3.1 (2018-19)]

2. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 11.1.1.1 (2017-18 through 2019-20)] (Level II)

The institution, the head women's basketball coach and enforcement staff agree that between May 2018 and August 2019, the head women's basketball coach is presumed responsible for the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1 and did not rebut the presumption of responsibility. Specifically, the head women's basketball coach did not demonstrate that she promoted an atmosphere of compliance due to her personal involvement in the violations, some of which she committed in the presence of her staff.
3. [NCAA Division I Constitution 2.8.1 (2017-18 through 2019-20)] (Level II)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that between December 2018 and August 2019, the scope and nature of the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1 demonstrate that the institution violated the NCAA principle of rules compliance when it failed to adequately monitor the women's basketball program and ensure compliance with NCAA recruiting legislation. Specifically:

a. In December 2018, the director of athletics and the director of compliance learned that the three student-athletes from the head coach's former institution visited campus and had in-person contact with the head women's basketball coach. However, neither the director of athletics nor the director of compliance detected, reported or took action to deter violations of NCAA legislation. [NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 (2017-18)]

b. In February and March 2019, the enforcement staff notified the institution of potential violations involving the head women's basketball coach's communications with women's basketball student-athletes from the head coach's former institution. Despite being notified of potential issues, the institution did not prevent further violations. [NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 (2018-19)]

c. On March 26, 2019, the head women's basketball coach acknowledged in email correspondence she was having ongoing communications with women's basketball student-athletes from the head coach's former institution. Even after the director of athletics and compliance administrator became aware of these previous communications, they failed to prevent further violations of NCAA legislation. [NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 (2018-19)]

As detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1, the head women's basketball coach continued having impermissible communications with the student-athletes through August 2019 and only ceased when notified by the enforcement staff. [NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 (2019-20)]

B. Agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors.

Pursuant to Bylaw 19.5.12.1.3-(e), the parties agree that the aggravating and mitigating factors identified below are applicable. The parties assessed the factors by weight and number and agree that this case should be properly resolved as Level II – Standard for the institution and the head women's basketball coach.

The parties reconsidered the application of aggravating factors in Bylaws 19.9.3-(j) and 19.9.3-(m) previously included in the notice of allegations. While the enforcement staff believes the aggravators could be applicable, the parties agreed to remove them so the case could be resolved
via negotiated resolution, which the parties believe is in the best interests of the Association. The parties believe the removal did not result in manifestly unreasonable penalties.

**Institution:**

1. **Aggravating factors (Bylaw 19.9.3).**
   
   a. Multiple Level II violations by the institution [Bylaw 19.9.3-(g)].
   
   b. Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violation or related wrongful conduct [Bylaw 19.9.3-(h)].

2. **Mitigating factors (Bylaw 19.9.4).**
   
   a. Affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter [Bylaw 19.9.4-(c)].
   
   b. The absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II or major violations committed by the institution [Bylaw 19.9.4-(h)].

**Involved Individual** (head women's basketball coach):

1. **Aggravating factors (Bylaw 19.9.3).**
   
   a. Multiple Level II violations by the involved individual [Bylaw 19.9.3-(g)].
   
   b. Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violation or related wrongful conduct [Bylaw 19.9.3-(h)].

2. **Mitigating factors (Bylaw 19.9.4).**
   
   a. Affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter [Bylaw 19.9.4-(c)].
   
   b. The absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II or major violations committed by the involved individual [Bylaw 19.9.4-(h)].

**III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED**

None.

**IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES**

None.
V. PARTIES' AGREED-UPON PENALTIES\(^3\)

All penalties agreed upon in this case are independent and supplemental to any action that has been or may be taken by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics through its assessment of postseason ineligibility, historical penalties or other penalties.

Pursuant to Bylaw 19.5.12.1.3-(e), the parties agree to the following penalties:

**Core Penalties for Level II – Standard Violations (Bylaw 19.9.5)**

1. Probation: Two years of probation from December 22, 2020, through December 21, 2022.\(^4\)

2. Financial Penalty: The institution shall pay a fine of $5,000 to the NCAA.

3. Scholarship reduction: The institution shall reduce the number of grants-in-aid awarded in women's basketball by 7% during the 2021-22 academic year. The reduction shall be based on the average amount of aid awarded in women's basketball over the past four years. Specifically, the institution shall be limited to no more than 14 grants-in-aid in women's basketball for the 2021-22 academic year.

   Pursuant to NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 5-15-5-2, if the institution has already awarded its full allotment of grants-in-aid for the 2021-22 academic year, it is permitted to take the grant-in-aid reduction in the 2022-23 academic year.

4. Recruiting Restrictions:

   a. The institution shall reduce the official paid visits in women's basketball during the rolling 2021-22/2022-23 period by six from the number of visits permissible during the period.

   b. The institution shall prohibit unofficial visits in women's basketball for four weeks during the 2021-22 academic year.

---

\(^3\) If an opportunity to serve a penalty will not be available due to circumstances related to COVID-19, the penalty must be served at the next available opportunity. With the exception of postseason bans, probation and general show-cause orders, this methodology applies to all penalties, including institutional penalties, specific restrictions within show-cause orders and head coach restrictions, unless otherwise noted.

\(^4\) Institutions must serve probation during the prescribed penalty period. The COVID-19 next available opportunity penalty methodology does not apply.
c. The institution shall reduce the number of recruiting-person days in women's basketball during the 2021-22 academic year by 22 from the number of recruiting days permissible.

d. The institution shall prohibit recruiting communications in women's basketball for four weeks during the 2021-22 academic year.

5. Show-cause order: The head coach was personally involved in impermissible communications and contacts as well as the provision of impermissible inducements. Therefore, the head coach shall be subject to a two-year show-cause order from December 22, 2020, through December 21, 2022. In accordance with Bylaw 19.9.5.4 and Committee on Infractions IOP 5-15-3, any employing member institution shall restrict the head coach from participating in all recruiting communication, contacts and off-campus recruiting for six weeks. There shall also be a reduction of three evaluation days for the head coach during the next recruiting cycle. The head coach will attend two NCAA Regional Rules Seminars in 2021 and 2022. St. Francis Brooklyn, or any member institution that employs the head coach in an athletically related position during the two-year show-cause period, shall abide by the terms of the show-cause order unless it contacts the office of the Committees on Infractions to make arrangements to show cause why the terms of the order should not apply. ¹ ⁵

6. Head coach restriction: The head coach violated head coach responsibility legislation when she failed to demonstrate that she promoted an atmosphere of compliance due to her personal involvement in the violations, some of which she committed in the presence of her staff. Bylaw 19.9.5.5 and the Figure 19-1 penalty guidelines contemplate head coach suspensions to address head coach responsibility violations. Therefore, St. Francis Brooklyn or any member institution that employs the head coach in an athletically related position shall suspend the head coach from three regular season contests (approximately 17% of the regular season competitions) during the 2020-21 season. ⁶ The suspension shall run concurrently with the show-cause order. The provisions of this suspension require that the head coach not be present in the facility where games are played and have no contact or communication with women's basketball coaching staff members or student-athletes during the suspension period. The prohibition includes all coaching activities for the period of time that begins at 12:01 a.m. the day of the game and

¹ The individual is subject to the show-cause order during the prescribed penalty period. The COVID-19 next available opportunity penalty methodology does not apply.

⁶ The parties initially contemplated four regular season games (13%) of the women's basketball season. However, in light of COVID-19, the Northeast Conference allowed its institutions to decide whether or not to schedule non-conference games. St. Francis Brooklyn determined that it would limit its season to conference games only, resulting in a total of 18 regular season games. As a result, the parties agreed that three games (17%) was appropriate under the circumstances.
ends at 11:59 p.m. that day. During that period, the head coach may not participate in any coaching activities, including, but not limited to, team travel, practice, video study, recruiting and team meetings. The results of those contests from which the head coach is suspended shall not count toward her career coaching record.7

Additional Penalties for Level II – Standard Violations (Bylaw 19.9.7)

7. Public reprimand and censure through the release of the negotiated resolution agreement.

8. During this period of probation, the institution shall:

   a. Continue to develop and implement a comprehensive educational program on NCAA legislation to instruct coaches, the faculty athletics representative, all athletics department personnel and all institutional staff members with responsibility for recruiting and certification legislation.

   b. Submit a preliminary report to the Office of the Committees on Infractions (OCOI) by February 15, 2021, setting forth a schedule for establishing this compliance and educational program.

   c. File with the OCOI annual compliance reports indicating the progress made with this program by November 1 during each year of probation. Particular emphasis shall be placed on rules education and monitoring related to recruiting contacts and inducements.

   d. Inform prospects in the women's basketball program in writing that the institution is on probation for two years and detail the violations committed. If a prospect takes an official paid visit, the information regarding violations, penalties and terms of probation must be provided in advance of the visit. Otherwise, the information must be provided before a prospect signs a National Letter of Intent.

   e. Publicize specific and understandable information concerning the nature of the infractions by providing, at a minimum, a statement to include the types of violations and the affected sport programs and a direct, conspicuous link to the public infractions decision located on the athletics department's main webpage "landing page" and in the media guides for the women's basketball program. The institution's statement must: (i) clearly describe the infractions; (ii) include the length of the probationary period associated with the case; and (iii) give

7 The individual is subject to head coach restrictions during the prescribed penalty period. If an opportunity to serve the penalty will not be available due to circumstances related to COVID-19, the penalty must be served at the next available opportunity.
members of the general public a clear indication of what happened in the case to allow the public (particularly prospects and their families) to make informed, knowledgeable decisions. A statement that refers only to the probationary period with nothing more is not sufficient.

9. Following the receipt of the final compliance report and prior to the conclusion of probation, the institution's president shall provide a letter to the Committee on Infractions affirming that the institution's current athletics policies and practices conform to all requirements of NCAA regulations.

VI. OTHER AGREEMENTS

The parties agree that this case will be processed through the NCAA negotiated resolution process as outlined in Bylaw 19.5, and a hearing panel comprised of members of the Committee on Infractions will review the negotiated resolution. The parties acknowledge that the negotiated resolution contains agreed-upon findings of fact of NCAA violations and agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors based on information available at this time. Nothing in this resolution precludes the enforcement staff from investigating additional information about potential rules violations. The parties agree that, pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.2, the violations identified in this agreement should be classified as Level II – Standard.

If a hearing panel approves the negotiated resolution, the institution and the head women's basketball coach agree that they will take every precaution to ensure that the terms of the penalties are observed. The institution and the head women's basketball coach acknowledge that they have or will impose and follow the penalties contained within the negotiated resolution, and these penalties are in accordance with those prescribed in Bylaws 19.9.5, 19.9.6, 19.9.7 and 19.9.8. The OCOI will monitor the penalties during their effective periods. Any action by the institution or the head women's basketball coach contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations may be considered grounds for prescribing more severe penalties or may result in additional allegations and violations.

The parties acknowledge that this negotiated resolution may be voidable by the Committee on Infractions if any of the parties were aware or become aware of information that materially alters the factual information on which this negotiated resolution is based. Additionally, the parties acknowledge that this negotiated resolution will not be binding if the case is referred to the independent accountability resolution process (Bylaw 19.11).

The parties further acknowledge that the hearing panel, subsequent to its review of the negotiated resolution, may reject the negotiated resolution. Should the hearing panel reject the negotiated resolution, the parties understand that the case may be submitted through a summary disposition report (Bylaw 19.6) or notice of allegations (Bylaw 19.7) and prior agreed-upon terms of the rejected negotiated resolution will not be binding.
Should a hearing panel approve the negotiated resolution, the parties agree to waive NCAA appellate opportunities.

VII. DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS APPROVAL

Pursuant to Bylaw 19.5.12, the hearing panel approves the parties’ negotiated resolution agreement. The hearing panel's review of this agreement is limited. Hearing panels may only reject a negotiated resolution agreement if the agreement is not in the best interests of the Association or if the agreed-upon penalties are manifestly unreasonable. See Bylaw 19.5.12.2. In this case, the hearing panel determines that the agreed-upon facts, violations, aggravating and mitigating factors, and classifications are appropriate for this process. Further, the parties classified this case as Level II-Standard for St. Francis and the head coach's violations. The agreed-upon penalties align with the ranges identified for core penalties for Level II-Standard violations in Figure 19-1 and Bylaw 19.9.5 and with the additional penalties available under Bylaw 19.9.7. Pursuant to Bylaw 19.5.12.4, this negotiated resolution has no precedential value.

The COI advises St. Francis and the head coach that they should take every precaution to ensure that they observe the terms of the penalties. The COI will monitor the institution while it is on probation to ensure compliance with the penalties and terms of probation and may extend the probationary period, among other action, if the institution does not comply or commits additional violations. Likewise, any action by the institution or head coach contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations shall be considered grounds for prescribing more severe penalties and/or may result in additional allegations and violations.
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