

Connecticut Debate Association

January 7, 2012, Fairfield Warde High School and King School

Resolved: College athletes should be paid competitive salaries.

The Shame of College Sports

By Taylor Branch, *The Atlantic*, October 2011

...The United States is the only country in the world that hosts big-time sports at institutions of higher learning. This should not, in and of itself, be controversial. College athletics are rooted in the classical ideal of *Mens sana in corpore sano*—a sound mind in a sound body—and who would argue with that? College sports are deeply inscribed in the culture of our nation. Half a million young men and women play competitive intercollegiate sports each year. Millions of spectators flock into football stadiums each Saturday in the fall, and tens of millions more watch on television. The March Madness basketball tournament each spring has become a major national event, with upwards of 80 million watching it on television and talking about the games around the office water cooler. ESPN has spawned ESPNU, a channel dedicated to college sports, and Fox Sports and other cable outlets are developing channels exclusively to cover sports from specific regions or divisions.

With so many people paying for tickets and watching on television, college sports has become Very Big Business. According to various reports, the football teams at Texas, Florida, Georgia, Michigan, and Penn State—to name just a few big-revenue football schools—each earn between \$40 million and \$80 million in profits a year, even after paying coaches multimillion-dollar salaries. When you combine so much money with such high, almost tribal, stakes—football boosters are famously rabid in their zeal to have their alma mater win—corruption is likely to follow....

(We suggest students read the full 28 page article after the tournament. It was too long for the packet.

See: <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2011/10/the-shame-of-college-sports/8643/>)

College athletes deserve to be paid

ESPN, by Michael Wilbon, July 18, 2011, espn.com

I used to argue vehemently against paying college athletes. Tuition, room, board and books were compensation enough. And even if, increasingly, it wasn't enough and virtually every kid who accepted a scholarship was in the red before Christmas of his freshman year, the notion of pay-for-play was at best a logistical nightmare. Where exactly would the money come from? How could you pay college football players but not baseball players or members of the women's field hockey team? And how in the world would you pay men in a way that wouldn't violate Title IX?

So you know what caused me to do a 180 on the issue? That \$11 billion deal -- OK, it's \$10.8 billion to be exact -- between the NCAA and CBS/Turner Sports for March Madness between 2011 and 2024. We're talking \$11 billion for three weekends of television per year. On top of that, there's a new four-year deal with ESPN that pays the BCS \$500 million. So, if those two deals were worth, say, a combined \$10 billion instead of \$11.3 billion, would the games not be televised? Would the quality of the broadcasts or the coverage or the staging of the events be somehow diminished? What if people in the business of money took \$1.3 billion off the top, invested it, sheltered it and made it available to provide a stipend to college athletes, how could anybody stand on principal and argue against paying the people who make the events possible in the first place?

Let me declare up front I wouldn't be the slightest bit interested in distributing the funds equitably or even paying every college athlete. I'm interested in seeing the people who produce the revenue share a teeny, tiny slice of it. That's right, football and men's basketball players get paid; lacrosse, field hockey, softball, baseball, soccer players get nothing. You know what that's called? Capitalism. Not everything is equal, not everything is fair. The most distinguished professor at the University of Alabama won't make \$5.9 million in his entire tenure in Tuscaloosa; Nick Saban will make that this year. So I don't want to hear that it's "unfair" to pay the quarterback of Alabama more than all the sociology students in the undergraduate college.

Using the inability to distribute the funds equally as an impediment is an excuse, a rather intellectually lazy one at that. Nothing about the way hundreds of millions of dollars is distributed is equitable or even fair. The BCS' new deal with ESPN was based, in part, on paying more money to schools/conferences with regard to what has been

called "population centers." Of the \$174 million distributed from five bowl games, 83.4 percent went to six conferences in 2011. In question right now is whether the BCS even conducts its business dealings in a manner consistent with principles expressed in federal anti-trust laws. So, the equitable-application excuse for not paying athletes doesn't hold water; at the very least there's a level of hypocrisy here that ought to make the opponents of paying athletes uncomfortable.

Don't get me wrong, paying players out of individual athletic department budgets is beyond impractical; it's probably not feasible. Because so many athletic departments run at a deficit, it's difficult to make the case that schools should pay regular salaries to athletes, even football players who produce more income than anybody. But it's another thing entirely for the students who play for revenue-producing teams (at UConn and the University of Tennessee, this would include the women's basketball teams) to be somehow compensated from the lucrative television/radio/Internet rights fees they make wholly possible.

It's commendable that the NCAA has paid millions into a fund for in-need athletes to cover clothing purchases, emergency travel and medical expenses. There's also a special assistance fund and a student-athlete opportunity fund. Why can't hundreds of millions of dollars be directed into those, and in turn make money much more accessible to athletes for the kinds of regular day-to-day expenses regular college students pay by working jobs that are off-limits to intercollegiate athletes?

In the meantime, if they cannot be paid outright, surely the scholarship athletes should be able to engage in entrepreneurial pursuits that currently leads to costly NCAA investigations that have proven to be mostly a waste of time since, one, such activities historically haven't been checked and, two, the kids who commit the "infractions" aren't effectively punished. Their revelations, short of Heisman Trophy winners having to return their statues, wind up penalizing only the kids and coaches who remain on the team and in the vast majority of cases have done nothing to merit a penalty themselves.

If somebody is willing to give A.J. Green \$750 or \$1,000 or even \$2,500 for his Georgia Bulldogs jersey, fine, good. If one of his teammates, a tackle, can fetch only \$50 for his jersey, then it'll be a good marketing lesson for both of them. It's called supply and demand, and if both men are fortunate enough to reach the NFL it'll be a lesson worth learning because that dynamic will exist their entire careers. If a soccer player can't get a dime for his jersey, well, there's a realization in that, too.

The question from the opponents of paying college athletes inevitably comes back, "What would stop a star player from agreeing to shake hands at a local car dealership for \$50,000?" The answer is, nothing. If a car dealer wants to strike that deal then good for the player in question. If a music student goes out in the summer and earns 50 grand, who objects? Who even knows? The student-musician is no less a college student because he struck a lucrative deal. Neither is the student-journalist who spends his nights writing freelance stories and picking up as much money along the way as he can.

If the student as athlete can find a way, he/she should be able to endorse products, to have paid-speaking gigs, to sell memorabilia, as Allen Sack, the author and professor at the college of business at the University of New Haven has suggested in recent years. The best college athletes in the two revenue-producing sports have always been worth much more than tuition, room, board and books. The best football and basketball players in the Big Ten have produced to the degree that a television network has become the model for every conference in America, a network worth at least tens of millions of dollars to the member institutions. Yet, no player can benefit from that work. The players have become employees of the universities and conferences as much as students -- employees with no compensation, which not only violates common decency but perhaps even the law.

Michael Wilbon is a featured columnist for ESPN.com and ESPNChicago.com. He is the longtime co-host of "Pardon the Interruption" on ESPN and appears on the "NBA Sunday Countdown" pregame show on ABC in addition to ESPN. Wilbon joined ESPN.com after three decades with The Washington Post, where he earned a reputation as one of the nation's most respected sports journalists.

Comments on Taylor Branch's article, "[The Shame of College Sports](#),"

College Athletes Should Get Paid, but How?

By Kenneth Shropshire, The Atlantic, Sep 20 2011

I agree. Philosophically Branch has reached the right conclusion. But the *how* is the extraordinarily complicated part of this. Where Branch is absolutely correct is that there should be no shyness regarding the concept of providing greater compensation, in whatever form, to NCAA student athletes. All of the amateurism reasons that some

collegiate sports leaders and enthusiasts deliver are a sham. I once interviewed David C. Young, the author of the aptly named book, [The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics](#) in order to better understand the role of amateurism and the difficulties being encountered in regulating the sports agent business. He admonished me, "whatever you do, please don't blame this on those poor dead Greeks."

There are reasons not to pay student athletes, and the leading one is equity issues related to Title IX. More broadly, as Branch points out, is who gets paid what? The logistics are head exploding if you reflect on it too long. Branch tells us essentially, to just let the markets determine who should receive what (the star quarterback vs. the high jumper vs. the top WNBA prospect). Is that too American? Not really, but it would be radically chaotic in its implementation.

Bear in mind his core conclusion is correct. There is no reason not to focus efforts on figuring out how to redistribute the profits to labor, because if you are basing the nonpayment on some vision of ancient Greeks celebrating amateurism, you are wrong. According to Young again, "Ancient amateurism is a myth ...The truth is that 'amateur' is one thing for which the ancient Greeks never even had a word."

[Kenneth Shropshire](#) - Kenneth L. Shropshire is the David W. Hauck Professor at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania and the Faculty Director of its Wharton Sports Business Initiative.

College Athletes Should Not Get Paid

By Andrew Zimbalist, The Atlantic, Sep 20 2011, 1:20 PM ET

With the possible exception of a half dozen schools, the 320 athletic programs in Division I do not generate profits each year. According to the NCAA's own figures (which generally exclude capital costs, among others), the average FBS athletic program ran a \$9.44 million operating deficit in the latest year. Herein lies one of the problems with Branch's bromide of paying the athletes. Where will the money come from? Other pertinent questions include which athletes should be paid and how much? Do we create an open labor market for athletes? And, if we pay the athletes, maybe we should also do it for the first violinist in the school orchestra or lead actor in theatrical productions? And as long as we are monetizing relationships at the university, perhaps popular professors should allocate course enrollment slots to those students who bid the highest? The list goes on.

There is, however, much that can and should be done to improve the treatment of college athletes, starting with raising the scholarship limit to cover the full cost of attendance, shortening the competitive seasons, providing four-year (rather than one-year) scholarships, and relaxing a panoply of arbitrary, hypocritical and nefarious rules in the NCAA's 1'000-plus-page manuals. Most would agree that amateurism means that one plays strictly for the enjoyment of the sport, not the remuneration (after all, *amateur* is French, and *amator* is Latin, for lover). It follows that student athletes should be able to: employ their skills in compensated summer jobs (much as chemistry majors can be paid for working in labs), use agents for ascertaining terms prior to signing a professional contract, return to play college ball even if they've entered a professional draft (but not signed a contract), receive payment for the ongoing use of their publicity rights after graduation, enjoy better health and safety benefits, and so on.

[Andrew Zimbalist](#) - Andrew Zimbalist is an economics professor at Smith College.

'College Athletes Should Receive a Living Stipend'

By C. Thomas McMillen, The Atlantic, Sep 19 2011, 12:45 PM ET

Players should receive a living stipend, and there should be more flexibility for athletes to profit from endorsements and sponsorships. The concept of amateurism is anachronistic and needs to be eliminated. Traditionally, the problem for the NCAA is that granting the players more income sources creates a slippery slope that could eventually lead to the players having full rights, including the right to counsel to negotiate their contracts for their relationship with the university, as well as for ancillary income. I am cheering for the players to win these rights because only if such a "nuclear event" occurs will the NCAA undergo the radical restructuring it so desperately needs.

[C. Thomas McMillen](#) - C. Thomas McMillen is a former NCAA and NBA basketball player and a former Democratic Representative from Maryland.

How to Pay College Athletes: A Three-Part Plan

By Ramogi Huma, The Atlantic, Sep 21 2011, 8:00 AM ET

The debate should not be focused on if college athletes should be paid, but how they should be paid. College athletes should be paid in the following ways:

1.) Scholarships that equal the cost of attendance. The NCAA currently caps scholarships below the price tag of every school leaving the average "full" scholarship player at an FBS school with a scholarship shortfall of \$3222 per year and living below the federal poverty line.

2.) Put a portion of new revenues into an educational lockbox, a trust fund that athletes can access in their pursuit of or upon achieving their degree. Players violating NCAA rules could lose this money. Graduation rates go up, violations go down.

3.) Grant college athletes access to the commercial free market by adopting the Olympic amateur model by which amateur players can receive money for autograph signings, endorsements, etc. A portion of these funds can be put in the educational lockbox described above. In this model, most "scandals" of the last 12 months wouldn't have been NCAA violations at all. Yes, some schools in endorsement-rich geographic locations may gain some advantage in recruiting, but competitive equity doesn't currently exist. SEC Commissioner Mike Slive says competitive equity is an "illusion."

[Ramogi Huma](#) - Ramogi Huma is the founder and President of the National College Players Association (NCPA) and a former UCLA football player.

'Should College Athletes Get Paid?' Is the Wrong Question

By Ellen J. Staurowsky, The Atlantic, September 19, 2011

Whether big-time college athletes should be paid is the wrong question. Given the historical record, which shows that the NCAA well knew that it had established a pay-for-play system with the creation of the athletic scholarship, that question is moot. To entertain it is to validate the cloak of fictions as manifest in terms like "student-athlete" and "amateurism" that form the basis for the NCAA's defense of business and educational practices that should be abolished.

The real question is why the NCAA has been permitted for over 60 years to get away with denying the full measure of the contributions athletes make who serve as the central attraction in college sport spectacle.

At the core of every position taken by the NCAA regarding athlete compensation is its principle of amateurism. Despite the central role that amateurism plays as a foundational principle on which the college sport enterprise is built, the manual itself is silent on the question of what an amateur is.

If the principle of amateurism is so central to the beating heart of the NCAA and serves as a rationale to deny athletes recognition as workers along with the protections and benefits associated with that status, then why no definition of amateur?

Walter Byers, former executive director of the NCAA, whom Branch quotes in the article, has an answer. It was Byers who observed, "Amateurism is not a moral issue; it is an economic camouflage for monopoly practice."

That monopoly practice has resulted in a system of controls over college athletes lives that should inspire a healthy fear among anyone who cares about fair and equitable treatment in a democratic society.

We should be past the time when we fall for the NCAA party line that suggests that a "free education" is adequate compensation for college athletes who generate billions of dollars in revenue for corporate marketing and media partners. In a recent study I just completed in collaboration with the National College Players Association, we estimate that football players in Football Bowl Series institutions have an average market value of \$121,048 (not including individual commercial endorsement potential). At the same time, due to the limitations of athletic scholarships, which do not even cover the full cost of attendance leaving an average shortfall of \$3,222 to be covered by athletes on full scholarships, the average FBS "full" scholarship athlete earns approximately \$2,000 below the poverty line.

As commercial interests in college sport continue to grow, the fictions understandably become more difficult to sustain. The shame rests not with college sports per se but with higher education officials who have served as the architects and promoters of such a system.

Should College Athletes Get Paid? Ending the Debate, Once and for All

By Patrick Hruby, The Atlantic, April 6, 2011

Both sides of the argument are passionate. Both are largely well intentioned. And both tend to give short shrift to the obvious.

To pay or not to pay? Such is the question facing big-time college sports, a question born of disparity: Football and men's basketball players generate billions in revenue for an intercollegiate athletic-industrial complex, yet receive a paltry cut of the profits via scholarships. Angina over this arrangement has flared in recent weeks, in part because the NCAA pocketed an astonishing \$771 million in television money for its just-completed men's basketball

tournament. On one side of the debate are the defenders of amateur purity, asserting that pay-for-play would destroy campus sports as we know them; on the other side are the fiscal reformers, arguing that the status quo is both unfair and untenable. Both sides are passionate. Both are largely well intentioned. And both tend to give short shrift to the obvious.

Namely, the fact that college athletes already are being paid.

The father of former Auburn University quarterback Cam Newton allegedly solicited \$180,000 from a second school in exchange for his son's Heisman Trophy-winning services. Football players at Ohio State recently were suspended for selling memorabilia and receiving discounted tattoos. Just last week, five other former Auburn players said that they were given sexual favors—shades of Spike Lee's *He Got Game*—and cash while being recruited by and playing for the school, including post-game "money handshakes" from friends of the program. Of course, none of this is new: from early 20th century Ivy League football to John Wooden-era UCLA super-booster Sam Gilbert to former USC running back Reggie Bush returning his Heisman statuette in the wake of a cash 'n' agents scandal, college sports long have featured an underground economy, because talented young athletes forever have been worth more than the above-board value of a scholarship. And since underground economies by definition involve corruption and rule breaking, almost everyone in the pay-for-play debate agrees that money handshakes are a problem.

Thing is, they ought to be a solution.

Want to mute the pay-for-play debate while restoring a dollop of credibility to the wheezing Rube Goldberg contraption of increasingly indefensible hypocrisy that is top-flight college sports? Then split the difference. Don't pay campus athletes. But do allow them to be paid. Eliminate amateurism—the outdated philosophy that says jocks can't receive any form of compensation, not even fruit and bagels—and bring the underground college sports economy into the light, treating it like the vast, untapped resource that it is.

In short: legalize money handshakes. And free tattoos. And anything else college athletes can score through the sheer dint of their rare and valuable talents.

Hands out, Jock America. Without shame.

Look, there's no denying that football and men's basketball players create a great big geyser of cash with every touchdown and jump shot, a greenback shower that douses celebrity coaches and behind-the-scenes bureaucrats alike. It would be nice - just, even -- if the young men working themselves to the point of physical harm received something more than room, board, tuition, and books for their trouble. Problem is, having university athletic departments pay athletes market salaries is utterly impractical. For one, college sports currently works a lot like health insurance: In the latter, the healthy subsidize the care and treatment of the sick; in the former, the sports that make money from ticket sales, television rights and licensing fees (i.e., football and men's basketball) subsidize everything else. Dip in to the kitty to pay Newton something approaching his actual value to Auburn, estimated at \$3.5 million? Say goodbye to men's tennis, women's lacrosse, and all the other cute-but-money-losing sports currently enjoyed on campus.

Moreover, say hello to a probable Title IX lawsuit.

Indeed, the biggest problem with paying players isn't the math; it's the legal and structural chaos that would result. In an interview with PBS's Frontline that aired last week, NCAA president Mark Emmert said it would be "utterly unacceptable ... to convert students into employees." Emmert had reason to be adamant. What happens when college athletes become employees? Can they collectively bargain? Can they strike? Do injured players receive workman's comp? Are players at state schools eligible for subsequent retirement benefits? Do *only* football and men's basketball players receive salaries? Should a star point guard earn more than a third-string center? Should an All-American quarterback earn more than his entire offensive line? Who decides?

Oh, and do athletic departments and the NCAA get to keep their all-important federal tax-exempt status?

Scrapping amateurism deftly sidesteps all of the above. Athletes remain students. College sports organizations remain—ahem—non-profits. Powerbrokers like recently fired Fiesta Bowl CEO-cum-gentlemen's club inspector John Junkers can keep on keepin' on in the manner of their corporate boardroom and investment banking peers, receiving absurdly outsized compensation packages. The entertainment delivery system fans know and mostly love would remain intact.

The only difference? Athletes would be able to realize much more of their economic value.

If the college sports black market has taught us anything—beyond the fact that landing a future NBA player like O.J. Mayo (current pro salary: \$4.5 million) for less than \$200,000 and a flat-screen TV is a bargain—it's that the money is there for the taking. And the giving. Well-heeled boosters want to distribute sacks of cash. Fans can't wait to purchase autographed jerseys. Local car dealers like putting jocks in sweet rides. Why not make it nice and legal, the same way said arrangements would be for any other student?

Fact: No one bats an eyelash when a talented music student earns beer money playing weddings. Also fact: The

National Panhellenic Conference does not launch a formal probe when a sorority sister receives an expensive piece of jewelry from her older, wealthier boyfriend. If someone wants to give Newton a cool hundred grand—or put him in a commercial for a regional cola distributor—let them. College sports won't spontaneously combust in an apocalyptic conflagration of unmarked Benjamins and Impalas with fancy rims.

If anything, our campus games will simply be more rational.

As a philosophical and historical construct, amateurism is dubious. And that's being kind. The Victorian-era English aristocrats who came up with the concept ascribed it to the ancient Greeks, who competed at their Olympic games for nothing more than honor, glory and olive wreaths. And also all kinds of goodies for victorious athletes, including prize money and senatorial seats in Athens. Romantic revisionist history aside, amateurism was a way for snooty upper class rowers to avoid trading strokes with unwashed farm-and-factory-working proles. Could anything be more antithetical to our notion of sport as a level, meritocratic playing field? To our notion of America as the same? Besides, if you're trying to prepare college students to compete in the cutthroat, profits *uber alles*, grab-what-you-can 21st century global economy, working-for-free is the last concept you want polluting young minds, a tragic waste of brainpower that otherwise could be devoted to learning something useful. Like Mandarin.

It's often said that the War on Drugs—like Prohibition before it—takes a preexisting drug problem and adds a crime problem. Amateurism creates a similar dilemma for college sports. Except there is no initial drug problem. There's nothing inherently wrong about people paying other people to perform—otherwise, we should outlaw *American Idol*. Allow money handshakes, and campus athletes will be free to participate in normal economic life, instead of pocketing illicit gains from an incoherent, morally bankrupt system and pretending otherwise. College sports will benefit by becoming (slightly) less hypocritical. The rest of society will benefit, too, because legal quid pro quo can be taxed, one money handshake and accompanying 1099 and/or 709 form at a time, with the NCAA's much-loathed enforcement division folded into the equally reviled IRS.

After all, in an era of massive state and federal shortfalls—where subsidy-starved universities are slashing their research and classroom budgets at the same time mega-profitable corporations such as GE earn billions in tax credits—don't we need all the additional public revenue we can get?

Should Colleges Pay for Play?

by David Mansdoerfer *Nevada News and Views, Jul 14th, 2011*

Should college athletes be paid to play college sports? In some ways, this seems like a good idea, top-tier colleges make millions in ticket and merchandise sales. It seems only fair that colleges reimburse their players for their hard work and commitment.

The problem, however, is two-fold. First, while scholarships come directly from a school's own pocketbook, they can be supplemented with federal Title IV funding in the forms of Pell grants. This essentially means that taxpayers would be subsidizing the money that college athletes are paid.

Second, not all schools are flush with cash to be able to do this. Obviously, this will benefit big time athletic conferences. But, what about state schools that are cutting academic programs to keep their head above water? What about D II, D III and NAIA schools that don't compete at the same level as D I schools but whose athletic programs are also important?

As an avid college sports fan, and a fiscal conservative, there should only be four schools where taxpayers help to subsidize the college athletic programs – the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Coast Guard Academies. Outside of the military academies, if colleges want to pay for play, they should be required to do two things.

First, students/athletes that a college chooses to pay must be exempted from Title IV funding. Taxpayers should not be subsidizing college athletic programs. Title IV funding is for educational purposes and should only be used to fund education.

Second, the amount that athletes can be 'paid' must be capped. Be it \$1,000, \$3,000, or \$5,000, the amount a college athlete can be paid must be the same across the board for each athletic division. That way schools won't be able to simply outbid their competitors for student athletes.

If colleges really believe that it is in their and the students' best interest to pay them to play, they will have no problem with adhering to these restrictions. However, it is important that this additional money not be on the shoulders of the taxpayer. Especially since the system is already built so that top-tier athletes will not finish school. (NBA's One and Done policy & NFL's 3 Year Eligibility Policy)

Colleges should remain focused on their original purpose – to provide quality higher education. If they choose to go down this slippery slope, it should be on their dime and not the taxpayers.

Should College Athletes Get Paid?

By Duncan Currie Nationalreview.com, April 5, 2011 12:41 P.M.

Maybe it was the annual spectacle of March Madness. Maybe it was the [Jim Tressel imbroglio at Ohio State](#). Maybe it was the lingering aftereffects of the [Cam Newton scandal](#). Maybe it was [Ed O'Bannon's ongoing lawsuit](#), which contends that former NCAA players should be able to profit from uses of their image or likeness (as in video games, rebroadcasts, DVDs, etc.).

Whatever the reason, journalists have ignited a fresh debate over the merits of paying college athletes. Last week, [PBS](#) and [HBO](#) each aired major specials on the relative injustices of a system that allows players to generate billions in revenue each year but prohibits them from receiving a dime of it. Coaches can sign multimillion-dollar contracts, endorse products, and rake in lucrative speaking fees — that's all in the game. ([Just ask Alabama's Nick Saban](#).) But if a star quarterback sells even one autographed jersey, he is violating NCAA rules.

The perceived unfairness of those rules has spurred critics to demand a radical overhaul. It is time, they say, to give the players — “the employees” — regular wages or salaries. Broadly speaking, there are three common objections to this idea:

- (1) “Top-tier college athletes already *do* get paid, in the form of lucrative scholarships. Moreover, those with professional aspirations benefit from critical training and exposure that enhances their draft prospects.”
- (2) “What part of ‘student-athlete’ don’t you understand? Turning these kids into *de facto* salaried professionals would irrevocably transform college sports, make a further mockery of the ‘academic mission’ that schools claim to be pursuing, and exacerbate corruption.”
- (3) “Yes, it’s unfair that certain football and basketball players produce enormous riches for their schools and don’t get to reap the spoils. But paying them would be a logistical nightmare; indeed, it would prove impossible to devise a truly ‘fair’ revenue-distribution scheme. There are better ways to make college sports more equitable.”

The third objection is the most compelling. Paying student-athletes represents an ethically dubious solution to a legitimate problem. But the strongest argument against it is a practical one: How exactly would the payment system operate? Between 2004 and 2009, fewer than 7 percent of all Division I sports programs generated positive net revenue, according to [NCAA data](#). Fewer than 12 percent of all Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) schools — 14 out of 120 — did so in fiscal year 2009. For that matter, the NCAA reports that only 50 percent to 60 percent of FBS football and basketball programs make money.

In other words, a significant chunk of top-level FBS programs are *losing* money. Should those programs be obliged to pay their football and basketball players, even though they aren’t actually producing a net profit? Or should only moneymaking programs be forced to offer player salaries? Would it be “fair” to have a system in which roughly half of all FBS schools paid their players while the other half didn’t? Do we really want blue-chip recruits picking a college based on financial compensation? Wouldn’t the wealthiest programs just scoop up all the best talent?

Meanwhile, would each salaried player on a given team be paid the same amount? If not, who would decide whether the All-American linebacker deserved more money than the All-American wide receiver, or whether the star point guard was more valuable than the star power forward? Would 18-year-olds be negotiating “contracts” with officials in their athletic department? Would they be hiring agents before high-school graduation? And how would all this affect those sports programs that depend on football and basketball revenue to stay afloat?

To pose these questions is to realize that paying college athletes is simply unfeasible. Still, the current NCAA rules are deeply flawed, and many players are indeed being exploited. Let’s face it: Big-time college football and basketball basically function as minor-league systems for the NFL and the NBA, respectively, while creating massive profits for everyone except the athletes. Scholarships are financially valuable, sure. But according to [PBS](#), “The average scholarship falls about \$3,000 short of covering” an athlete’s “essential” college expenses. Closing that gap — i.e., boosting scholarship aid — would be an easy way to help cash-strapped players meet their living costs.

Renowned sports economist Andrew Zimbalist proposed such a reform two years ago in a [New York Times online symposium](#). He also made a broader point about the NCAA’s stated commitment to amateurism: “It is one thing to demand that a college athlete lose amateur status when he or she signs a professional contract, but quite another to bar an athlete from entering a professional draft or hiring an agent to explore the opportunities of going pro.”

In the same symposium, University of New Haven business professor Allen Sack (who played football at Notre Dame during the 1960s) noted that college sports have already effectively become professionalized. "Given the N.C.A.A.'s abandonment of time-honored amateur principles," he argued, "no good reason exists for preventing athletes from engaging in the same entrepreneurial activities as their celebrity coaches. Big-time college athletes should be able to endorse products, get paid for speaking engagements and be compensated for the use of their likenesses on licensed products. They should be allowed to negotiate an actual contract with the N.B.A. as part of a final project in a finance class, and have an agent."

Those changes seem reasonable enough. Writing in the 2009 *Times* forum, former Penn basketball player Stephen Danley suggested another: Schools should take a slice of the profits generated by their revenue sports and add a fifth-year option to athletic scholarships. As Danley explained, many student-athletes competing at the highest levels just do not have the time to handle a normal academic load. "In certain programs, players *aren't even allowed* to take enough classes to graduate in four years" (emphasis added). Of course, some players were never adequately prepared for higher education in the first place and wouldn't be attending university at all if not for their skills on the field or the court. But if America's richest college-sports programs are going to continue treating many "student-athletes" as *full-time* athletes, they should at least give those athletes the financial means to return for an extra year of schooling and complete a degree after their playing days are over.

Should NCAA Rethink Its Stance On Paying Athletes?

Steve Inskeep & Frank DeFord, NPR, Morning Edition 11-10-2010

STEVE INSKEEP, host: College sports teams generate a lot of money, but the athletes doing all the work on the field see very little of it.

Commentator Frank Deford wonders if it's time to change the rules.

FRANK DEFORD: The wheels turn slowly in the crack justice department of the NCAA. Each college is supposed to police itself with its own internal compliance office or, as one cynical administrator described it to me, it's a silo structure, a big tube constructed so that the only people who know what's going on are the very people inside the silo breaking the rules.

Basically, the NCAA investigative force, which is as outmanned as the constabulary in Somalia, must depend on conference rivals ratting one another out. Typically, however, by the time any penalty is handed down, the culprits have moved on to greener pastures.

A desperately favorite NCAA punishment is to require the offending college to forfeit the games it won sometime in its dark past. Oh, that smarts. That really scares cheaters.

Changing old record books is like telling you now that the vacation you had in Jamaica four years ago - when you were drinking rum, playing golf and swimming with a beautiful woman in the moonlight - really wasn't any fun. That's what makes this week's accusations involving Cam Newton, the Auburn star, so much more meaningful. The charges, you see, are current; namely that someone purporting to represent Newton, demanded \$180,000 for him to enroll at Mississippi State.

To its credit, State reported the matter. And to be fair to both Newton and Auburn, there is no evidence that the would-be broker was authorized to act or that Auburn subsequently anted up.

Withal, the most illuminating tidbit in the whole saga is that Newton's father, a preacher, says he didn't want his son to go to Mississippi State because there he would be, quote, "A rented mule."

Well, that's the best definition of college athletes I've heard. Everybody makes real money - some real big money - except the athletes, except the mules, the Cam Newtons. They're not allowed to be represented by reputable agents. So of course, mountebanks come out of the woodwork. They're not allowed to be paid, so of course money will slip under the table.

But the NCAA, in its delusion, persists in trying to continue to prop up the failed concept of 19th-century amateurism. Yes, 50 years ago, the NCAA had company in hypocrisy. Many sports were supposed to be amateur then. But by now, in all the world of big-time sport, only in American college football and basketball does the myth of amateurism still exist.

The Cam Newton case may itself add up to nothing. But it perfectly illustrates, once again, that the American way of college sports is outdated, corrupt and impossible to maintain with rented mules.

College Athletics by the Numbers: A Deeper Look at Profitability

Sportsologist, <http://sportsologist.com/college-athletics-by-the-number>, 2010

A recent NCAA report stated that only 14 of the 120 athletic programs in the Football Bowl Subdivision made

money. The Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) includes all BCS conferences (PAC 10, SEC, Big 10, Big 12, etc) so odds are your favorite athletic program is losing money. 12% of college athletic programs are profitable.

Which college athletic sports are profitable?

According to the NCAA study, only two sports were reported by any university as being profitable: Football & Men's Basketball

Let's take a closer look...

Football: There is a lot of discussion about football keeping athletic departments alive. Yes, football is one of only two sports (men's basketball being the other) that ANY university reported as being profitable. At the same time, however, only 57% of football programs reported being profitable. Thus the other 43% of football programs are still part of the problem.

Men's Basketball: As the only other profitable sport that any university reported, men's basketball is also considered an important aspect of keeping college athletics alive. Once again, however, keep in mind that roughly 57% of men's basketball programs reported being profitable, so there is a large percentage of men's basketball programs losing money.

How do college athletic departments MAKE money? Three items account for over 50% of revenues:

- Ticket Sales (17%)
- Alumni/booster donations (27%)
- NCAA/conference distribution (14%)

How do college athletic departments SPEND money? Two items account for over 50% of expenses:

- Salaries and benefits (32%)
- Scholarships (Grants In Aid) (25%)

In case you are curious, here are a few other items as a percentage of total expenses:

- Facilities maintenance and rental (13%)
- Team travel (7%)
- Recruiting (2%)
- Equipment/uniforms/supplies (3%)
- Game expenses (4%)

The median expense per student athlete in 2009 was \$76,000.

How much does a college athletic program cost each university? Average assistance that each university gave to the athletic department was \$10.2 million.

How do we improve college athletics moving forward? There isn't an easy answer although simple math tells us that a start would be to reduce costs and increase revenue. As witnessed yesterday by Cal's decision to cut five sports, universities are less willing to keep athletic programs alive so it's time for college athletic programs to be self sustaining.

Decrease Spending

While salaries and scholarships aren't necessarily easy to reduce as they are driven by outside factors (salaries of competing positions, tuition rises, etc), the data indicates its the first place to look in terms of reducing costs. This could come in the form of fewer staff members per department/team, lower salaries for staff members within college athletics, or cutting athletic programs. As someone who has worked in sports business, I recognize sports already has low salaries (particularly lower level positions) but I recognize that in order for college athletics as we know it to continue changes need to be made. In my experience, there are opportunities for college athletics to become more efficient. What if conferences became responsible for marketing individual teams instead of the universities athletic departments? Or media rights were handled at the conference or NCAA level instead of the individual institution? I recognize a large percentage of expenses for salaries are on the field in the form of coaches so perhaps there need to be guidelines for coaching salaries in college athletics? Is it time to re-evaluate the scholarship model? Reduce scholarships? Offer various levels of scholarship based on academic standing, performance on team, etc? . Cutting expenses is always a tough task full of difficult decision.

Increase Revenue

The report doesn't explicitly state what "NCAA and conference distributions" are but presumably its an athletic programs cut of any revenues generated by the NCAA or conference on their behalf (TV, radio, etc). What are some other ways to increase revenue? There is talk that a football playoff would generate significantly more revenue but is that the answer? What about individual conferences forming their own network (similar to Big 10 network)? Will that generate enough revenue for athletic departments? Can other sports generate significant fan interest? I think the 15,896 people who showed up to UC Santa Barbara to watch a college soccer game say yes.

Sources:

Pro Football's College Tuition Bill

By **ALLEN BARRA**, *The Wall Street Journal*, APRIL 30, 2009

Last weekend the National Football League drafted 256 players from America's colleges. On May 19, the National Basketball Association will take around 60 more. Then, on June 9 and 10, Major League Baseball will pick another 45 or so. All of these athletes will have one thing in common: The cost of their training wasn't paid for by the professional leagues that drafted them, but by their colleges.

There are many reasons for the rise of the NFL and NBA over the past half-century, but one of the most important is seldom discussed: They don't pay for the development of their players. Though MLB does draw some talent from the nation's top collegiate programs, the major percentage of their players are brought up through an extensive minor-league system.

Who pays for NFL recruits? Many writers who have analyzed the economics of college football believe that between 70% and 75% of athletic departments lose money. Murray Sperber, author of "Beer and Circus: How Big-Time College Sports is Crippling Undergraduate Education," believes the number is higher than that. "Almost all athletic departments lose money if they do their books honestly. The NCAA's latest accounting report, doing the books more honestly than ever before, supports my belief." This means that much of the bill for maintaining football and basketball programs comes from alumni and even taxpayers.

Despite talk of reform in college sports, the system remains pretty much what it has always been: a cost-free minor league for professional football and basketball, and one in which those who produce the revenue get the least from it. The National Collegiate Athletic Association Manual states that the basic purpose of their organization is "to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program . . . and by doing so, retain a clear line of demarcation between intercollegiate athletics and professional sports." We can think of at least one very clear line of demarcation between professional and college sports: In college, the athletes don't get paid; and the colleges don't get full benefit from the talent they produce for the pros.

Until someone comes along to establish a union for college athletes as Marvin Miller did for baseball players, there isn't much that can be done for the exploited players, but there is a solution for reimbursing the colleges that could benefit almost everybody.

Professional sports leagues are involved in college scholarship programs on several levels. For instance, the NFL endows \$300,000 worth of scholarship money for the National Football Foundation's Scholar-Athlete Award and both the NFL and NFL Players Association endow USA Football, a nonprofit organization for developing youth, high school and international amateur football. (One source indicates that last year's endowment was "in the neighborhood of \$1 million.")

But this is minor league compared to the actual cost of preparing athletes for the pros. Andrew Zimbalist, author of "Unpaid Professionals: Commercialism and Conflict in Big-Time College Sports," estimated in 1999 that colleges would be justified in charging pro football and basketball as much as \$130.5 million annually -- approximately \$170 million in today's dollars.

According to the College Board, the total estimated cost for a full scholarship at a public school for four years (including tuition, room and board and books) is approximately \$65,000. At a private school, it's around \$140,000.

In other words, based on the approximately 361 athletes who will be drafted by professional leagues in 2009 it can be reasonably estimated that the total cost of putting those students through four years of college at the schools that produce most of the professional athletes is around \$26 million. That's only 53% of last year's combined salaries for Ben Roethlisberger and Jason Kidd, the two highest-paid players in pro football and basketball, respectively, to have played college ball. And it's only 62% of the minimum salary the Detroit Lions are guaranteeing this year's bonus baby -- quarterback Matthew Stafford of the University of Georgia -- over six years.

Here's an idea for a stimulus package for America's colleges: the NFL and the NBA and MLB should provide a full, four-year scholarship to each school for every player they draft from that college.

First of all, this pays a debt, or at least part of it. The cost of providing a scholarship for every player drafted would still be just a fraction of what it costs to train and care for each athlete.

Second, a reimbursement plan could be a stimulus package for national education. The recipients of the scholarships could even be chosen for their aptitude in science and math instead of for spiraling footballs or making 20-foot jump

shots. The hundreds of millions in gross revenues produced by college students playing sports would at least benefit other students. Instead of dumping hundreds of uneducated former jocks on society every year, colleges would be sending out hundreds of professionals into our work force. Now that's a stimulus package for everyone.

Mr. Barra writes about sports for the Journal. His latest book, "Yogi Berra: Eternal Yankee," was just released by W.W. Norton.

Title IX

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is a [United States](#) law, enacted on June 23, 1972. In 2002 it was renamed the **Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act**, in honor of its principal author [Congresswoman Mink](#), but is most commonly known simply as **Title IX**. The law states that

"No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance..."

—United States Code Section 20

The regulations implementing Title IX require all universities receiving federal funds to perform self-evaluations of whether they offer equal opportunities based on sex^[15] and to provide written assurances to the Dept. of Education that the institution is in compliance for the period that the federally funded equipment or facilities remain in use.^[16] With respect to athletic programs, the Dept. of Education evaluates the following factors in determining whether equal treatment exists:^[17]

1. Whether the selection of sports and levels of competition effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of members of both sexes;
2. The provision of equipment and supplies;
3. Scheduling of games and practice time;
4. Travel and per diem allowance;
5. Opportunity to receive coaching and academic tutoring on mathematics only;
6. Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors;
7. Provision of locker rooms, practice and competitive facilities;
8. Provision of medical and training facilities and services;
9. Provision of housing and dining facilities and services;
10. Publicity.

Unequal aggregate expenditures for members of each sex or unequal expenditures for male and female teams if a recipient operates or sponsors separate teams will not constitute noncompliance with this section, but the Assistant Secretary [of Education for Civil Rights] may consider the failure to provide necessary funds for teams for one sex in assessing equality of opportunity for members of each sex.

Summary of NCAA Regulations, NCAA Division I

2. Amateurism – All Sports.

a. You are not eligible for participation in a sport if you have ever:

(1) Taken pay, or the promise of pay, for competing in that sport. [Bylaw 12.1.2]

(2) Agreed (orally or in writing) to compete in professional athletics in that sport.

Exception: Prior to collegiate enrollment, in sports other than men's ice hockey and skiing, you agreed to compete on a professional team provided the agreement did not provide for more than actual and necessary expenses and you did not receive more than actual and necessary expenses. [Bylaws 12.1.2 and 12.2.5.1]

(3) Played on any professional athletics team as defined by the NCAA in that sport. Exception: Prior to enrollment, in sports other than men's ice hockey and skiing, you competed on a professional team provided you did not receive more than actual and necessary expenses. [Bylaws 12.1.2 and 12.2.3.2.1]

(4) Used your athletics skill for pay in any form in that sport. [Bylaws 12.1.2 and 12.1.2.4]

...

b. You are not eligible in a sport if you ever have accepted money, transportation or other benefits from an agent or agreed to have an agent market your athletics ability or reputation in that sport. [Bylaw 12.3.1]

c. You are not eligible in any sport if, after you become a student-athlete, you accept any pay for promoting a commercial product or service or allow your name or picture to be used for promoting a commercial product or service. [Bylaws 12.5.2.1 and 12.5.2.2]

d. You are not eligible in any sport if, because of your athletics ability, you were paid for work you did not perform, were paid at a rate higher than the going rate or were paid for the value an employer placed on your reputation, fame or personal following. [Bylaw 12.4]

3. Financial Aid – All Sports.

a. You are not eligible if you receive financial aid other than the financial aid that your institution distributes. However, it is permissible to receive:(1) Money from anyone on whom you are naturally or legally dependent;(2) Financial aid that has been awarded to you on a basis other than athletics ability; or

(3) Financial aid from an entity outside your institution that meets the requirements specified in the Division I Manual. [Bylaw 15.01]

b. You must report to your institution any financial aid that you receive from a source other than your institution. However, you do not need to report financial aid received from anyone on whom you are naturally or legally dependent.

4. Employment Earnings – All Sports.

Earnings from a student-athlete's on- or off-campus employment that occurs at any time is exempt and is not counted in determining a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid or in the institution's financial aid limitations, provided:

(1) The student-athlete's compensation does not include any remuneration for value or utility that the student-athlete may have for the employer because of the publicity, reputation, fame or personal following that he or she has obtained because of athletics ability;

(2) The student-athlete is compensated only for work actually performed; and

(3) The student-athlete is compensated at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for similar services. [Bylaws 12.4 and 15.2.7]

Farm team

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

In [sports](#), a **farm team**, **farm system**, **feeder team** or **nursery club**, is generally a [team](#) or club whose role is to provide experience and training for young players, with an agreement that any successful players can move on to a higher level at a given point. This system can be implemented in many ways, both formally and informally....

Baseball

In the [United States](#) and [Canada](#), [Minor League Baseball](#) teams operate under strict franchise contracts with their major league counterparts....

Most major league players start off their careers by working their way up the minor league system, from the lowest (Rookie) to the highest (AAA) classification, with the rare exceptions usually being those players signed from Japan's [Nippon Professional Baseball](#)....

Ice hockey

The teams of the [National Hockey League](#) also have their own farm teams. They are primarily in the [American Hockey League](#). For example, the [Binghamton Senators](#) are the farm team for the [Ottawa Senators](#). However, many teams have additional affiliates in the [ECHL](#)....

Basketball

Traditionally, the [NBA](#) did not have a formal farm league. It mainly relies on the elite [NCAA](#) to produce NBA players, and thus the latter was often known as the "feeders". Since 2001, the NBA directly owns an entire farm league: the [National Basketball Association Development League](#). The NBA D-League started with eight teams in the fall of 2001....

American Football

The [National Football League](#), as of 2010, is the only one of the four major professional sports in the USA that does not have a farm system.
