

**COMPENSATING COLLEGE ATHLETES:
EXAMINING THE POTENTIAL IMPACT
ON ATHLETES AND INSTITUTIONS**

HEARING
OF THE
**COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION,
LABOR, AND PENSIONS**
UNITED STATES SENATE
ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
ON
EXAMINING COMPENSATING COLLEGE ATHLETES, FOCUSING ON THE
POTENTIAL IMPACT ON ATHLETES AND INSTITUTIONS

SEPTEMBER 15, 2020

Printed for the use of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.govinfo.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee, *Chairman*

MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming	PATTY MURRAY, Washington, <i>Ranking Member</i>
RICHARD BURR, North Carolina	
RAND PAUL, Kentucky	BERNARD SANDERS (I), Vermont
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine	ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., Pennsylvania
BILL CASSIDY, M.D., Louisiana	TAMMY BALDWIN, Wisconsin
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas	CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY, Connecticut
LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska	ELIZABETH WARREN, Massachusetts
TIM SCOTT, South Carolina	TIM KAINE, Virginia
MITT ROMNEY, Utah	MAGGIE HASSAN, New Hampshire
MIKE BRAUN, Indiana	TINA SMITH, Minnesota
KELLY LOEFFLER, Georgia	DOUG JONES, Alabama
	JACKY ROSEN, Nevada

DAVID P. CLEARY, *Republican Staff Director*

LINDSEY WARD SEIDMAN, *Republican Deputy Staff Director*

EVAN SCHATZ, *Minority Staff Director*

JOHN RIGHTER, *Minority Deputy Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

STATEMENTS

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2020

Page

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Alexander, Hon. Lamar, Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Opening statement	1
Murray, Hon. Patty, Ranking Member, a U.S. Senator from the State of Washington, Opening statement	6

WITNESSES

Blank, Rebecca, Chancellor, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI	10
Prepared statement	12
Dennis, Karen, Director of Track & Field and Cross Country, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH	15
Prepared statement	16
Summary statement	19
Hartwell, John, Vice President & Director of Athletics, Utah State University, Logan, UT	20
Prepared statement	22
Summary statement	25
Huma, Ramogi, Executive Director, National College Players Association, Norco, CA	27
Prepared statement	29

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Statements, articles, publications, letters, etc.	
Murray, Hon. Patty: Supplemental documents submitted by Ramogi Huma for the Record	59-189
University of San Diego, prepared statement	190

**COMPENSATING COLLEGE ATHLETES:
EXAMINING THE POTENTIAL IMPACT
ON ATHLETES AND INSTITUTIONS**

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Lamar Alexander, Chairman of the Committee, presiding.

Present: Senators Alexander [presiding], Burr, Paul, Cassidy, Scott, Romney, Braun, Murray, Casey, Baldwin, Murphy, Kaine, Hassan, Jones, and Rosen.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR ALEXANDER

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning. The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will please come to order.

First, I would like to go through a few administrative matters that we have adopted because of COVID. We have consulted with the attending physician and the Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control. Individuals in the hearing room are 6 feet apart. There is no room for the public in person. The press is covering as a pool. You can watch this on streaming, or there will be an unedited recording that everyone can watch. All of our witnesses today and some Senators are participating by video conference.

I would like to say something about masks. The Office of Attending Physician has advised that Senators and witnesses may remove their masks to talk into the microphone since our chairs are 6 feet apart. So, that is why my mask is off. When I am not back here, I am wearing my mask in the hall.

I am grateful to the Rules Committee, the Sergeant at Arms, the Press Gallery, the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police, and our Committee staff, Chung Shek and Evan Griffis, for all of their hard work to keep us safe and connected with one another.

Senator Murray and I will each have an opening statement. We will then turn to our witnesses, who we thank for being here today. We have four of them. Each witness, we will ask you to summarize your remarks in 5 minutes. Then, each Senator will have 5 minutes for questions and answers. We will ask Senators to keep the questions and answers within that 5-minute period.

We have votes today beginning at 10:30, but we will not interrupt the hearing. We will continue. Someone else will preside for a few minutes while I go vote and come back.

The question for the hearing today is whether the tradition of the intercollegiate student athlete is worth preserving; and, if so, how to do so. Specifically, what will be the impact on that tradition if a growing number of States pass laws allowing commercial interests to pay student athletes for use of their name, image, and likeness.

I have had a couple of experiences that have helped form my opinions on this subject. First, in 1960, during my sophomore year in college, I was exercising on Vanderbilt University's cinder track and a man with a large watch in his right hand came up. He introduced himself as Track Coach Herc Alley and he asked my name.

He said, Did you run track in high school? I said, No, sir. And he said—I said we did not have a track team.

Why don't you run 100 yards, he said. So, I did, and he looked at his watch and he said, that is very good—10.1. I have three really fast boys for the 400 yard relay. Why don't you be the fourth—440 yard relay then. Why don't you be the fourth?

I joined the Vanderbilt track team, and our team set a record for the 440 yard relay. My job was to carry the baton from the first fast guy to the third fast guy. The next year, we would sometimes practice with students from what was then called Tennessee A&I. They were pretty remarkable athletes. They included Olympians Ralph Boston, Wyomia Tyus, and Wilma Rudolph.

Coach Alley had no scholarships to offer. His teams rode buses to meets. Our cinder track made it hard to establish fast times. Scraping together teams of non-scholarship athletes, Coach Alley won several Southeastern Conference championships. His enthusiasm that day on the cinder track gave me an experience that millions of Americans have had—that of being an intercollegiate student athlete. Someone else who had that experience is also on this Committee, Senator Richard Burr. He actually had a scholarship to play football at Wake Forest University.

My experience on the Vanderbilt track team taught me a number of lessons, including this one. When joining a relay team, be sure to pick three runners better than you are, which is not bad advice for how to be an effective Senator.

As the college football season gets underway, even amidst COVID-19, we are reminded of how important these games are to the student athletes, to their institutions, and to millions of avid spectators. This fascination with sporting competition is nothing new, according to the Knight Commission's 1991 report on intercollegiate athletics.

The Knight Commission said, "The appeal of competitive games is boundless. In ancient times, men at war laid down their weapons to compete in the Olympic Games. Today, people around the globe put aside their daily cares to follow the fortunes of their teams in the World Cup. In the United States, the Super Bowl, World Series, college football, NCAA basketball tournament attract millions. Sports have helped break down bigotry and prejudice in American life. On the international scene, they have helped integrate east and west, socialists and capitalists. The passion from sports is uni-

versally shared across time and continents.” That is from the Knight Commission.

But, problems with sports is also nothing—are also nothing new. The Knight Commission was established in 1989 to address scandals in college sports that were shaking confidence, not just of big time collegiate athletics, but in the institutions of higher education themselves.

then, well before that, in 1929, a report from the Carnegie Foundation said recruiting had become “corrupt, professionals had replaced amateurs, education was being neglected, and commercialism reigned.”

Even before that, in 1906, in response to criticism from President Teddy Roosevelt, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the NCAA, had been formed to protect the safety of players and deal with corruption.

Now, my second experience forming an opinion about the subject we are talking about today came from my service on that Knight Commission when I was president of the University of Tennessee. Our commission recommendation was that university presidents take charge, assert themselves, take charge of college athletics, take charge of the huge amount of television money it attracted, and restore academic and financial integrity to the programs. As a result, over the next several years, academic standards became more stringent, financial support for student athletes increased, college presidents asserted more responsibility for financial controls.

What is especially relevant to today’s hearing is that despite the problems surrounding intercollegiate athletics then, the Knight Commission strongly endorsed keeping the student athlete tradition. This is what the Knight Commission said, and I think it is worth repeating:

“We reject the argument that the only realistic solution”—that is to the corruption—“to the problem is to drop the student athlete concept, put athletes on the payroll, and reduce or even eliminate their responsibilities as students.”

“Such a scheme has nothing to do with education, the purpose for which colleges and universities exist. Scholarship athletes are already paid in the most meaningful way possible: with a free education. The idea of intercollegiate athletics is that teams represent their institutions as true members of the student body and not as hired hands. Surely, American higher education has the ability to devise a better solution to the problems of intercollegiate athletics than making professionals out of the players, which is no solution at all, but an unacceptable surrender to despair.”

I hope those words from the Knight Commission 30 years ago will guide how this Congress deals with the newest issue threatening the concept of student athletes: allowing commercial interests to pay athletes for the use of their name, image, and likeness.

Already, four States have enacted laws sanctioning such payments in various forms, and more than 30 States are considering such legislation. Senator Roger Wicker, Chairman of the Commerce Committee, is considering whether there ought to be congressional action. Our purpose today as the Senate’s Education Committee is

to inform the work of the Commerce Committee by considering the impact of such payments on the tradition of the student athletes.

It would make sense to take a minute to consider exactly who and what we are talking about. Last year, there were about 20 million undergraduates in about 6,000 colleges and universities in the United States. Nearly 1,100 of those 6,000 colleges and universities are members of the NCAA. More than 460,000 young men and women participate in 24 different sports each year in about one-quarter of one million contests. About 300 of those institutions play football and basketball at the highest level. Fewer than 2 percent of student athletes will go on to play professional sports, according to the NCAA, so this means we are talking about approximately 9,000 college student athletes who compete in a few sports out of more than 460,000 college athletes across 24 sports.

The current controversy is primarily about an even smaller number. A small percentage of those 9,000 students, who play football, baseball, or men's or women's basketball, and whose skills, or the institutions for which they play, make them attractive targets for recruiting officers—offers that will combine their scholarship dollars with endorsement money. For example, an exceptional quarterback, pitcher, or running back might be offered a half million dollars a year by a car dealership in the same town as the college with a big time football, baseball, or basketball program.

Now, as the Knight Commission said, student athletes are already paid in the most meaningful way with a free education. Athletic scholarships are limited to tuitions and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, but this can add up to a lot of money. The University of Tennessee estimates it spends about \$115,000 a year per student athlete, including room and board, student stipends, academic support, meals, sports medicine, training, travel, and equipment.

Student athletes may also combine other sources of financial aid, including Federal or State need-based aid to help cover the full cost of attendance. These include Pell Grants, Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, work-study, State grants based on need using Federal need calculations, such as Tennessee's HOPE Scholarship, or veteran's programs, such as the GI Bill or Post-9/11 GI Bill. About 92,000, or 20 percent of the student athletes, receive Pell Grants, which can be up to \$6,200 more.

According to the College Board, the value of a lifetime degree is \$1 million over an individual's lifetime, and 88 percent of the NCAA's student athletes graduate, earn a degree.

Now to the question at hand. Should Congress act or should varying State laws govern payments for name, image, and likeness to student athletes? Is a patchwork set of regulations worth the confusion it will cause with unrestrained boosters, creative agents, the impact of Title IX on men and women's programs, on a coach's effort, and most of all, on the tradition of the intercollegiate student athlete? Solving that question will be the job of the Commerce Committee, but we can inform their decision with today's testimony and Senators' comments.

Based on my experience as a student athlete, my time as a university president, and my membership on the Knight Commission, let me offer these suggestions:

One, the Knight Commission was correct to say that student athletes should not be on the payroll and should not be treated as hired hands.

Two, Congress should act, but in a limited way as possible to authorize an independent entity, safe from litigation, to write rules governing payments for the use of names, image, and likeness. Congress—imagine all 535 of us doing this—should provide aggressive oversight of that entity rather than try to write those rules.

Three, that governing entity should be the NCAA. I know, I know. The NCAA is controversial. So will every entity or any entity that tries to write rules for intercollegiate student athletes. If the NCAA is not doing a good job, the presidents of the universities who are in charge of it ought to reform it.

Giving the job to some existing entity, such as the Federal Trade Commission, which does not have exercise—any expertise or any sense of responsibility for higher education, makes no sense. Giving the job to a new entity would take forever.

Now, as to rules which the NCAA should write, here is what I believe should be the overriding principle: Money paid to student athletes for the use of their name, image, and likeness should benefit all student athletes at that institution. Following this principle would allow the earnings to be used for additional academic support, further study or degrees, more health insurance options, more support for injured players, and other needs.

It would avoid the awkwardness of a center, who earns nothing, snapping the ball to a quarterback, who earns a half million dollars for promoting the local auto dealer. It avoids the inevitable abuse that would occur with agents and boosters becoming involved with outstanding high school athletes. It would avoid the unexpected consequences to other teams at an institution because of the impact of Title IX or the impact on existing student aid to athletes.

Such a principle as I am suggesting preserves the right of any athlete to earn money for the use of his or her name, image, or likeness. It simply says if you elect to be a student athlete, your earnings should benefit all student athletes at your institutions. If you want to keep the money and be someone's employees, then go join a professional team. This system would create the same kind of choices that today's NCAA rules for college baseball require. A high school student must stay 3 years if he chooses to participate in a college baseball program.

Senator Kaine and I were talking before the hearing about Virginia and Vanderbilt's baseball program. Take Vanderbilt, for example. David Price, Sonny Gray, and Dansby Swanson—familiar names to Major League Baseball fans—all very successful professional athletes now. All were drafted by Major League Baseball teams while they were in high school. They could have earned a lot of money going directly into professional baseball. Instead, they chose a Vanderbilt education, 3 years of college experience, and the opportunity to be taught by Coach Tim Corbin. If Price, Gray, and Swanson had been permitted to sell their name, image, and likeness while at Vanderbilt, under the principle I am suggesting, their earnings would have been used for the benefit of all of Vanderbilt's sports teams, men and women.

Applying such a principle to all intercollegiate athletics might cause a few talented athletes to join professional leagues immediately after high school. That is their right. But, if that young athlete prefers the college experience, the expert coaching and teaching, the free education, other academic support, and the additional \$1 million in their lifetime that comes with earning a college degree, then their earnings should benefit all the students at their institution. And, while the NCAA is making new rules, it ought to assign most of the TV revenues to institutions for use and academic support for student athletes rather than continue to encourage inordinately high salaries for some coaches.

I do not see a good ending to allowing a few student athletes to be paid by commercial interests while most of their teammates are not. If young athletes want to be a part of a team, enjoy the undergraduate experience, learn from coaches who are among the best teachers in the Country, and be paid a full scholarship that helps them earn \$1 million during their lifetime, then all the student athletes at their institution should benefit. If that student athlete wants to keep the money for himself or herself, that student athlete should become a professional.

I will now recognize Senator Murray for her opening statement.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURRAY

Senator MURRAY. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to all of our witnesses for joining us for this hearing today.

Before I speak on the hearing, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to mention a few things. First of all, I just wanted to say I have been in very close contact with local leaders on the ground as families in my home State of Washington and the West Coast are dealing with devastating fires that are wiping out communities and damaging air quality dramatically.

I just want to publicly thank the many courageous first responders and firefighters, who are risking their lives to save our families and communities, and let them all know I am committed to doing everything I can to make sure that local fire departments and officials and communities have everything they need to fight these fires and begin this long road to recovery. So, thank you for allowing me to say that.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to just acknowledge your many decades of leadership on a vast number of issues, including on today's topic, which I know you have always been focused on. Throughout our time in the Senate and our 6 years running this Committee together, you have often helped the Committee and its Members in leading us in very important discussions on critical issues facing families across this Country. And I know I speak for all the Members when I thank you for the manner in which you have partnered with me to run this Committee as we look into issues like name, image, likeness, and so many others.

It is easy, especially now, to just go into our respective corners and not have a discussion about big problems that our Country is facing, and it demonstrates really your commitment to this institution and the importance of dialog that even now you are facilitating bipartisan discussions on topics like this. This Committee benefits

enormously from your experiences as a Governor, as president of the University of Tennessee, and Education Secretary.

I know January is a ways off, but I want to start off by thanking you for all of your great work on this Committee and in the Senate. Mr. Chairman, I have to say, our work together really means a lot to me because, while we do have different backgrounds and different perspectives and different styles, you and I and the great members of this Committee share a commitment to getting things done for families and communities we represent, and for our Country. We both want to continue the important role this Committee and the Senate play, and we truly will miss you helping drive discussions like that one we are having today. Again and again over the years, you have come to work looking to solve problems, not score political points.

I know I speak for all Committee Members on both sides of the aisle when I say you will be greatly missed.

There is no better proof of your determination to work in a bipartisan way and do whatever it takes to find common ground than the countless bills that we have worked on together and this Committee was successful in passing, from the 21st Century Cures Act to the Every Student Succeeds Act to Perkins CTE, as well as a number of bills to address the opioids epidemic. These laws did not just tackle big issues. They managed to get broad, bipartisan support from all of our colleagues, and millions of families for years to come will benefit from your work. So, thank you.

Now, today I am glad to have the opportunity to talk about college athletes, which I know is personal to you as a former track and field star. And, Mr. Chairman, as you and I have talked about before, the issue of compensating college athletes is something you have long been focused on, and I am glad we are having this conversation today.

I also want to thank Senator Murphy for pushing us to have this discussion today and to colleagues who are off this Committee, like Senator Booker, for their work and leadership on this issue.

This summer, our Nation finally began to reckon with police brutality and the pervasiveness of systemic racism in our Country, a reality which so many have lived with their entire life. One of the many issues we are overdue to address is the exploitation of college athletes, which has profound racial and economic justice implications.

For too long, the \$15 billion college sports industry has been a glaring example of economic and racial inequity, one where the majority of athletes in Division I revenue-generating sports are Black, and mostly White coaches and NCAA officials make millions off the labor of young college athletes. Despite the fact that college athletes bring in millions of dollars for colleges each year and stimulate local economies across the Country, they are prohibited from receiving a penny in compensation.

I know there are people who say a 'free education' is a privilege, or compensating athletes will hinder their education, or paying college athletes will be the end of college sports as we know it. But, you know, the stories I have heard from many young athletes back in my home State of Washington about the inequity and abuse they have experienced show how our current system exploits young ath-

letes, particularly young athletes of color, and it has to be reformed.

I heard from a former all-star Black college athlete in Washington State who, before he went pro, said he had to steal food from the cafeteria and grocery stores because he was not allowed to work and he could not afford food. That is a tough thing for someone to share, but he wanted everyone to know just how difficult it can get for so many athletes.

There are countless stories of college athletes who have their futures thrown into jeopardy because they got injured and were not guaranteed long-term, affordable healthcare. And, in some instances, they might lose their scholarship and their chance at an education.

College athletes are struggling to manage their academic course loads and grueling daily schedules filled with workouts, practices, and games, while also facing food and economic insecurity, while the NCAA and member schools enter into billion-dollar media deals, universities invest in luxury facilities, coaches receive million-dollar salaries, and more. That is immoral. We should not accept that. So, I urge all my colleagues in the Senate to listen to the experiences of college athletes, particularly college athletes of color, in their home States because once you do, it is impossible to deny that change is needed.

There are a lot of ways Congress and other committees can act to protect college athletes' rights, and I want to talk about a few of them. First and foremost, we need to make sure that college athletes are fairly compensated. An important first step toward that issue is allowing athletes to profit from the use of their name and image and likeness, or NIL. And, we have to ensure that all athletes, men and women, get their fair share of the revenue that they help to generate.

But, fair compensation is just one part of protecting the rights of college athletes, especially now as the COVID pandemic rages on. It is crucial that we establish enforceable health and safety standards. If an athlete gets injured while playing for their college, they should not be expected to deal with the medical or financial fallout on their own. We have to make sure that college athletes are guaranteed affordable healthcare and that colleges take responsibility for life-long health issues related to an injury.

We absolutely need to give college athletes the quality educational opportunities and support they deserve. Too many college athletes are being funneled into easy classes, sometimes even fake ones, simply do not have the time to complete their coursework due to rigorous practice schedules or are not finishing their degree. And, for Black athletes, graduation rates are significantly lower than White athletes. Just 55 percent of Black male athletes from the Power 5 conferences graduate within 6 years, compared to 70 percent of all college athletes. That is wrong, and it is unacceptable. All college athletes should receive the academic support they need to complete a quality education and assurances that their scholarships will not be revoked if they are injured.

It is clear the status quo is not working. It only serves those at the top. The NCAA should have addressed these issues long ago but failed to do it, so Congress must face these challenges head on

and offer college athletes solutions that end this current system of exploitation and replace it with a system which values college athletes' voices.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, as well as to each of our witnesses, who we will hear from shortly.

Before I close, I just want to say, in addition to these injustices right now, college athletes and their peers are also dealing with a pandemic that has brought enormous uncertainty to higher education. For students and everyone suffering through this pandemic, I just want to note, we cannot wait for weeks or months for another relief package. We have a lot of work to do—a lot of it. So, I hope in the days to come, we can finally get started on a serious negotiation to reach an agreement that meets the dire needs we are hearing from our families and the communities we serve.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Murray, and thanks for your generous comments at the beginning. I think everyone on this Committee knows that we would not have had the success we have had as a committee of very disparate views over the last several years if I had not been working with the Democratic Ranking Member, who used to be a kindergarten teacher and who learned, as well as taught, how to work well together. So, I will have more to say about that at a future hearing, but I deeply appreciate that—those comments and the way we have had a chance to work together, including today's hearing.

I want to acknowledge the efforts of Senator Murphy, who is here, Senator Romney, Senator Burr, all of whom are among Senators who have had a real interest in this subject, which is being considered by several committees.

I am pleased to welcome our witnesses today to the hearing focusing on intercollegiate athletics. Senator Baldwin will introduce our first witness. Senator Baldwin?

Senator BALDWIN. Thank you.

I am pleased to introduce Dr. Rebecca Blank, Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Dr. Blank has served as chancellor since 2013. Previously, she served as Deputy Secretary and Acting Secretary of Commerce under President Obama. She was also a member of the Council of Economic Advisors under President Clinton. She has served as Dean and Professor of Public Policy and Economics at the University of Michigan. She was a faculty member at Northwestern and Princeton Universities, and a fellow at the Brookings Institution.

The University of Wisconsin is a member of the Big Ten, one of the Power 5 conferences, with 23 varsity sports and approximately 800 participating students each year. Chancellor Blank was recently appointed to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

I look forward to hearing her insights today as part of today's important discussion about college athletics and compensation.

Welcome, Chancellor Blank, and On Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Baldwin.

Our second witness is Karen Dennis. She has served as Director of Track & Field and Cross Country at The Ohio State University for the past 6 years. She has been named Big Ten Coach of the Year four times and was inducted to the Coaches Hall of Fame of

the U.S. Track & Field and Cross Country Coaches Association in 2018. She earned both a Bachelor's Degree in Public Affairs and a Master's Degree in Physical Education from Michigan State University.

Senator Romney will introduce our next witness.

Senator ROMNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have the honor to introduce John Hartwell, who is Vice President and Athletic Director at Utah State University.

As a former student athlete himself, he played basketball for The Citadel. For more than 5 years, he has been the Director of Athletics at Utah State, and he has ensured that his students have success both in the classroom and on the playing field.

Under his leadership, the Utah State Aggies have achieved a 54–15 record in men's basketball. Overall, Utah State University has claimed five Mountain West regular-season championships, and four post-season titles during his tenure.

Just as impressive is Utah State's student-athlete success in the classroom with a 93 percent graduation rate and a cumulative 3.36 grade point average, the highest in school history.

Utah State University is a Division I-A institution with 16 varsity teams. It offers 168 undergraduate degrees and 143 graduate degrees, and educates 28,000 students, one of whom, by the way, is my grandson.

Today, we examine the potential impacts of the NCAA's decision to allow student athletes to be compensated for their name, image, and likeness. As a former student athlete, as a certified public accountant, as an athletic director at Utah State University, John brings an informed and firsthand perspective, which I look forward to hearing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Romney.

Our fourth and final witness is Ramogi Huma, Executive Director of the National College Players Association.

Mr. Huma played college football at UCLA, where he became an advocate for student-athletes' rights. He and his work has been featured on numerous news programs. He is often quoted on ESPN and CBS Sports promoting athletic—or athlete compensation. He earned a Bachelor's Degree in Sociology and a Master's of Public Health at UCLA.

We will now begin hearing from our witnesses.

Chancellor Blank, let's start with you. Welcome.

STATEMENT OF REBECCA BLANK, CHANCELLOR, THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON, MADISON, WI

Dr. BLANK. Chairman Alexander, Ranking Member Murray, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for inviting me today. And, thank you, Senator Baldwin, for that very kind introduction. I am going to testify about the collegiate model of athletics and some of the potential reforms around student-athletes' ability to earn income from name, image, and likeness.

The University of Wisconsin at Madison is the flagship university of our State. We provide a world-class education to our students, and I am proud to be its chancellor.

We are here today to discuss collegiate student athletes. I believe deeply in the student-athlete role, with an emphasis on student first. It is the right role for those who play sports in college. Only a small percentage of student athletes compete after college. Three percent at UW go on to play professionally. So, we need to prepare our athletes for careers off the field.

The University of Wisconsin is a strong program with student athletes who perform well both in the classroom and in their sport. Our student athletes not only compete for Big Ten and national titles, but they are also strong students. More than 350 have been named to the dean's list each year. Last year, our student athletes majored in 84 different areas of study, and the multi-year graduation rate for our student athletes is 90 percent. For all Division I athletes, it is 88 percent.

Like other universities, we provide broad support for our student athletes. Their scholarships cover the full cost of attendance, including tuition, books, fees, housing, and other expenses.

But, that is just the beginning of the support they receive. They receive laptops, tutoring, and access to dedicated academic advisors. They have access to mentoring and world-class coaching, mental health counseling, sports psychologists, state-of-the-art healthcare, including care that covers anything for at least 2 years after they leave the university.

They have access to unlimited meals and snacks. They receive nutrition advice and career counseling, and we pay for degree completion at any school in the Country for those who leave for professional sports that want to complete their degree later.

All of those benefits, however, are dwarfed by what they receive from their college education. I am an economist by training, and I know the extensive literature on the returns to a college education. College graduates earn a million dollars more than those with only a high-school degree over their lifetime. The return to their college degree is by far the greatest benefit our student athletes receive.

The business model for college athletics is greatly misunderstood by the public. We are not sponsoring college sports because of its potential to make money. At the University of Wisconsin, only football and men's basketball are revenue-generating sports. Our other 21 sports cost more money than they generate. But, the value of our academic program is the broad opportunities it provides for students with many skills to compete. If we had to spend all of our revenue in only our two revenue-producing sports, I am not sure we would choose to run an athletic program at UW.

In recent years, there has been a lively discussion about allowing students to generate income from name, image, and likeness, or NIL. Other students have this opportunity, and I support finding ways for student athletes to do so, as well. I would like to discuss the parameters, however, of what that should look like. While we need congressional help, any legislation should improve the situation for students, not make it worse.

The NCAA, the Big Ten, and the A-5 have endorsed a set of principles we hope you will consider. These include:

One, we need Congress to pass Federal legislation and need it before July 2021 when the first State law goes into effect. We cannot function under a hodgepodge of State laws now being passed

that will make it difficult for a level playing field for recruitment or competition.

Two, Federal legislation must include a preemption over those State laws already enacted. And, in addition, we need a very narrowly tailored anti-trust exemption.

Three, we must protect college recruiting. Student athletes should have new avenues to pursue payment from third parties for name, image, and likeness, but those should be totally outside the recruiting process.

Four, we must avoid pay-for-play. Our student athletes are not professional athletes and they should not be paid to participate in sports.

Last, student athletes are not university employees. Their first priority is to be students working toward a college degree.

The NCAA's Division I board of directors is developing new NIL rules for student athletes, which will come to the board for consideration later this year.

I value the role of Congress in constructing a national framework on NIL and giving us the tools we need to make it work. You should not wait on the NCAA process, and I hope you will once—once you agree on a national NIL standard, you will provide us with the narrow, legal protection needed for us to implement your decision.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Rebecca Blank follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REBECCA BLANK

Chairman Alexander, Ranking Member Murray, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for inviting me to testify about the collegiate model of athletics and potential reforms around the issue of student-athletes' ability to profit from Name, Image, and Likeness licensing.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison is the flagship university in our state. We are one of the largest research institutions in the country and provide a world-class education to our students. We are committed to sharing knowledge and innovation that improves lives in Wisconsin and around the globe. I'm proud to have led the university as Chancellor since 2013.

We're here today to discuss collegiate student-athletes. In most of the world, talented young athletes leave school to pursue their sports; few advance to the top rungs of competition but all pay a price in lost opportunities for education. In contrast, the U.S. collegiate model of athletics allows students to pursue their athletic ambitions in sports as different as volleyball, wrestling, track and field, and basketball, while also receiving life-changing educational benefits from great institutions like UW-Madison.

Only a small percentage of college athletes go on to play professional sports after college. Since 2015, at Wisconsin we typically have around 800 students engaged with our athletic program in any year. Over the last 5 years we have had approximately 4,000 total student athletes on our campus. Of those student athletes, approximately 120, or about 3 percent, have gone on to play professionally; this means that 97 percent will not. But one hundred percent will benefit from the education they receive on campuses like ours.

I believe deeply that the student-athlete role is the right role for those who play sports at UW. The University of Wisconsin is the example of a strong program with student-athletes who perform well both in the classroom and in their sport. We are proud that our student-athletes not only compete for Big Ten and national titles, but they also are strong students in the classroom. On average more than 350 are named to the Dean's List each year.

During the 2019–20 academic year, UW student-athletes majored in 84 areas of study. These majors represent all schools and colleges at UW-Madison except the School of Pharmacy. The multi-year graduation rate for our student-athletes is 90

percent. The overall rate for all NCAA Division I student-athletes is 88 percent for the data reported in Fall 2019.

Like other schools in the Autonomy Five, or Power Five, conferences, the University of Wisconsin—Madison provides broad-based support for our student-athletes. Financially, our scholarships cover the full cost of attendance, including tuition, books, fees, housing, and other expenses. Those who are eligible receive Pell Grants in addition to their full scholarships. The value of these scholarship benefits provided to student-athletes receiving a full aid package total nearly \$87,000 for out of state students and more than \$59,000 for a Wisconsin resident per year.

But that's just part of the support received by student-athletes. They also receive laptops, tutoring and access to dedicated academic advisors. They have access to mentoring and world-class coaching, mental health counseling, sports psychologists, state-of-the-art health care including care, which covers any issues for at least 2 years after they leave the university. They have access to unlimited meals and snacks, all provided free of charge—they don't have to pay for food out of their scholarship money. They receive nutrition advice, and career counseling. We also pay for degree completion at any school in the country for those who leave for professional sports but want to complete their degree at a later point.

But all of these benefits are dwarfed by what they receive from their college education. I'm an economist by training and know the extensive literature on the returns to a college education. By any measure, college graduates outperform their peers who have only completed their high school degree. For example, the average college graduate is 24 percent more likely to be employed than a high-school graduate and average earnings among college graduates averages \$1 million higher over a lifetime. When looking at the benefits received by student-athletes, for the vast majority, the value of their college degree will be the biggest benefit they receive from their college experience.

Add the scholarship benefits to the other assistance available to student-athletes and then add in the return to their college education. This is a generous package of benefits—more than is received by any other students on our campus. Their college-athlete experience also builds a network of friends and experiences that shape them for a lifetime. Their education has the power to change the trajectory of entire families, particularly among first-generation college students or those who but for their athletic ability may not have the opportunity to attend college at all.

The business model for college athletics is greatly misunderstood by the public. The American collegiate model is focused on offering athletic opportunities to a broad base of student-athletes in a wide range of sports, regardless of their revenue potential. If college sports followed the business model used by private companies, we would compete in the sports that generate positive cash-flow and eliminate all others. That's not the model any university follows. For instance, at the University of Wisconsin, only football and men's basketball are revenue-generating sports. Our other 21 sports cost more money than they generate—and that is true almost everywhere, with very few exceptions.

But we're not running college sports primarily to make money. We are offering training and competitive experiences to a large number of students with diverse athletic skills. That fits into our educational model, where our goal is to help students develop their skills, their self-discipline, their self-knowledge and self-confidence over the college years. If we had to spend all of our revenue only within our two revenue-producing sports, there would be no Olympic sport opportunities and a relatively small number of student-athletes. Under these circumstances, I'm not sure we would choose to run an athletic program at UW-Madison. Our 800 athletes across 23 sports are all part of the fabric of our institution. I'm proud of all of them.

Collectively within the Big Ten, member institutions offer nearly 350 varsity sport programs that provide opportunities to over 9,500 student-athletes. In addition, Big Ten institutions will provide nearly \$240 million in athletics scholarships this year.

College athletics has continued to evolve and the system has changed as the needs and demands of student athletes has changed. For instance, there are a variety of recent NCAA Autonomy 5 rule changes to further support student-athletes including a more inclusive definition of full cost of attendance, more extensive medical expenses and meal provisions, to name a few.

We are now in the midst of a lively national discussion on how to best allow students to generate income from Name, Image, and Likeness, familiar known as NIL. Other students have this opportunity and I support finding ways for student-athletes to do so as well. I'd like to discuss the parameters of how this should look.

As the debate about Name, Image, and Likeness rights has progressed, it has become clear that some would like to use this to upend the entire collegiate model. As noted, I agree that we need to change our NIL rules, and as you know, the NCAA is in the midst of finalizing new rules that allow students to benefit from their NIL, with some guideposts around how this would work. This will also require assistance from Congress through legislation setting national standards. But this must be done thoughtfully. Federal legislation needs to improve the situation for student-athletes, not make it worse.

The NCAA, the Big Ten, and the A5 have endorsed a set of consensus principles on NIL that we hope Congress will consider.

- We need Congress to pass Federal legislation. The members of the Big Ten and the A5 conferences agree that it is time to reform the rules around Name, Image, and Likeness and we urge Congress to adopt a national standard in short order. A national framework is imperative—we cannot function under a hodgepodge of state laws that make it difficult to have a level playing field for recruiting or competition.
- Congress must enact a law before July 2021. Time is of the essence. The State of Florida passed a NIL law that takes effect on July 1. Four other states have also passed NIL laws and 31 other states are considering such laws. The need is obvious for a national framework that is universal, fair, and can be implemented without threat of legally upending the collegiate model.
- Congress must include a preemption. A number of state laws are already enacted, and more states are proposing action, so it is vital that Federal legislation include a preemption over the state laws. In addition, the NCAA has faced many antitrust lawsuits, so we hope Congress will include a safe harbor to allow the implementation of NCAA rules on NIL. This is a request for a very narrowly tailored antitrust exemption that allows NCAA to enforce common rules about NIL without facing constant external lawsuits.
- Protect college recruiting. Student-athletes should have new avenues to pursue payment from third parties for NIL—but those transactions should be totally outside the recruiting process. It would be a mistake to allow NIL to corrupt the recruiting process, allowing the promise of payments, directly by schools or indirectly by boosters or sponsors. This will contaminate the recruiting process.
The guardrails needed around the recruiting process are to protect our student-athletes. It doesn't take much imagination to envision a car dealership or other business offering to pay a 17-year old five-star recruit still in high school to enroll at the local university and not consider other options.
- Prevent pay for play. Our student-athletes are not professional athletes, and they should not be paid to participate in sports. It is essential to preserve the collegiate model that provides opportunity for so many.
- Student-athletes are not university employees. We must make clear that our student-athletes are students, and not university employees. Their first priority is to work in the classroom toward a college degree.

I have recently been appointed to the NCAA's Division-I Board of Directors. The association is currently in the process of considering new rules for student-athletes to benefit from their Name, Image, and Likeness. By the end of next month, each division should have legislation drafted to update NIL rules.

Speaking personally, I want to assure you that I value the role of the Congress in constructing a national framework on NIL. I do not believe you should wait on the process at the NCAA to be complete, and I hope that once you agree on a national NIL standard, that you will provide us with the narrow legal protections needed to implement your decision.

New opportunities for NIL can exist within the confines of our student-athlete model and Congress can help make this work—preserving the educational opportunities for hundreds of thousands, while modernizing endorsement opportunities for all.

Thank you again for your attention to this important issue and your concern for our student-athletes.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Chancellor.

Ms. Karen Dennis, welcome.

STATEMENT OF KAREN DENNIS, DIRECTOR OF TRACK & FIELD AND CROSS COUNTRY, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OH

Ms. DENNIS. Thank you, Chairman Alexander. And, just quickly, I would like to say your 10.1 performance in 1960 would still be pretty good 60 years later.

[Laughter.]

Ms. DENNIS. Chairman Alexander, Ranking Member Murray, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

As one who has been engaged in sports over the past 6 decades as an athlete, coach, and now one of only 3 percent of women in the Country to preside as director of a dual-gender track and field program, I am honored to be with you today to provide some insights.

My parents were both college-educated. My mother was a school teacher; my father a city of Detroit employee. My father was an outstanding high-jumper and sprinter, who competed against and with the great Jesse Owens, a renowned Buckeye.

I graduated Michigan State with a Bachelor's and Master's degree. I was the first woman at Michigan State in track and field to receive an athletic grant and aid—a whopping \$300. I was the head coach of Michigan State, UNLV, and the 2000 U.S. Women's Track & Field Olympic team. Currently, I am in my sixth season as Director of Track & Field and Cross Country at The Ohio State University.

Ohio State's Department of Athletics offers 36 intercollegiate sports—17 women's, 16 men's, and three co-ed—and approximately 1,000 student athletes. Only two programs, football and men's basketball, actually generate a profit. Revenue-sharing from these programs is what makes it possible for programs like mine to exist. Ohio State's athletic department is one of approximately 20 nationwide that is self-sustaining and receives no university funds, tax dollars, or student fees.

I have been fortunate to have witnessed and been a benefactor to the many changes in collegiate sports over the past several decades. Throughout each period and change of governance, the student-athlete experience has been significantly enhanced. As States begin to enact laws governing student-athlete compensation, I would like to offer some insights on the impact pay-to-play and name, image, likeness, NIL, could have on our students and university sport teams.

I am a strong supporter of the amateurism model of collegiate athletics. Paying players to play, in essence making them employees of their universities, would have serious, negative consequences on college sports and the student athlete. I fear once enrolled, student athletes would prioritize athletic performance to the detriment of their academics and athletics. The cost of funding pay-to-play, at best, would result in smaller squad sizes, thereby eliminating competitive opportunities for many students. At worst, it would force many athletic departments to completely eliminate non-revenue-generating sports, such as track and field.

I also support the NCAA's efforts to allow name, image, and likeness opportunities for student athletes consistent within the collegiate athlete model. I believe it will serve a broader base of students, while embracing the successful NCAA amateur sports structure. Given the opportunity to brand themselves while in college with technical, intellectual, tangible, and legal resources at their disposal, a greater number of student athletes will leave school better prepared for life and global citizenship.

However, certain guiderails in education programs must be put into place to appropriately support the student athlete. With new-found NIL revenue comes new and probably unexpected tax liabilities and unexpected financial implications that could affect an athlete's ability for some student aid programs, such as Pell.

Social media opportunities must be properly vetted by both the student athlete and the institution with appropriate privacy protections put into place.

At Ohio State, we place great emphasis on life-after-sport through the Eugene D. Smith Leadership Institute, which provides leadership, character, and career development opportunities to all student athletes in order to best prepare them for life after graduation. There are serious benefits, as well as concerns, for student athletes as compensation opportunities become reality.

Policymakers should be encouraged to continue to hear multiple viewpoints to ensure that the appropriate structures support student athletes and protect the amateurism model, which has been so important to the collegiate experience of millions of athletes.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Karen Dennis follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KAREN DENNIS

Chairman Lamar Alexander, Ranking Member Patty Murray and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify on the subject of "Compensating College Athletes: Examining the Potential Impact on Athletes and Institutions." As one who has been engaged in sports over the past six decades as an athlete, coach, and now one of only 3 percent of women in the country to preside as director of a dual gendered track and field program, I'm honored to be with you today to provide you my insights on this important topic.

My parents were both college educated. My mother was a school teacher, my father a city of Detroit employee. My father was an outstanding high jumper and sprinter who competed against and with the great Jesse Owens.

I fell in love with track and field watching the 1960 Olympics and Wilma Rudolph winning three Olympic gold medals. She became my sports hero because she looked like me, and I thought I was also fast. I didn't know anything about what it took to become an Olympian. I only knew I was faster than any girl and most of the boys in elementary school.

I entered high school during the pre-Title IX era. A time when sport participation for girls was limited to only basketball in my school. I raced locally, regionally, and ultimately for a state championship. As a member of the Detroit Track Club, I was able to compete throughout the country and internationally. I qualified for the 1968 Olympic trials in the 200m dash hoping to be among the top three to make the team. Unfortunately, I placed 5th, losing my bid for the team.

In 1972, I entered Michigan State University (MSU). I had a daughter and new responsibilities. Completing college became my priority. However, while at MSU, I was encouraged by two prominent coaches (Coach Jim Bibbs, the first minority head coach in the school's history, and Dr. Neil Jackson, the Athletic Director and Women's Track and Field coach and former Olympian) to try out for the newly formed track team at MSU. I couldn't resist the opportunity to put my spikes back on. I

was the first woman at Michigan State in track and field to receive an athletic grant in aid—a whopping \$300.

I graduated Michigan State University with a bachelor's degree and a master's degree. I was the head coach of Michigan State, UNLV, and the 2000 U.S. Women's National Track and Field Team. Currently, I'm in my sixth season as Director of Track & Field and Cross Country at Ohio State.

The Department of Athletics at Ohio State offers 36 intercollegiate sports—17 women's, 16 men's and three co-ed—and approximately 1,000 student-athletes, nearly two-thirds of whom are Ohio State Scholar-Athletes and nearly one-half who are Academic All-Big Ten honorees. Four Ohio State sports generate revenue: football, men's basketball, men's ice hockey and wrestling. Of those, only two programs—football and men's basketball—actually generate a profit. Revenue sharing from these programs is what makes it possible for programs like mine to exist. Ohio State's Department of Athletics is one of approximately 20 nationwide that is self-sustaining and receives no university funds, tax dollars or student fees.

The track and field program is one of the oldest and most storied at Ohio State. The men's program dates back to 1913 while the women's program started in 1978. Some of the most recognizable names in the sport wore the scarlet and gray, including the incomparable Jesse Owens. The men's program has won one national championship, produced 59 NCAA indoor and outdoor champions and nine Big Ten team titles. The women's teams have been among the best and most consistent programs in the conference and are the winners of back to back indoor team titles (2019 and 2020) and three outdoor championships, most recently in 2019. It has crowned seven NCAA champions (five indoor and two outdoor). Between the two programs, Ohio State has over 400 individual Big Ten champions, 200 first-team All-Americans and countless more student-athletes who have gone on to success in all walks of life.

I've been fortunate to have witnessed and been a benefactor to the many changes in collegiate sports over the past several decades.

- **Increased scholarship opportunities for women.** Collegiate sports in 1972 were two separate entities: one for men and one for women. Men's sports was governed by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and women's sports by the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). The disparity between the men and women's programs was blatantly obvious, most notably in travel, housing, equipment, practice times, facilities, coach's pay, and scholarships. The impact of Title IX on women student-athletes cannot be overstated. Today, the number of female student-athletes is at an all-time high.
- **The “Cost of Attendance” component to all student athlete scholarships & budget increase to women sports programs.** In 1972, Title IX was enacted into law, which kick-started progress for women by requiring schools to provide equitable opportunities for both men and women in sports. By the late 1970's budgets were increased for women's sport programs. Thanks to increased funding and institutional opportunities, there has been a 545 percent increase in the percentage of women playing college sports since the passage of Title IX and in 2019, more than 10,000 women's team competed in NCAA-sponsored sports according to the NCAA. It is critical that these existing opportunities for female college athletes and the advancements which have occurred as a result of Title IX are supported and protected.
- **National and international team travel for competitions.** As a young coach, after the passage of Title IX, I advocated for a travel budget that would allow for more competitive opportunities, two athletes to a room instead of four, two pairs of shoes per person, \$20.00 a day per diem, and scholarship numbers equal to some of my Big Ten competitors. I figured I had nothing to lose, everything to gain. Some of my requests were met.

Other significant changes include:

- **Media and television exposure.**
- **Equality for National Championships among all NCAA Division programs.**
- NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL RECRUITMENT.
- **Upgraded facilities and locker rooms for both men and women's teams**
- **Medical services, nutritional and psychological services.**

- **Equality consideration of salaries for women.**

Throughout each period in change of governance, the student athlete experience has been significantly enhanced. The driving force of change in this moment is to stay laser-focused on what really matters. As a former student athlete, a young coach, and now in the youth of my old age, the student athlete experience will continue to be what really matters to me.

The current debate to “compensate college athletes” has been discussed among coaches and student athletes for years dating back to my years as a young coach. As states began to enact laws governing student athlete compensation, I’d like to offer some of my insights on the impact “Pay to Play” and “Name Image and Likeness” (NIL) could have on our students and university sport teams.

I am a strong supporter of the amateurism model of colligate athletics. Paying players to play—in essence making them employees of their universities—would have serious, negative consequences on college sports and the student athlete. I fear once enrolled, student athletes would prioritize athletic performance to the detriment of their academics. While “paying players to play” sounds simple and easy, the distribution of funds to every student athlete is not. Will all student athletes be paid the same? Would non-scorers and students that don’t play, receive the same level of pay as scorers and our teams most relied upon athletes? If so, this approach will take away the competitive incentive to get better by rewarding everyone for unequal participation. Finally, the cost of funding “pay to play” at best would result in smaller squad sizes thereby eliminating competitive opportunities for many students. At worst, it would force many athletic departments to completely eliminate nonrevenue generating sports—such as track and field.

The NIL model will serve a broader base of students through sport and continue to embrace the successful NCAA amateur sport structure. Providing our student athletes the opportunity to monetize their talents through NIL will allow them to grow and use their intellectual and creative talents beyond their athletic abilities. It’s exciting to imagine a student population incentivized to experience and discover talents beyond their athletics. Given the opportunity to brand themselves while in college with technical, intellectual, tangible and legal resources at their disposal, a greater number of student athletes will leave school better prepared for life and global citizenship.

At Ohio State for example, we place great emphasis on “life after sport” through the Eugene D. Smith Leadership Institute, which provides leadership, character, and career development opportunities to all student-athletes in order to best prepare them for life after graduation. This is in addition to a national model Student-Athlete Support Services Office (SASSO) that supports the University and Athletic Department missions by providing programs and services that promote degree attainment and comprehensive personal development. SASSO highlights include:

- An academic counselor assigned each team to provide accurate, academic information and planning related to a student’s college progress and degree program;
- Priority scheduling;
- Learning specialists and mentors; and
- Study table and tutoring programs.

I do have concerns with NIL. Social media apps are the easiest way for student athletes to gain recognition and make money. Unfortunately, it’s the least monitored and regulated. If not properly checked for content, highly inappropriate postings could damage the reputation of the student and have long-lasting impact. While inappropriate content can be identified after the fact, unfortunately that may be too late. Who defines what’s appropriate becomes another issue that may require litigation. Living in the world of Covid-19 and social injustice, student athletes run the risk of infringing on a teammate’s privacy in their posts.

Social media “following” is a highly competitive business. The amount of money to be made is dependent on the number of “followers.” Moreover, immediate financial gratification could become more important than attending classes and school events, and even athletic practices. Also, with some newfound revenue comes new and probably unexpected tax liabilities as well as financial implications that could affect their eligibility for some student aid programs, such as Pell. Finally, young athletes could attract older followers with the financial means to show up at a student’s school, residence, hotel or competition. This possibility worries me that our student athletes may be exposed to uncomfortable and possibly dangerous situa-

tions. Certain guardrails and education programs must be put into place to appropriately support the student-athletes.

As a minority coach in a minority sport, I know the changes considered in this moment will not only change the lives of our student athletes but will alter the trajectory of their families, communities, and society at large. I've witnessed the value in providing an education through athletic participation to students in nonrevenue sports and underrepresented populations that have been intellectually marginalized. I've watched hundreds of students who would never have gone to college—some who didn't even think they belonged in college—leave school with jobs in careers of their choice.

In the most recent statistics, Ohio State student-athletes combined for a 995 single-year Academic Progress Rate (APR) with 21 teams—20 of them nonrevenue generating, including men's track and field—posting perfect 1,000 scores. Looking at multi-year scores, 23 teams are at 980 or higher, including women's track and field and men's and women's cross country. According to a 2017 Bureau of Labor Statistics earnings by Educational Attainment as cited in the Commission on Black Girls in Columbus study, people with a Bachelor's degree earn 65 percent more weekly income than those with a high school diploma. The study reflected weekly earnings for H.S. graduates is \$712 and college graduates with a B.S. \$1,173. Eliminating economic disparity is liberating!

We cannot ignore the current reality facing universities and their athletic programs. The possibility of nonrevenue sports being canceled due to lack of funding is frightening. The effects of Covid-19 has given us a jarring reality check on our athletic community that now threatens our survival. In fact, just last week a Big Ten institution dropped its men's track and field program.

As you craft legislation to increase student opportunities, I ask that you do so with an eye not just toward revenue-generating sports, but also to sports like those I am privileged to coach.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

[SUMMARY STATEMENT OF KAREN DENNIS]

Coach Karen Dennis graduated from Michigan State University with a bachelor's degree and a master's degree. She has served as the head coach of Michigan State, UNLV, and the 2000 U.S. Women's National Track and Field Team. She's in her sixth season as the Director of Track & Field and Cross Country at The Ohio State University.

Coach Dennis is a strong supporter of the amateurism model of collegiate athletics. Paying players to play would have serious, negative consequences on college sports and the student athlete. The cost of funding "pay to play" at best would result in smaller squad sizes thereby eliminating competitive opportunities for many students. At worst, it would force many athletic departments to completely eliminate nonrevenue generating sports.

Ohio State's Department of Athletics offers 36 intercollegiate sports—17 women's, 16 men's and three co-ed—and approximately 1,000 student-athletes. Only two programs—football and men's basketball—actually generate a profit. Revenue sharing from these programs supports the existence of nonrevenue programs like track and field and cross country. Ohio State's Athletics is one of approximately 20 nationwide that is self-sustaining and receives no university funds, tax dollars or student fees.

Coach Dennis supports compensation for name, image and likeness (NIL) and believes it will serve a broader base of students while embracing the successful NCAA amateur sport structure. However, certain guardrails and education programs must be put into place to appropriately support the student athlete. With newfound revenue comes new and probably unexpected tax liabilities and unexpected financial implications that could affect an athlete's eligibility for some student aid programs, such as Pell. Social media opportunities must be properly vetted by both the student athlete and the institution, with appropriate privacy protections put into place.

There are serious benefits, as well as concerns, for student athletes as compensation opportunities become a reality. Policymakers should be encouraged to continue to hear multiple viewpoints to ensure that the appropriate structure supports student athletes and protects the amateurism model which has been so important to the collegiate experience of millions of athletes.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Ms. Dennis, for being here today. Mr. Hartwell, welcome.

STATEMENT OF JOHN HARTWELL, VICE PRESIDENT & DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS, UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY, LOGAN, UT

Mr. HARTWELL. Thank you, Chairman Alexander and Ranking Member Murray and distinguished Members of the Committee. Thank you so much for inviting me to testify on this important topic today.

Collegiate athletics have played a huge part in my life. The education experiences, relationships, and life lessons learned over 4 years as a student athlete at The Citadel many years ago have been invaluable to me over the last 37 years. The most rewarding aspect of my job is being able to facilitate and provide life-changing opportunities through collegiate athletics to others, just as I was fortunate to be given many years ago.

My primary responsibility as the Director of Athletics is to provide the tools and resources necessary for our student athletes to be successful in the classroom and on the fields of play. As Senator Romney so graciously pointed out, at Utah State, we are winning in the classroom and on the fields of play. In addition to the championships won and the high grade-point averages and grade—graduation success rates, we have also finished in the top 25 in the Country over the last 5 years in the sports of football, men's basketball, men's cross country, and men's track and field. In addition, in the 2020 NFL draft, quarterback Jordan Love was the only non-autonomous Power 5 conference student athlete selected. So, there are a lot of things going well here at Utah State University.

I want to talk a little bit about the financial side of college athletics, and I will throw back on my CPA hat from many years ago to talk a little about that. Operating budgets for FBS institutions, the highest level of football playing institutions, which there are 130, range from roughly \$16 million to over \$230 million in annual budgets. Here at Utah State, our budget is around \$36 million; and of that \$36 million, \$13 million in revenues are generated through football and men's basketball. Conversely, for expenditures, we spend about \$11.5 million annually on football and men's basketball expenditures.

One important consideration in collegiate athletics and the collegiate athletics funding model is Title IX. Revenues from football and men's basketball help fund scholarships in many sports, including for female student athletes, which are required by Title IX compliance.

To me, the greatest victory a student athlete can achieve during their collegiate experience is when they walk across the stage to get a degree. Once earned, that degree can never be taken away. And, as you have heard from other witnesses, that degree can often lead to financial success in your life going forward, regardless the field of competition they go into. On the flip side, an athletic career can be taken away, whether by illness or injury, in the flash of an eye. So, the importance of getting that degree is so, so important.

College athletics provides outstanding educational opportunities for student athletes, many of whom would not be able to afford these educational opportunities without athletic scholarships. The

evolving needs of student athletes have been addressed in recent years with additional benefits being allowed by NCAA bylaws, to include cost of attendance stipends, which were introduced in 2015. And, the most recent iteration is in name, image, and likeness.

The concept of allowing student athletes the ability to profit from their name, image, or likeness, just as any other student on campus has the ability to, makes total sense. However, this opportunity does not need to become the path to pay-for-play, which would erode the collegiate model, which is so important to us.

Some key elements to consider when examining name, image, and likeness are these:

First off, the percentage of student athletes likely to generate significant money from name, image, and likeness endorsements and sponsorships is a very small percentage of the total number of student athletes that compete. At the Division I level, we have an average of 180,000 student athletes to compete. I would venture to say that the number who can generate significant income off of name, image, likeness is a very small fraction of that.

We also have to be careful of the unintended consequences of name, image, and likeness can create. Major recruiting violations have the opportunity to increase dramatically. It would be very difficult to monitor compensation and ethics, especially when funneled through third-party entities. As I had mentioned, Title IX could be a significant challenge based on the makeup of who would be receiving these benefits.

Also, revenues that benefit all student athletes on a campus, such as apparel and footwear deals, or corporate sponsorships, may be reduced that benefit—right now benefit every student athlete on campus and instead be rechanneled to a select few student athletes.

I think an important point is the financial challenges will likely be most severe at limited-resource institutions. We have got to have recruiting guardrails put in place, make sure that they are in place for collegiate athletics as it relates to NIL. Recruitment of prospective student athletes has to be safeguarded by the NCAA to maintain any type of competitive balance.

In conclusion, we need Congress to pass legislation on NIL to provide a consistent, national framework and ensure collegiate institutions and student athletes are not forced to navigate different State guidelines on the topic. We would ask for swift, preemptive, Federal legislation to offset the individual State laws.

I realize higher education may not be for everyone. In baseball and hockey, which have very strong minor league programs, there are alternatives if athletes in these sports don't desire to go to college. We need to work with the NFL, the NBA, the WNBA, and other professional leagues to further study possible minor league development systems as an option for those athletes not inclined for higher education.

As we navigate through unprecedented and challenging times in our Country, including the COVID-19 pandemic and social and political unrest, we must safeguard the overwhelmingly positive impact of college athletics and its structure tethered to higher education.

On behalf of my fellow athletic directors, I want to express our appreciation for your attention to name, image, likeness' impact on collegiate athletics going forward. We believe there is a way to provide additional income opportunities to student athletes through NIL while preserving the collegiate model and the student athletes' amateur status.

Thanks to you—each of you for your dedicated service to our Country and for your interest in this important topic.

[The prepared statement of John Hartwell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN HARTWELL

Chairman Alexander, Ranking Member Murray, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for inviting me to testify regarding the current collegiate model for student-athletes and the potential impact of Name, Image, and Likeness on that structure moving forward.

Utah State University is one of the Nation's premier student-centered land-grant and space-grant universities with 17,000 students on our main campus in Logan, and nearly 11,000 on our other eight campuses around the State of Utah. We are committed to fostering the principle that academics comes first by cultivating diversity of thought and culture and by serving the public through learning, discovery, and engagement. I am fortunate to serve our great University as Vice President and Director of Athletics, a position I have held since 2015.

Athletically, Utah State is a proud member of the Mountain West Conference and competes in 16 sports at the NCAA Division I level. We consider the academic success of our 385-plus student-athletes to be our #1 priority. Our current graduation success rate (GSR) is 93 percent, which is #1 in the Mountain West Conference, and the current cumulative grade point average (GPA) for our student-athletes is 3.36.

In addition to winning in the classroom, our student-athletes are excelling on the various fields of play as well. Over the last 5 years Utah State Athletics teams have won nine Mountain West titles, including back-to-back Men's Basketball Championships in 2019 and 2020, and had Men's Cross Country, Football, Men's Basketball, and Men's Outdoor Track & Field all finish in the Top 25 in the Nation during that span.

I was fortunate enough to be the beneficiary of an athletics scholarship to play basketball at The Citadel in the mid 1980's. The education, experiences, relationships, and life lessons learned in those 4 years have been invaluable to me over the last 30+ years. After working 10 years as a certified public accountant (CPA), including private practice, internal audit, and as a Financial Officer for a private company, I have spent the last 23 years serving in collegiate athletics administration. I made this career change because I wanted to facilitate and provide life-changing opportunities through collegiate athletics to others just as I was fortunate to have experienced.

The landscape of collegiate athletics has changed significantly over the last 30 years, and it continues to evolve. One thing which has remained consistent, however, is that student-athletes are the core of collegiate athletics. Without student-athletes, no coach or administrator would have a job, and institutional athletics programs would not exist. My primary responsibility as an Athletics Director is to provide the necessary resources to our student-athletes so they can be successful in the classroom, as well as on the fields or courts of play, and to equip them with life skills to utilize the remainder of their life, regardless of the career path they choose.

While there is a broad variance in operating budgets for Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) institutions in Division I (\$16 million—\$230 million), most FBS institutions provide full cost of attendance scholarships. A full athletic scholarship at Utah State covers the full cost of attendance, including tuition, fees, books, room, board, and other expenses. The cost of a full aid package for the 2020–21 academic year (Fall & Spring semester) is \$36,340 for out-of-State students and \$21,652 for a Utah resident. In addition, those student-athletes who qualify for a full Pell Grant will receive \$6,345 this academic year. Our student-athletes who live off campus receive \$11,500 in stipend checks for the academic year (Fall & Spring semester). If they attend Summer School, they receive an additional stipend. The below table provides the value of an athletic scholarship at Utah State over a 5-year period (most student-athletes are on aid for 5 years):

	In-State	Out of State
Full Athletic Scholarship (5 yrs)	\$108,260	\$181,700
Stipend (cash) from scholarship (5 yrs)	\$57,500	\$57,500
Pell Grant (5yrs)	\$31,725	\$31,725

The value of support our student-athletes receive goes far beyond the cost of the scholarship outlined above. Every student-athlete has an assigned academic advisor, access to individual tutors for academics, career counselors, mental health counselors, sports psychologists, nutritionists, extensive health care including team doctors, licensed trainers, physical therapists, and strength and conditioning coaches. Utah State student-athletes also receive training table meals and access to a nutritional fueling station that is open during the week for snacks and supplements. Our student-athletes also receive sport-specific instruction from an outstanding group of both head coaches and assistant coaches. These coaches also serve as mentors and provide support and guidance far beyond preparing student-athletes for competition.

The relationships that develop between college coaches and their student-athletes often last many years after a student-athlete's playing career is over. Speaking from personal experience, Les Robinson, my college coach, was very influential in my career change 10 years after I played for him. Due to the amount of time spent with their student-athletes in formative years of maturity, coaches feel a sense of obligation to mentor their student-athletes long after their playing days are over.

I tell our graduating senior student-athletes every year that walking across the stage to receive a degree is by far the biggest victory they will experience in college. They may not believe that when it happens, but the further along in life they progress, the more they realize the truth of that statement. Once earned, that degree can never be taken away. Conversely, an athletic career can be cut short by injury or illness in the blink of an eye. I can remember several conversations with friends when I was in my mid-30's and they would be complaining about still paying off student loans, and thinking to myself how fortunate I was to get my education paid for while playing a game I love.

Often the narrative these days in collegiate athletics, especially at the FBS level, is that athletic departments are flush with cash due to the money brought in primarily by football and men's basketball. What is usually lost in that discussion is the net revenue generated by these sports is used to fund the operations of the non-revenue sports, as well as the administrative areas such as academic support, sports medicine, and media relations. At Utah State, football and men's basketball are the only sports which produce enough income to cover their operating expenses, and that does not happen every year. An important consideration in the collegiate athletics funding model is Title IX. Revenues from football and men's basketball help fund scholarships and operations for female student-athletes which are required for Title IX compliance.

It is important for us to always remember athletics is but one silo, albeit a very noticeable silo, of an institution of higher learning where education is the focus. College athletics provides a point of pride and identity for the institution, but it also provides outstanding educational opportunities for student-athletes, many of whom would not be able to afford these educational opportunities without an athletics scholarship.

In an effort to continue to address the needs of student-athletes there have been positive changes in recent years related to allowable benefits under the NCAA bylaws. The implementation of cost of attendance stipends in 2015 is one example of such progress. The most recent iteration is the introduction of Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) opportunities for student-athletes. To this end, in April 2020, the NCAA Board of Governors directed each of the NCAA's three divisions to immediately consider updates to relevant bylaws to permit student-athletes the opportunity to benefit from the use of their name, image, and likeness. In Division I, the Legislative Solutions Working Group is on track to introduce legislative changes to the Division I Council for vote in January 2021. In the interim, the NCAA has approved waivers over the last 2 years allowing student-athletes to benefit from their name, image, and likeness in certain circumstances. The waiver opportunity will

continue to be available to student-athletes as the NCAA membership works to modify its rules.

On the surface, the concept of allowing student-athletes the ability to profit from their name, image, or likeness as it applies to professional development and entrepreneurship, just as any other student has the ability to, makes total sense.

However, this opportunity does not need to become the path to pay for play which would erode the collegiate model.

There are some key elements to consider when examining the impact of Name, Image, and Likeness:

- **The percentage of student-athletes likely to generate significant money from NIL endorsements and sponsorships is less than 1 percent of all scholarship student-athletes.** Do we need to “recreate the wheel” in a system that the overwhelming majority of student-athletes do not think is broken? The Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, which represents over 180,000 Division I student-athletes, spoke loud and clear about this topic in its Oct. 29, 2019 document titled “*We are the 100 percent*”.
- **The unintended consequences of NIL reform could be significant.**
 - The probability of unfair recruiting practices rises exponentially.
 - Monitoring compensation and ethics will be extremely difficult.
 - Direct or indirect issues with Title IX.
 - Revenues from footwear/apparel contracts, corporate sponsorship rights on campuses that benefit all student-athletes will be reduced due to deals by the footwear/apparel companies and corporate sponsors with individual student-athletes.
 - The financial challenges will likely be the most severe at limited resource institutions and historically black colleges and universities.
- **We need the U.S. Congress to pass legislation on NIL to provide a consistent national framework and ensure collegiate institutions and student-athletes are not forced to navigate a myriad of different State guidelines on the topic.** There are five states which have already passed NIL legislation with the Florida law set to be the first to go into effect on July 1, 2021. Thirty-one additional states have introduced legislation related to NIL. We would ask for swift, preemptive Federal legislation to offset the individual State laws.
 - **Recruiting guardrails for college athletics are a must.** Recruitment of prospective student-athletes has to be safeguarded by the NCAA to maintain any type of competitive balance.

We are currently navigating through unprecedented and challenging times in our country, including the COVID-19 pandemic, social and political unrest, and the economic challenges associated with the aforementioned issues. As we continue to address these issues, the overwhelmingly positive impact of collegiate athletics and its structure tethered to higher education is something we must safeguard.

I realize higher education may not be for everyone, whether or not you are a student-athlete. For those athletes in sports such as baseball and hockey, which have strong minor league systems available to kids right out of high school, there are alternatives if they do not desire to go to college. We need to work with the NFL, the NBA, and the WNBA to further study possible minor league developmental systems as an option for athletes in those sports who do not want to go to college.

As we have witnessed here in the past several weeks, sports are a vital and positive component of our society. Whether it is to unite people of different backgrounds or beliefs to reach together for a common goal, or to serve as a platform for speaking out, sports are powerful. Collegiate sports, which is such a unique and positive platform in our country, need to be preserved for both this generation and generations to come.

I speak both from a personal perspective, as one whose life has been so positively impacted by the opportunity to be a collegiate student-athlete, and from a professional perspective, when I think about the countless student-athletes I have seen make the amazing and positive transformation and maturation from prospect to student-athlete to professional (in a wide array of vocations), all made possible by the education they received as a student-athlete. I speak for all of my fellow Directors of Athletics when I express our appreciation for your attention to NIL’s impact on collegiate athletics going forward. We believe there is a way to provide additional

income opportunities to student-athletes through NIL, while preserving the collegiate model and the student-athletes' amateur status.

Thanks to each of you for your dedicated service to our country and your interest in this important topic.

[SUMMARY STATEMENT OF JOHN HARTWELL]

Chairman Alexander, Ranking Member Murray, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for inviting me to testify regarding the current collegiate model for student-athletes and the potential impact of Name, Image, and Likeness on that structure moving forward.

Utah State University is one of the Nation's premier student-centered land-grant and space-grant universities with 17,000 students on our main campus in Logan, and nearly 11,000 on our other eight campuses around the State of Utah. I am fortunate to serve our great University as Vice President and Director of Athletics, a position I have held since 2015.

Athletically, Utah State is a proud member of the Mountain West Conference and competes in 16 sports at the NCAA Division I level. Our current graduation success rate (GSR) is 93 percent, which is #1 in the Mountain West Conference, and the current cumulative grade point average (GPA) for our student-athletes is 3.36. In addition to winning in the classroom, our student-athletes are excelling on the various fields of play as well. Over the last 5 years Utah State Athletics teams have won nine Mountain West titles, including back-to-back Men's Basketball Championships in 2019 and 2020, and had Men's Cross Country, Football, Men's Basketball, and Men's Outdoor Track & Field all finish in the Top 25 in the Nation during that span.

I was fortunate enough to be the beneficiary of an athletics scholarship to play basketball at The Citadel in the mid 1980's. The education, experiences, relationships, and life lessons learned in those 4 years have been invaluable to me over the last 30 plus years.

The landscape of collegiate athletics has changed significantly over the last 30 years, and it continues to evolve. One thing which has remained consistent, however, is that student-athletes are the core of collegiate athletics. Without student-athletes, no coach or administrator would have a job, and institutional athletics programs would not exist. My primary responsibility as an Athletics Director is to provide the necessary resources to our student-athletes so they can be successful in the classroom, as well as on the fields or courts of play, and to equip them with life skills to utilize the remainder of their life, regardless of the career path they choose.

While there is a broad variance in operating budgets for Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) institutions in Division I (\$16 million—\$230 million), most FBS institutions provide full cost of attendance scholarships. A full athletic scholarship at Utah State covers the full cost of attendance, including tuition, fees, books, room, board, and other expenses. The cost of a full aid package for the 2020–21 academic year (Fall & Spring semester) is \$36,340 for out-of-State students and \$21,652 for a Utah resident. In addition, those student-athletes who qualify for a full Pell Grant will receive \$6,345 this academic year. The below table provides the value of an athletic scholarship at Utah State over a 5-year period (most student-athletes are on aid for 5 years):

	In-State	Out of State
Full Athletic Scholarship (5 yrs)	\$108,260	\$181,700
Stipend (cash) from scholarship (5 yrs)	\$57,500	\$57,500
Pell Grant (5yrs)	\$31,725	\$31,725

The value of support our student-athletes receive goes far beyond the cost of the scholarship outlined above. Our student-athletes also receive sport-specific instruction from an outstanding group of both head coaches and assistant coaches. These coaches also serve as mentors and provide support and guidance far beyond preparing student-athletes for competition. The relationships that develop between col-

lege coaches and their student-athletes often last many years after a student-athlete's playing career is over.

I tell our graduating senior student-athletes every year that walking across the stage to receive a degree is by far the biggest victory they will experience in college. They may not believe that when it happens, but the further along in life they progress, the more they realize the truth of that statement. Once earned, that degree can never be taken away. Conversely, an athletic career can be cut short by injury or illness in the blink of an eye. I can remember several conversations with friends when I was in my mid-30's and they would be complaining about still paying off student loans, and thinking to myself how fortunate I was to get my education paid for while playing a game I love.

Often the narrative these days in collegiate athletics, especially at the FBS level, is that athletic departments are flush with cash due to the money brought in primarily by football and men's basketball. An important consideration in the collegiate athletics funding model is Title IX. Revenues from football and men's basketball help fund scholarships and operations for female student-athletes which are required for Title IX compliance.

It is important for us to always remember athletics is but one silo, albeit a very noticeable silo, of an institution of higher learning where education is the focus. College athletics provides a point of pride and identity for the institution, but it also provides outstanding educational opportunities for student-athletes, many of whom would not be able to afford these educational opportunities without an athletics scholarship.

In an effort to continue to address the needs of student-athletes there have been positive changes in recent years related to allowable benefits under the NCAA by-laws. The implementation of cost of attendance stipends in 2015 is one example of such progress. The most recent iteration is the introduction of Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) opportunities for student-athletes. On the surface, the concept of allowing student-athletes the ability to profit from their name, image, or likeness as it applies to professional development and entrepreneurship, just as any other student has the ability to, makes total sense. However, this opportunity does not need to become the path to pay for play which would erode the collegiate model.

There are some key elements to consider when examining the impact of Name, Image, and Likeness:

- **The percentage of student-athletes likely to generate significant money from NIL endorsements and sponsorships is less than 1 percent of all scholarship student-athletes.**
- **The unintended consequences of NIL reform could be significant.**
- **We need the U.S. Congress to pass legislation on NIL to provide a consistent national framework and ensure collegiate institutions and student-athletes are not forced to navigate a myriad of different State guidelines on the topic.**
- **Recruiting guardrails for college athletics are a must.**

We are currently navigating through unprecedented and challenging times in our country, including the COVID19 pandemic, social and political unrest, and the economic challenges associated with the aforementioned issues. As we continue to address these issues, the overwhelmingly positive impact of collegiate athletics and its structure tethered to higher education is something we must safeguard.

I realize higher education may not be for everyone, whether or not you are a student-athlete. For those athletes in sports such as baseball and hockey, which have strong minor league systems available to kids right out of high school, there are alternatives if they do not desire to go to college. We need to work with the NFL, the NBA, and the WNBA to further study possible minor league developmental systems as an option for athletes in those sports who do not want to go to college.

As we have witnessed here in the past several weeks, sports are a vital and positive component of our society. Whether it is to unite people of different backgrounds or beliefs to reach together for a common goal, or to serve as a platform for speaking out, sports are powerful. Collegiate sports, which is such a unique and positive platform in our country, need to be preserved for both this generation and generations to come.

I speak both from a personal perspective, as one whose life has been so positively impacted by the opportunity to be a collegiate student-athlete, and from a professional perspective, when I think about the countless student-athletes I have seen make the amazing and positive transformation and maturation from prospect to stu-

dent-athlete to professional (in a wide array of vocations), all made possible by the education they received as a student-athlete. I speak for all of my fellow Directors of Athletics when I express our appreciation for your attention to NIL's impact on collegiate athletics going forward. We believe there is a way to provide additional income opportunities to student-athletes through NIL, while preserving the collegiate model and the student-athletes' amateur status.

Thanks to each of you for your dedicated service to our country and your interest in this important topic.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Hartwell.
Mr. Huma, welcome.

**STATEMENT OF RAMOGI HUMA, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL COLLEGE PLAYERS ASSOCIATION, NORCO, CA**

Mr. HUMA. Good morning. My name is Ramogi Huma. I am a former UCLA football player and the Executive Director of the National College Players Association, which served as the primary advocate for the California, Florida, and Nebraska NIL laws, and is assisting nine of the other 27 States pursuing similar legislation.

First, I would like to thank Chairman Alexander and Ranking Member Murray for inviting me to testify today. For the record, the NCPA's opposition to each NCAA and Power 5 conference proposal is included in my written testimony.

In the last couple of months, we have seen colleges, conferences, and the NCAA voice opposition to racial injustice in policing and in other areas, which is positive. However, NCAA sports itself is based on racial injustice. The NCAA uses amateurism as cover to systematically strip generational wealth from predominantly Black athletes from lower-income households to pay for lavish salaries of predominantly White coaches, athletic directors, commissioners, and NCAA administrators.

Amateurism is further exposed as a fraud as colleges and commissioners cite billions in college football revenues as justification for resuming college football in the COVID pandemic without uniform safety standards.

To claim education is the top priority is also exposed as false as colleges cut non-revenue sports and players' educational opportunities while paying coaches millions of dollars.

NCAA sports is asking Congress to support this unjust system and trample the rights of States for adopting laws to protect their college athletes.

NCAA sports claims that a patchwork of State laws that give athletes economic freedoms would be impossible to govern, but NCAA sports has demonstrated its ability to comply with an ever-changing array of COVID orders issued by Governors and counties to return players to play in the pandemic. They can surely comply with any mild differences in State laws that grant college athletes economic freedoms.

NCAA sports also claims a patchwork of State laws would ruin the level playing field in college sports. However, Federal courts have concluded multiple times that a level playing field does not exist under NCAA rules. Colleges with the most revenues and wealthiest boosters have the largest recruiting budgets, hire the best coaches, build the best facilities, and in turn, they get the best

recruits, win the most games, and score the richest TV deals, allowing them to continue their dominance.

In 2019, Ohio State University earned \$209 million in athletics revenue. Utah State earned \$35 million. Both are in the FBS Division. ESPN's pre-season football rankings had Ohio State at No. 2 in the Nation, while Utah State was ranked 95th. College athletes should not be forced to sacrifice their economic freedoms and rights so the NCAA and its colleges can pretend that a level playing field exists.

The claims that non-revenue sports would have to be cut and players in revenue sports should earn some of the money that they generate are baseless. If big football and basketball revenues were needed for other sports to exist, then NCAA Division II would not exist. But, it does—over 300 schools where there are not enough football and basketball revenues to subsidize other sports.

NCAA Division III and the IA in community college athletics would not exist either. But, they do exist. They simply do not spend extravagantly like Division I schools.

We conducted an analysis with Drexel University professor Ellen Staurowsky, finding that in 2017, the average Division I FBS college spent about \$34 million per year more than the average Division I FCS college to field the same sports. This means that FBS expenditure levels are not necessary to field these Division I sports.

In fact, while FBS revenues exploded by over \$5 billion between 2003 and 2018, the number of athletes decreased by over 300, while the number of assistant coaches increased by over 1,500. Administrative expenses skyrocketed by over \$1 billion. It is clearly unnecessary to hire more coaches and administrators for fewer athletes.

Part of the \$34 million per school in excess expenditures could be used to compensate college athletes while fully complying with Title IX and preserving all non-revenue sports. Equal payments to athletes could come directly from conferences or athletic associations. It is a very realistic model. All it would take is for colleges to curb some of the excess expenditures on extra coaches, enormous salaries, and lavish facilities.

In closing, we are asking Congress not to adopt a narrow NIL law designed to reduce athletes' economic freedoms as requested by NCAA sports. College athletes do not need Congress to secure NIL freedoms as States across the Nation are already enacting equitable laws. Instead, we ask Congress to enact much-needed, broad-based reform to bring forth the enforcement of health and safety standards, to end sexual abuse and negligent practices that harm college athletes, to prevent college athletes from being stuck with sports-related medical expenses, improve graduation rates, and to finally allow players to share in the revenue that they generate. And, yes, we would like NIL compensation to be included in a broad-based bill in a way that extends, not undermines, what the States are pursuing.

We are grateful to the group of Senators who put forward legislative framework for our College Athletes Bill of Rights that will bring forth broad-based reform in college sports, and we support the direction of that framework 100 percent.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ramogi Huma follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RAMOGI HUMA

Dear Chairman Alexander, Ranking Murray, and Members of the HELP Committee,

Thank you very much for inviting me to participate in the “Compensating College Athletes: Examining the Potential Impact on Athletes and Institutions” hearing on Tuesday, September 15, 2020. This discussion encompasses important economic rights and freedoms that college athletes should be afforded. The National College Players Association (NCPA) is a co-sponsor of California SB 206 known as The Fair Pay to Play Act, served as the primary advocate for the Florida NIL and Nebraska laws, and is providing information and support to an additional 9 of an estimated 27 other states pursuing similar legislation.

Please accept this summary, full written testimony, the attached documents, and the list of topics and links at the end of this letter to be entered as my written testimony.

Summary

NCAA sports’ athlete compensation prohibition imposes second-class citizenship upon college athletes nationwide. It’s a system based on racial injustice as it denies predominantly Black revenue athletes, many of whom are from low income homes, of billions of dollars in generational wealth that instead flows to predominantly White coaches, administrators, commissioners, and NCAA staff.

College athlete NIL compensation and equitable revenue sharing can take place without cutting nonrevenue sports or violating Title IX by targeting excess expenditures on coaches’ salaries and luxury facilities. Data and information in this testimony provides objective support for this fact.

Congress should not ignore sexual and physical abuse, deadly negligence, poor graduation rates, and other serious issues that harm college athletes while passing NCAA-friendly NIL legislation designed to roll back rights and freedoms states are providing college athletes. Instead, the NCPA encourages Congress to adopt broad based reform that includes the third party enforcement of uniform health and safety standards, protections to increase graduation rates, medical expenses, revenue sharing and other key protections for college athletes.

Full Written Testimony

NCAA sports seeks to operate above the law while legally sentencing college athletes, many of whom are Black athletes from underprivileged households, into second class citizenship. Separate is not equal in education and college athletes should have equal rights and freedoms afforded to other students and Americans. NCAA sports is asking Congress to eliminate college athletes’ protection under both antitrust and labor law in return for tinkering with just a sliver of the racially discriminatory economic exploitation inflicted upon college athletes.

College athlete name, image, and likeness (NIL) pay is the smoke that hovers above the raging fire of injustices at the core of NCAA sports. College athletes’ economic, academic, and physical well-being continue to be consumed by an insatiable greed and a mentality that treats players as property rather than people.

America has not seen so many college athletes in modern times voice opposition to racial discrimination in policing, on campus, and elsewhere. Their anger over racial injustice has finally outweighed their fear of coaches who have sought to silence them. It would be a travesty that, in the midst of college athletes finding their voice, Congress gives legal cover and protections to cement the devastating racial discrimination that exists in NCAA sports.

Equal Rights

Instead of excluding college athletes from antitrust protections, Congress can address certain restraints on trade directly through legislation. For instance, Congress can prevent NIL agreements from being used as inducements to lure high school recruits and college transfers to a particular college. Congress does not need to give the NCAA an antitrust exemption to accomplish these things.

Similarly, Congress does not need to proactively exclude college athletes from rights under the National Labor Relations Act or state labor laws. The NIL pay in question does not have implications on employee status so there is no compelling reason for Congress to address the issue. Though college athletes have yet to prove that they are employees, this could change in the future. Plenty of students are uni-

versity employees—including those who work in the student store, dining halls, and libraries. Congress should not block an avenue that could help college athletes address a host of critical issues such as health and safety and degree completion.

Ignore the Competitive Equity Myth

NIL arrangements with boosters, alumni, and college sponsors should not be banned in the name of competitive equity because competitive equity does not exist in college sports. These same sources already give athletic programs money that is used to recruit the best recruits, win the most games, and generate the biggest TV deals that allow rich athletic programs to continue their dominance. In their most recent report to the Department of Education, Ohio state reported \$209 million dollars in athletic revenue while Utah State reported only \$35 million in athletic revenue. They are both in the FBS Division. How can anyone suggest that these two colleges compete on an equal playing field? How can colleges, conferences, and the NCAA justify denying college athletes economic freedoms in the name of competitive equity when this severe disparity among colleges exists and is held up as the system that should be preserved? Colleges, conferences, and the NCAA have not moved to address these inequities—they haven't banned booster payments to colleges and they don't share athletics revenue equally among colleges in the name of competitive equity. In addition, other leagues do not ban 3d party NIL deals with fan clubs and those leagues operate very well.

Federal legislation should not sacrifice college athletes' freedoms so that NCAA sports can pretend that competitive equity exists. Additionally, roster and scholarship limits keep the inequity from "getting worse". There is a finite number of recruits each year and the top recruits already flow to the Power 5 Conferences. If fair legislation inadvertently changes recruiting migrations to where some of the top recruits begin to flow away from some of the Power 5 Conferences, it would actually increase competitive equity compared to where it is today.

Developments

One recent development exposes as false claims that the NCAA, conferences, and colleges would be unable to withstand competitive inequities or navigate around a patchwork of state name, image, and likeness (NIL) laws. The vigor and support these same entities have for complying with everchanging state, county, and city COVID-19 orders related to the return of college sports makes clear that they are capable of complying with an array of different laws—just as other businesses involved in interstate commerce must do. Disturbingly, the return to college sports is taking place without the enforcement of COVID-19 health and safety standards while higher rates of obesity, high blood pressure, and sickle cell put college football players at higher risk of COVID-19 complications. College athletes lack information about such risks, are being required to sign liability waivers at many campuses, are subject to inadequate testing, and often have little to no information about how many teammates may have COVID.

Competitive equity will be affected as some of the COVID-19 orders may limit or even prevent some teams from returning to sports this season. This situation will have a significant impact on athletics revenue and recruiting, which are the primary factors when considering competitive equity. Nonetheless, the NCAA, conferences, and colleges are demonstrating that state and local laws that will have stark impacts on competitive equity is compatible with "The Collegiate Model".

To date, many athletes from football teams across the Nation have players who have tested positive for COVID-19. Some outbreaks have been so severe that athletic activities have been suspended on some campuses, and entire seasons have been postponed or canceled at many other colleges. If NCAA sports is willing to risk the health and safety of their college athletes, their families, and communities in pursuit of billions of dollars in football revenue, it can surely withstand inconveniences that allow college athletes economic freedoms associated with NIL compensation.

Additionally, the State of Florida and Nebraska have adopted name, image, and likeness legislation similar to California SB 206. In total, approximately 27 other states are pursuing NIL freedoms for their college athletes. Federal legislation is not necessary to preserve college sports or ensure college athletes gain NIL compensation freedoms.

I would also like to inform you that the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), an intercollegiate athletic association comprised of more than 250 colleges and 65,000 college athletes, announced a NIL proposal that mirrors the pillars of California SB 206 and virtually all of the other proposed state NIL legislation. The proposal would allow college athletes to secure representation and receive

NIL compensation. This is significant. This proposal undercuts the NCAA's notion that "The Collegiate Model" must impose overbearing restrictions and exclude various economic freedoms that the states are pursuing.

Another development is that on May 18th, 2020, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in favor of plaintiffs who sued the NCAA over illegally price-fixing college athlete compensation. This is yet another instance of the NCAA breaking Federal antitrust laws, laws for which they are currently seeking an exemption from. This ruling includes prohibiting the NCAA from restricting compensation and benefits related to a college education. As I stated in my previous Senate Commerce Committee testimony, each antitrust action against the NCAA has resulted in benefits for countless college athletes.

Finally, another antitrust lawsuit was filed on June 15, 2020 against the NCAA for its rules that prohibit college athlete NIL compensation. The NCAA's claims in an earlier NIL case (*O'Bannon v. NCAA*) that NIL pay would destroy college athletics will ring hollow now that California, Florida, and Nebraska have passed NIL laws; and NCAA leaders and conference commissioners now say players should have some NIL freedoms. Notably, this lawsuit seeks to open NIL compensation related to TV broadcast revenue, which is an important aspect of gaining economic equity for college athletes.

Congressional Action

It would be especially unjust for Congress to turn a blind eye on critical aspects of college athlete well-being and economic equity that are much more important than narrow NIL compensation.

Today, the NCAA says it has no duty to protect college athletes and refuses to enforce health and safety standards despite negligent deaths during workouts, sexual assaults against hundreds of college athletes, and athletic trainer surveys finding rampant mistreatment of concussions and other serious injuries nationwide. The NCAA says it has no duty to ensure a quality education for college athletes while football and basketball players' Federal graduation rates hover around 50 percent and many college athletes are pushed into classes and majors that they do not want to take for athletic eligibility purposes.

Economic equity for college athletes is inextricably tied to not only college athlete NIL freedoms and ensuring they receive a significant portion of commercial revenue that their talents generate, but it is tied to their freedom from medical expenses, freedom from preventable sports-related injury and abuse, freedom from serious obstacles that impede degree completion, freedom to transfer once without punishment in pursuit of better academic and athletic opportunities, freedom from unfair athletic association investigations that can harm their economic stability and future, and freedom from illegal, cartel activity that stifles their economic opportunities.

The NCPA is asking Congress to decline NCAA sports' request for narrow and unjust NIL legislation. Instead, the NCPA is asking Congress to pursue broad-based reform that is critical to college athletes' well-being. The NCPA has background information and well as a roadmap for legislative provisions that will provide critical freedoms and protections for college athletes. I ask for a continued dialog with each of your offices so that we can work together to bring forth a fair and just arrangement for college athletes.

The NCPA strongly opposes the following athlete NIL restrictions proposed by the NCAA and the Power 5 Conferences that would roll back protections and freedoms guaranteed by California, Florida, and being pursued in other states:

- A Federal ban on direct compensation to college athletes from colleges, conferences, or athletic associations—opposed. No other student or American faces such a threat to or restriction of their rights. This provision would impose second class citizenship on college athletes, many of whom are Black athletes from low-income households. This is a shameful attempt to legalize NCAA sports' racially discriminatory system that pays lavish salaries to predominantly white coaches, athletic directors, and commissioners, off the backs of disproportionately Black athletes in revenue sports. Players should receive an equitable portion of athletic revenue they help generate.
- Antitrust and litigation exemptions—opposed.

The very narrow areas where restraint of trade are justified such as prohibiting NIL deals to be used as inducements for prospective college athletes should be enacted directly by Congress. The NCPA has assisted antitrust lawsuits and investiga-

tions that have led to important advancements for college athletes such as the elimination of an NCAA prohibition on medical coverage during summer workouts (White v. NCAA antitrust lawsuit settlement), removing the NCAA's 1-year scholarship limit (US DOJ Antitrust Investigation), eliminating the NCAA's ban on player stipends to cover basic necessities (O'Bannon v. NCAA NIL antitrust ruling), and, assuming the US Supreme Court will allow the 9th Circuit's Alston v. NCAA antitrust ruling to stand, the option for colleges to pay athletes educational related compensation including up to \$14,000 per year in academic achievement awards. If the NCAA already had an antitrust exemption, these gains would never had been made and the states would have never had the ability to adopt NIL laws at the core of this hearing.

- Prohibiting employee status for college athletes—opposed. Targeting and stripping college athletes of rights under labor laws is unethical and racially discriminatory. Plenty of regular students are university employees and this exclusion would have a disparate impact on thousands of college athletes from protected classes. Third party NIL reform does not invoke employee status so there is no need for Congress to address this issue at all.
- Denying college athletes the ability to secure representation and earn NIL pay for a semester—opposed. This is simply an unjustifiable and needless attack on college athletes' rights. Other students work long hours to put themselves through college and do not face such prohibitions in the name of academics. As compared to traditional student employment, NIL deals can require very little time demand. If there is true concern about having the appropriate balance of time demands, NCAA sports should reduce athletic time demands. NCAA surveys found that Division I athletes spend 32 hrs/week in their sport alone (42 hrs/week in football) despite the NCAA's 20 hr/week limit on athletics participation. Reducing athletic time demands to give players more time to exercise their economic freedom is a fair way to address this issue.
- Punishment of college athletes who do not publicly expose their NIL deals—opposed. This would prevent opportunities in which college athletes could otherwise start a small business or enter into NIL deals with businesses that need to protect trade secrets. The right to secure proper representation and financial skills development will help ensure players are informed about agreements that may enter into.
- Prohibiting NIL deals with athletic boosters and companies/competitors contracting with colleges—opposed. Players are people not university property. Universities deals should not dictate whether or not players are free to earn compensation from their own name, image, and likeness rights. And again, competitive equity does not exist in college sports. Athletic booster donations and corporate sponsorships already inhibit competitive equity. It is unjust to allow booster payments and sponsorship money to continue to athletic programs while excluding players from NIL deals with these same sources. Such restraints of trade would significantly harm players' economic freedom and opportunities.
- Prohibition on group licensing—oppose. The NCAA's claim that college athlete group licensing could only take place with a union is false. For instance, One Team is a group licensing entity that services a number of professional athletes and is not a union.
- Enlisting the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to handle agent certification—opposed. Agent certification in pro sports is operated by players unions. While no such union exists in college, Congress should create player-led oversight commission for this function. The FTC has no experience in college athlete NIL and cannot be expected to properly fulfill this role.
- Preemption of state laws—opposed. There has been no reasonable Federal legislation introduced that would ensure equitable economic terms for college athletes to warrant preventing states from addressing these issues.

Thank you again for the opportunity to participate in this hearing and I am committed to working with you in continuing discussions on this issue and other issues concerning college athletes' well-being.

Attachments to be included as part of written testimony:

- “Lavish Spending: 2016–17 Division I Expense Comparisons, FBS v FCS”—Analysis using Data from US DOE by Ramogi Huma, Executive Director, National College Players Association and Ellen J. Staurowsky, Ed.D., Professor, LeBow College of Business, Drexel University Professor, Sports Media
- “FBS Participation, Revenue, Expenses Trends”—Analysis using Data from US DOE and The Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics by Ramogi Huma, Executive Director, National College Players Association and Ellen J. Staurowsky, Ed.D., Professor, LeBow College of Business, Drexel University Professor, Sports Media
- “Comments from Professor Len Simon on Name, Image, and Likeness Bills”—Len Simon, lawyer and Professor of Sports Law
- “Madness Inc.: How everyone is getting rich off college sports—except the players”—US Senator Chris Murphy
- “2019 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sport” by the Institute of Diversity and Ethics in Sport
- 2018–19 NCAA “Coach and Student-Athlete Demographics by Sport” (Division I Men’s Basketball)
- 2018–19 NCAA “Coach and Student-Athlete Demographics by Sport” (Division I FBS Football Autonomy)
- 2018–19 NCAA “Coach and Student-Athlete Demographics by Sport” (Division I FBS Football Non-Autonomy)
- “2019 Adjusted Graduation Gap Report: NCAA FBS Football” by The College Sport Research Institute
- “2019 Adjusted Graduation Gap Report: NCAA Division I Basketball” by The College Sport Research Institute

Links to be included as part of written testimony:

NCAA Sports’ Racially Discriminatory System

“How the NCAA’s Empire Robs Predominantly Black Athletes of Billions in Generational Wealth”—Ramogi Huma, Executive Director, National College Players Association Ellen J. Staurowsky, Ed.D., Professor, LeBow College of Business, Drexel University & Professor, Sports Media, Roy H. Park School of Communications, Ithaca College <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1z97vhcjErrHIvuO3Nu2wUWbG90bFKnm—/view>

“Four Years a Student-Athlete” <https://www.vice.com/en—us/article/ezexjp/four-years-a-student—athlete-the-racial-injustice-of-big-time-college-sports>

“The Shame of College Sports”—Civil Rights Historian Taylor Branch in The Atlantic <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2011/10/the-shame-of-college-sports/308643/>

Players Can be Stuck With Sports-Related Medical Expenses

<https://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/16/sports/16athletes.html>

<https://abcnews.go.com/Health/kevin-ware-injury-draws-attention-ncaa-healthcare—debate/story?id=18889697>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/25/sports/a-fight-to-keep-college-athletes-from-the-pain-of-injury—costs.html>

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/karenweaver/2020/01/18/add-this-to-your-list-of-ncaa-to-dos-medical—expenses/#53b92d8e752f>

The NCPA sponsored a 2012 Athletes Bill of Rights in California that requires colleges with high media revenues to pay for players’ out-of-pocket sports related medical expenses as well as premiums for low income college athletes. It also prohibits colleges from refusing to renew scholarships due to permanent injury: <https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill—id=201120120SB1525>

Power 5 Conferences (65 of 351 Division I colleges) adopted a rule aimed at covering players’ sports-related medical expenses for up to 2 years, and the Pac-12 adopted a rule requiring colleges to pay up to 4 years of sports-related medical expenses. However, conferences have not demonstrated enforcement. For instance, Stanford’s policy states such expenses are covered only between 12–24 months. Stanford’s SA Handbook (p. 66): <https://s3.amazonaws.com/sidearm.sites/gostanford.com/documents/2019/10/29/2019—20—Student—Athlete—Handbook.pdf>

Power 5 4-year medical expense (unenforced?) commitment: <https://swimswam.com/power-5-conferences-vote-extend-medical-care-student-athletes/>

Lack of Enforced Health & Safety

- Health and safety standards are not enforced in college sports—NCAA says colleges “self-police”, can choose not to follow NCAA guidelines, including those related to COVID-19. <http://a.espn.com/ncaa/news/2001/0816/1240463.html>

COVID-19 “Guidance” not mandatory <http://www.ncaa.org/sport-science-institute/resocialization-collegiate-sport-action-plan-considerations> <https://deadspin.com/ncaa-lets-michigan-state-off-the-hook-in-nassar-case-1828719733>
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/oregon-football-workouts-sent-players-to-hospital-who-will-stand-up-for-them/2017/01/17/1c0d7fae-dcf7-11e6-918c-9ede3c8c8afa-story.html> <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/09/01/advocates-say-uncs-hiring-coach-accused-abuse-points-lack-ncaa-oversight>

- NCAA holds it has no duty to protect college athletes. <https://www.cbssports.com/general/news/ncaa-denies-legal-duty-to-protect-student-athletes-court-filing-says/> <https://www.oregionregister.com/2020/06/02/ncaa-argues-in-sex-abuse-case-it-has-no-legal-duty-to-protect-athletes/>
- Athletic staff’s sexual and physical assaults against college athletes, and injuring or killing an athlete in a negligent workout are not against NCAA rules.
- Countless sexual assaults by athletic personnel against college athletes led to no NCAA sanctions.
- NCAA study: 50 percent of college athletic trainers admit to returning concussed players back to same game. <https://www.cbssports.com/college-football/news/why-the-ncaa-wont-adopt-concussion-penalties-at-least-not-yet/> <https://www.cnn.com/interactive/2014/10/us/ncaa-concussions/index.html>
- National Athletic Trainers Assoc: 19 percent of coaches played athletes who were not medically cleared, 2/3 report being pressured by nonmedical staff to make medical decisions for athletes, despite NCAA guidelines discouraging this practice. <https://www.nata.org/press-release/062619/only-half-collegiate-level-sports-programs-follow-medical-model-care-student> <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Trainers-Butt-Heads-With-141333/cid=longform-related> <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4639885/>
- California Athletic Trainers Association Survey: 82 percent of trainers do not follow colleges’ own concussion policies.
- Multiple claims of serious athlete mistreatment at UCLA, USC, Loyola Marymount. <https://www.latimes.com/sports/ucla/la-sp-ucla-football-lawsuit-jim-mora-20190530-story.html> <https://sports.vice.com/en-us/article/usc-football-team-doctor-admits-to-ignoring-fda-and-ncaa-pain-killer-regulations> http://www.espn.com/college-football/story/_/id/14682233/university-california-admits-negligence-2014-death-lineman-ated-agu <http://www.latimes.com/sports/usc/la-sp-usc-brian-baucham-lane-kiffin-lawsuit-20160425-story.html> <http://deadspin.com/5949336/usc-robert-woods-couldnt-keep-his-balance-after-a-helmet-to-helmet-hit-missed-one-play> <http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2016/07/08/stanford-university-ncaa-facing-concussion-lawsuit-from-former-football-players/> <http://www.dailycal.org/2016/09/01/former-cal-football-players-files-concussion-lawsuit-pac-12-ncaa/> *Loyola Marymount faculty member & NCPA spoke w multiple players claiming misconduct—here’s a glimpse* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S-aW6skSHOs>
- African American college athletes and football players may have an increased risk of COVID-19 complications (high blood pressure, sickle cell, obesity) <https://prospect.org/health/playing-games-with-college-athletes-lives/> <http://www.ncaa.org/sport-science-institute/core-principles-resocialization-collegiate-sport> <http://www.ncaa.org/sport-science-institute/resocialization-collegiate-sport-action-plan-considerations>

Due Process

How a Little Known Rule Shuts NCAA Athletes Out of the Legal System <https://www.vice.com/en-us/article/8qy400/how-a-little-known-ncaa-rule-shuts-athletes-out-of-the-legal-system>

Transparency

Why Top NCAA Recruits Shouldn't Sign National Letters of Intent <https://www.vice.com/en-us/article/pgn38z/why-top-ncaa-recruits-shouldnt-sign-national-letters-of-intent>

Example of Alternative to National Letter of Intent: <https://www.ncpanow.org/cap-guarantee>

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Huma. And thanks to all the witnesses.

Votes have begun. We will continue the hearing, and we will alternate so we can go to the floor and vote.

I will begin a 5-minute round of questions. And, again, I would ask Senators to—and witnesses to try to keep each Senator's time within 5 minutes.

Mr. Huma, I agree with you about coaches' salaries, and my thinking is slightly different than the issue that we are—of name, likeness, and image that we are talking about today. But, I agree with the point that I think it would be a practical move for the NCAA, particularly if we were in the pre-COVID situation where television revenues were about to explode, to require most of that revenue to go for the benefit of student athletes, not to raise the salaries of coaches around the Country.

But, let me take that principle and apply it to name, image, and likeness. Mr. Hartwell, why hasn't baseball come pretty close to getting it right? I mean, here we have a—there is a great—you know, I mentioned some of the great Vanderbilt baseball players—Sonny Gray, a couple of others, David Price, Cy Young winner. Kumar Rocker is there now. He helped them win the World Series. When he graduated from high school, he had a choice to make. He could have gone straight into Major League Baseball and probably played in the minor leagues for a little while. Or, he could have gone to Vanderbilt and got a Vanderbilt degree, been coached by Tim Corbin, enjoyed the undergraduate experience, but he would have to stay for 3 years.

Why shouldn't we say that if some auto dealer in Nashville wants to sponsor the name, image, and likeness of Kumar Rocker, or Sonny Gray when he was there, why shouldn't those earnings go to all of the student athletes at Vanderbilt instead of to the pitcher? Why shouldn't we simply say that jeopardizes the inter-collegiate athletic experience for student athletes, and that if a pitcher or a running back or a quarterback wants to be sponsored individually by someone, they can become a professional?

Now, they might find that even if they are a very good quarterback that they will earn a lot more money from the local auto dealer at the university—if they are a quarterback for the University of Alabama than they are for a Class A professional football league.

Why isn't the right solution to make the choice a lot like the baseball choice and to say, sure, you have a right to earn it, but if you earn it and you elect to be a student athlete, then that money goes to all the student athletes; if you elect to keep it, then you become a professional?

Mr. Hartwell.

Mr. HARTWELL. Mr. Chairman, you know, that model exists in some extent right now as it relates to, again, the example I used

earlier, whether it is footwear and apparel rights as it relates to a Nike or an Adidas or an Under Armour. And, in the situation if they were allowed to do individual deals—

I will go back to our example, Jordan Love, our highest profile student athlete, first-round draft pick of the Green Bay Packers. We would have a select few student athletes who would be able to command those types of revenues.

In all likelihood, as it relates to a footwear and apparel company, they would diminish the amount that they were providing to the institution and instead funnel it to that individual, who they thought had the greatest opportunity to go forward and be professional and have a greater return on that investment for them. And, so, in that example, you would, in all likelihood, not be able to provide two or three pairs of shoes and practice gear and uniforms for, you know, all the individuals on your track and field team, or on your gymnastic team and things like that. And, so, those are the challenges that are there.

Also, with baseball, you have the opportunity—with baseball and hockey, they have very robust minor league systems that allow those students coming out of high school, who are not inclined to pursue higher ed or who want to go directly to the professional ranks, that opportunity. And, so, that minimizes in a lot of cases the issues in those sports.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Dennis, I have only 30 seconds left. What would the impact be—would it be better to allow any endorsement money to be spread among all the student athletes or should the individual student keep it?

Ms. DENNIS. Thank you for that question, Senator Alexander. I am not sure—I am not sure how to answer that because I think name, image, and likeness really—there are two different classes of student athletes that can really make money off of their name, image, and likeness. However, I do think all student athletes can benefit from the financial literacy and educational components, including financial literacy, how to brand themselves, how to create a brand, and how to brand themselves for after college.

I think—I think there are two different set of athletes that would be affected by name, image, and likeness. However, all of them can benefit from it.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay. Thank you for the answer. I am going to try to stick close to my 5 minutes to set a good example.

Senator Murray.

Senator Murray is voting. Is Senator Casey available?

Senator Burr.

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to all our witnesses today.

I happen to be one of two scholarship—collegiate scholarship players in the U.S. Senate. I may not know much about this, but it entitles me to an opinion. And, I have been somewhat outspoken on the fact that I think this is a huge mistake and have expressed that to my colleagues and to the NCAA. Let me say to all of you that this is an issue that could not be reversed if we made the wrong move. There is no do-over.

I would turn to you, Mr. Huma, and ask you, since your organization is predominantly funded by the United Steel Workers of America, what is their interest in name and likeness in this issue?

Mr. HUMA. Thank you for the question. We have had tremendous support from the steel workers since—of almost 20 years now. And, as I mentioned, some of the progress that we have made over the years really could not have happened without their support. And, honestly, the steel workers—and I can't speak on their behalf, but they have demonstrated very clearly that they support our cause for college athletes; that really this issue is about workers who don't have workers' rights when trying to navigate that space. And, so—

Senator BURR. So this isn't because they are great—

Mr. HUMA [continuing]. conversation or raising awareness—

Senator BURR. They are not great fans of college sports; they—they are out promoting some type of equity that they think is being cheated.

As a scholarship athlete, I am having a hard time—it is almost an out-of-body experience to figure out how a professional athlete that gets paid millions of dollars was cheated somehow in college because they got an education and now they have an opportunity at an income.

I am going to turn to Chancellor Blank. I am sure that your school, like every school, when COVID hit and decisions were made not to have fall sports for some, athletic budgets were reviewed and you began to look at what the impact was going to be of losing the revenue from fall sports. Tell me, if you will, without specificity, because I don't want to ask something of Wisconsin or The Ohio State or Utah State that is proprietary. But, how would that have impacted non-revenue sports? Or how might it impact non-revenue sports, which are predominantly women's teams?

Dr. BLANK. Wisconsin, as in almost all universities, we use the revenue that comes in from our athletic program to support the entire athletic program. It is not unlike the rest of my university where I have certain units, like business or engineering, where they generate more income. But, they are not ships on their own bottom. I use some of that revenue to support first-class history and political science and language programs.

Similarly, I—you know, we want to support a broad-based athletic program, and our revenue, all of which goes back into the students and into the programs, you know, it does that. So, when COVID hit, you know, we did cut athletic budgets. In fact, none of our teams are competing right now in the fall. As you know, the Big Ten has postponed its season because of health concerns. And, you know, all of the programs were equally affected by this, just to say all are equally benefited by the revenue that any team generates.

Senator BURR. Coach Dennis, let me turn to you because I am sure you were privy to the budget calculations made at The Ohio State. How would that have impacted your track and field and cross country teams?

Ms. DENNIS. Senator, there is no way that we would have a track and field team if a pay-for-play kind of model existed where the majority of the revenue that—or the majority of money that could

be paid to our high-visibility student athletes. It would not allow our non-revenue sports to fund—or even just team the—have the same number of student athletes on each team. Each team may have to reduce a number of participants, which would deny collegiate athletic experience for hundreds of students and/or sports would be dropped. You know, just recently, here in the Big Ten, Minnesota, due to COVID and the economic impact on their athletic budget, they had to drop their men's track and field team, and it is happening in some of the MAC conferences where teams are being dropped. So, it would have a really devastating effect on how programs would be able to exist.

Senator BURR. And, last, to Director Hartwell. You are the athletic director. You are where the buck stops. You have to make the tough decisions. And, I think you said your athletic budget total was \$36 million, which, to some degree, is dwarfed by many institutions around the Country. How would that have impacted specifically women's sports at Utah State if you lost your revenue sports, if significant changes happened in your revenue stream?

Mr. HARTWELL. Yes. We have had to spread the wealth, if you will, so our budget iterations have gone from thirty—for the current fiscal year have gone from 38 million to 35 million to 27 million as a result of COVID-19. And, it has been a correction, if you will, in collegiate athletics.

When this all started for us in March, the two priorities that we had to protect were sports and scholarships, and we compete at—in 16 Division I sports, which is the NCAA minimum to be at the FBS level, so that is really not an option for us. And, obviously, we want to protect our student athletes. So, everything else is on board and across the board. Whether it is, you know, men's or women's basketball or football or our Olympic sports, including all of the women's sports, have taken an equal share in trying to help us get to the other side of this pandemic.

Senator Burr [Presiding]. I thank all of our witnesses and will take the Chairman's lead, and my time is expired.

Senator Casey.

Senator CASEY. Thank you very much. I wanted to thank Chairman Alexander and Ranking Member Murray for this hearing today.

I think we can all agree that the COVID-19 crisis has shined an even brighter light on the racial and economic inequities that continue to permeate our society and has made clearer than ever the urgent need to address them. Today, we are discussing a college athlete model that is in need of reform, and I think that is an understatement, to ensure that it justly benefits the athletes it is meant to serve. It is a system whose shortcomings disproportionately—it disproportionately affects athletes of color, who are generating enormous revenues for the colleges and universities they represent, whether it is playing football, basketball, or other sports.

I think we have to keep in mind at least four broad goals. No. 1, to ensure that these revenues, the revenues generated by athletes, are more equitably distributed.

No. 2, ensure that college athletes are kept safe and healthy and that best practices are not just talked about, but in fact implemented.

No. 3, improve academic outcomes for college athletes.

No. 4, ensure that athletes' voices are heard and that they have a say in decisions that affect their well-being and futures.

We know that millions of Americans love college sports and love the players who proudly represent their schools. We have to make sure that the sports we love do right by those who play them.

Let me start with a—I will have a question for the whole panel in the time that I have, but I wanted to start with a question for Mr. Huma.

In your testimony, you describe how health and safety standards are not uniform across schools and are not enforced identically across schools. You have also spoken about how the issue is not that the information—or not that information on best practices does not exist, but that it is not being implemented. It is critical we do all we can to keep college athletes healthy and safe, as I mentioned, not just during this pandemic, but during the course of their regular competition.

Can you speak in greater detail about player safety issues where best practices are known—known but not implemented—and, second, about the consequences for athletes regarding this lack of action?

Mr. HUMA. Sure, and thank you for the question.

In 2001, there were three deaths in college football in the off-season, one of which was heat illness. There was also the death of Korey Stringer, a Minnesota Vikings offensive lineman, who also died of heat illness. And, the difference between the NFL and NCAA sports is that in the NFL, they implemented best practice guidelines and made them enforceable. In college sports, the NCAA refused to do so.

I finished playing at UCLA. I had no idea that NCAA sports did not enforce health and safety standards, and to this day, it still does not. And unfortunately, there continues to be deaths related to heat illness and other preventative issues. And, you know, included in that is deaths related to sickle cell concussions. You know, even, you know, with all the different attention to concussions and CTE has received, to this day, it is not against NCAA rules for a football coach to force a player back in with a concussion on national television. The NCAA will not investigate. They won't come to anyone's rescue. As well as sexual assaults we have seen at many of these institutions. Those players have nowhere to go because the NCAA allows the schools to 'self-police.' So, it is a major ongoing problem.

Senator CASEY. In the remaining time that I have, just for the whole panel, and I know these answers will have to be short. But, we know the system has to be improved. We also have to work toward a system that treats athletes fairly and makes sure that we listen to the voices of these athletes.

Here is a question for all the witnesses. What do you believe are the two or three most important changes we could make to the current model of college athletics to ensure it treats players both equitably and is responsive to their voices? Maybe we can go in order of testimony.

Dr. BLANK. Let me start in that case. I first just want to say that what Mr. Huma says is simply not true in the Big Ten, which is

the group that I am most familiar with. We, for instance, have independent observers stationed at every game who can pull any player who is observed to have any concussion-related illness, can override any coach decision. We care a great deal about safety and use best practices. I just found his statement wrong, and I need to start by saying that.

Your question was what can they—you know, the main topic here is name, image, and likeness. The most important things I think that the Federal Government can do with legislation right now is to free up State laws; set some national standards for how name, image, and likeness should work; give us a narrow anti-trust exemption so that we can enforce those laws; safeguard the student status, that these are students and not employees; and help us address the Title IX issues so that name, image, and likeness doesn't get caught up in Title IX in a difficult way. Those are the things that I think we are asking for in terms of Federal legislation in the very near future.

Senator CASEY. Maybe the other answers could be by way of written submissions, if that is alright.

Senator BURR. I thank Senator Casey for that. And all witnesses will have an opportunity to answer that in writing.

Senator Paul is recognized.

Senator PAUL. You know, advocates of change are beseeching Congress for Federal regulation of college sports. Really? Be careful what you wish for.

The history of government regulation is not a benign one. What starts as a soft touch may well ultimately morph into a heavy hand. What happens if the Democratic socialists of America win? Will universities become coops or communes? Will presidents' and secretaries' and coaches' and players' salaries be equalized? Be careful what you wish for.

I think it is a terrible, rotten, no-good idea to Federalize college sports. The NCAA should promulgate their own rules. If the NCAA needs exception from anti-trust rules to create these rules, I can support that, but setting Federal rules for college sports is a huge mistake.

Advocates of Federalizing college sports argue, oh, we will have a hodgepodge of rules and all the different States will have rules. We hear this from the business community, and I have opposed it steadfastly. Federalizing the rules is a mistake. You may start out with rules you like, but they may well morph into something that is intolerable.

The argument also ignores that the NCAA is particularly poised to promulgate nationwide rules because losing membership in the NCAA is a significant cudgel to enforce a nationwide rule on name, image, and likeness. I would propose that the NCAA can do this on their selves, but we should not involve Washington. We should not involve Congress. It is a mistake to take this away from the NCAA and those who represent the NCAA from colleges.

My argument is if you choose not to obey the NCAA rules and they kick you out of the NCAA, it is going to be hard to get players. It is going to be hard to have a Division I or an accepted program if you don't obey the rules. This should be left to the NCAA. I don't think anybody on the Committee agrees with me, so I won't ask

any questions, and I will only take a couple of minutes. But, I would suggest if we do another hearing like this, we ought to get somebody on the Committee who actually thinks it is a bad idea to Federalize college sports, and that there is an argument that could be made for the NCAA doing this on their own.

Thank you, and I yield back my time.

Senator BURR. Thanks, Senator Paul.

Senator Murphy.

Senator MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to Senator Alexander and Senator Murray for bringing us here together today.

I am a huge college sports fan, and I can't help but have noticed that this has turned into a \$15 billion industry over the course of the last 15 years. In fact, in that period of time, it has gone from a \$5 billion industry to a \$15 billion industry. And, it is the only multi-billion-dollar industry in this Country where we allow for the employers to collude in order to fix the wages of the majority of their employees. That is what is going on here.

We can say that, you know, the workers, the athletes, should be happy with the cost of tuition, but that is not how the free market works. And, to me, it is just pretty rich to listen to a coach who is making \$5 million a year tell his athletes that they should be okay with simply the cost of tuition. For all of those in this body who believe in the free market, I don't know why we decide to keep it from athletes, who are producing an incredibly and increasingly valuable service.

Now, the argument is that they aren't athletes, they aren't workers; that they are actually just students who happen to play a sport. The argument from Senator Alexander and others is that if they want to be pros, just go be pros. Right? You have a choice.

I want to start with you, Mr. Huma, just to try to understand whether those two arguments hold up. And I want to make sure I have a minute remaining to ask one additional question of Chancellor Blank.

Quick answers, if you could, Mr. Huma. Can a high school football player who wants to go to the NFL and make money, who is ready to do so, can they do that?

Mr. HUMA. No. They have to pass through college, and, so, college has a monopoly on college football, a big business. And even from there, just to say simply go pro, less than 2 percent set foot in the NFL. You have 90 percent—98 percent of people who never get that opportunity, who rightfully deserve their fair share of that industry. And, as we have shown in studies, this should be hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, easily. And, as we can prove, it would not require deleting non-revenue sports from the rosters and, you know, some of the scare tactics.

Ohio State has \$209 million. It cannot say that if they were to share some of that with some of the revenue athletes that they suddenly have to cut all sports when other colleges in the same division are footing all kinds of non-revenue sports. You will get that scare tactic even from the top producers. It is just not true.

Senator MURPHY. So, let's be clear. You do not have a choice as a high-value, high-school athlete. You can't just go to the NFL. In fact, you can't go to the NBA. You have to make a stop along the

way in the big business of college sports because there are a lot of folks who make millions of dollars depending on it.

Mr. Huma, are these students like all other students? How many hours a week are Power 5 football players spending on athletics? You know, if they are students and then on the side athletes, I would expect that they would, you know, be putting in, you know, 5, 10 hours a week on athletics. How many hours a week are some of these Power 5 students putting into athletics?

Mr. HUMA. When you ask about Power 5 football, the NCAA's own surveys show that the average FBS football player spends 44 hours per week in their sport alone. And even when you come to the other athletes, you are talking about well over 30 hours per week. So, to pretend that academics is first—and these are athletes who have to schedule their entire majors and coursework around athletics, who oftentimes have some—have to miss games in many of these sports and prioritize their athletics. So, that is the true nature of college sports.

Senator MURPHY. So, they don't have the choice to go pro. They are athletes first and students second. Let's just be honest about that as we approach this conversation.

Finally, in the minute that I have remaining, to Chancellor Blank, I have heard the argument from you and others that, you know, if you were forced to pay college athletes, at least in sports like football and basketball that make money, then you couldn't afford to run all the other sports. I think Mr. Huma did a pretty good job of explaining that, in fact, there are plenty of other institutions, from high school to Division III colleges, that manage to run sports programs without making any money. So, I am not necessarily sure why you couldn't adopt a model in which it is just a little bit less professional looking.

But, let me make the argument to you that you don't have to actually reallocate money at all outside of your football program. Your head coach at University of Wisconsin makes \$4 million a year. What is the problem with just paying him, you know, the salary of the average Member of Congress and taking those additional dollars and divvying them up amongst those who play for him? That wouldn't affect the rest of your college sports, just reallocating money within the football program.

Chancellor Blank. So, I actually have been quoted as being quite critical of the amounts of money that we currently pay coaches. I am an economist. It is a market out there.

As I noted earlier, it is very hard to find people who have really top coaching skills, whether in college or in professional sports, and the market competes those prices up. We used to restrict college coach salaries in the NCAA. There was a lawsuit on antitrust grounds that we lost, and at that point, or since then, college coaches have simply been competed up by the market.

I would be more than happy, and I have said this before publicly, to consider an antitrust exemption that would allow us to restrict coaches' salaries. I think that is appropriate for college sports. I think it is somewhat outrageous that the highest paid employee in many States is their State university college coach.

Senator MURPHY. So, just in closing, you are not allowed by anti-trust rules to be able to restrict the pay of college coaches, but you

are allowed under current rules to be able to restrict the compensation of athletes. That just is patently absurd to me, and it is one of the reasons why this Committee has to be engaged with the Commerce Committee—

Senator BURR. Senator's time—

Senator Murphy—in some pretty broad reform. Thank you.

Senator BURR. Senator's time has expired.

Senator Cassidy.

He may be having some technical problems.

Senator CASSIDY. Senator Burr, I am walking on the street right now, so I will defer until after the next set of questions.

Senator BURR. I thank you, Senator Cassidy.

Senator Romney.

Senator ROMNEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My concern about athlete compensation has been focused less upon the 2-percent that are going to go into the pros and who could make a lot of money. I know there is a sense of, gee, it is just not fair that these very, very top athletes are not getting paid their full market value. I recognize that. I appreciate that concern.

My biggest concern has been the 98 percent who play on the football team or basketball team and are putting in as much as 5, 6, 7 hours a day in practice and are never going to go onto the pros. And they are making an enormous sacrifice and are doing so for the love of the sport and probably for hope that they will be able to go onto the pros, and it seems unfair that they have to endure the kind of sacrifice that they carry out without the prospect of additional compensation.

I have spoken with the NCAA about that matter, and they say, our challenge is that to provide any additional compensation to the members of these teams makes them effectively, under Federal law, employees, and therefore subject to employment law, which would mean they would be subject to age discrimination actions, wrongful termination. You could get cut by a team and sue the team.

Mr. Huma, is your thought that these college athletes might appropriately be members of a union, join a union?

Mr. HUMA. Well, I think that, you know, if there are State laws and the NLRA that recognize they are—you know, what they do as employees, they should not be denied rights under labor law.

But, in terms of different models of compensation, there is many out there. I mean, players can receive money directly from the media outlets, which has nothing to do with employee status. Even the conferences or the associations. There are ways to, you know, really look at this and consider all of those different aspects. So, again, I think that there are pretty realistic and easy models to consider that don't get into some of the more challenging issues. They may not have full support of Congress, but, you know, what they do, obviously, you know, they are there to provide money for the university. They spend a lot of time like workers, and so that could be a possibility, as well.

Senator ROMNEY. Yes. No, I think the point is that I have a sense as to why the steel workers is interested in this topic, which is this is the potential for some—a unionization of college athletes,

which could be a real revenue-generator for a union. And this, I think, is the reason why—

Senator Paul raised the question about why is the Federal Government looking at this. The NCAA has come to the Federal Government and said, look, we could solve this, but we run up against all sorts of Federal law and Federal regulation. We need to have help to understand what you want us to do and guidance through this labyrinth. Because obviously the colleges are not interested in having the athletes become union members, to be subject to employment law, wrongful termination, age discrimination. All the sorts of things that I think would make it very difficult to run an athletic problem.

I guess my own inclination is that the right course here is to find a way to provide additional compensation to members of teams. For those that are the 2-percent, if you will, that—either they might be able to get name, image, and likeness, but limit it to let's say \$50,000 a year, no more than that, or allow them to go pro.

You indicated that, well, they can't go pro. As Senator Murphy just indicated, gosh, they can't go pro in football, but my guess is that it should be easier for football to change that than—and to follow more like the baseball model than for us to come up with a new law.

I wonder, are we—would we satisfy the concerns that you have if we indicated that, look, we are going increase the ability to compensate all the members of a team, not just the 2-percent that go onto the pros, and that the very high-earner potential, the 2-percent, they might be able to get name, image, and likeness but limit it at something like \$50,000 a year? Does that work?

Let me ask Ms. Blank or Dr. Blank. Would a process of that nature work? And do you see the same concern that I am describing?

Dr. BLANK. I would oppose that type of thing because it becomes a pay-for-play system. You know, I am primarily an educational institution and I have 850 student athletes, and I run those programs because I want those students to develop the set of skills that may not be developed in other classrooms. I want them to learn self-discipline, self-confidence. The same thing I hope they are learning and other students are learning as they are coming to college. And, you know, that is about an educational process. As they say, the main benefits these students take away is their educational degree. It is not about coming here to earn money and to be an employee.

I would not agree with you, but I think that is a good idea.

Senator ROMNEY. Okay.

Ms. Dennis.

Ms. DENNIS. Senator Romney, thank you. Pro athletes—football players can go pro in college. They can't go pro like Mr. Huma said from high school.

But, we are not interested really in—for non-revenue sports, as well as I think for all of our student athletes, we are not interested in being professionals of a university. You know, we are interested in being student athletes who gain from the educational experience.

If we started making all of our student athletes, you know, have them go pro, our Olympic teams are going to be decimated. You

know, and I don't know if you have thought about, you know, the feeding system that college athletes serves as—for our Olympic teams.

You know, in 2016, the road to Rio ran right through the university system. There were—80 percent of our student athletes comprised our Olympic team. And of that, there were 555 members on the—on Team USA, and 436 of them came from—they were either incoming student athletes, current student athletes, or former student athletes.

I am not interested in that.

Senator ROMNEY. Alright. Thank you.

The Chairman [presiding]. Okay. Thank you.

Senator Murphy—Senator Romney, your time is up.

Senator ROMNEY [continuing]. our time. So, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I return it to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Romney.

Senator Murray.

Senator MURRAY. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Huma, you were a college football player at UCLA, a large Division I program that brings in millions of dollars in revenue, but then you are also the executive director at the National College Players Association and you work with college athletes, men and women, participating in a very wide range of sports—those we see playing on TV and whose name we recognize, as well as the vast majority who play sports that are never aired on TV and whose names we may never know.

I wanted to ask you, in your work with college athletes, what are some of the biggest health and safety concerns for players? Are these issues different between sports or across the three NCAA divisions?

Mr. HUMA. Thanks for that question. There are issues that are very common across all the divisions. And, again, the problem is because there are no health and safety standards that are enforced in NCAA—by the NCAA. But, there are life and death issues that continue to keep coming up. As I mentioned, heat illness. Some of you members may remember the death of Jordan McNair at Maryland just a couple years ago. That was completely preventable, and Maryland admitted negligence. And it will happen. You can set your clock to it. We don't know exactly when, but it will happen until there is enforcement of those kinds of rules.

Sickle cell-related deaths, rhabdomyolysis from, you know, trainers and strength and conditioning coaches that really are not regulated in a way to make sure their workouts are safe.

We mentioned the Big Ten. There are plenty of problems in the Big Ten. They have actually some of the worst sexual assault scandals in the history of college sports that are still actively being investigated. Those issues, you know, really go unaddressed across all these divisions because there is nowhere for these players to go.

Traumatic brain injury, CTE. It is not just football. And actually, women's sports have higher rates of concussions in comparable sports. So, women's soccer players have higher rates than men's soccer players, and on and on.

There are some things that are common, in contact sports especially, but it is really throughout the divisions.

Senator MURRAY. Okay. Thank you. That is very concerning.

I wanted to also ask you, the safe reopening of schools across the Country is a critical challenge for students and parents and staff, and for many colleges, college athletes, who are the first students to return to campus in order to participate in summer workouts and practices. Are there mandatory, enforceable protocols established by the NCAA for schools to follow?

Mr. HUMA. Well, when players started arriving on campus, there was absolutely nothing, and players began getting sick pretty much immediately in those workouts across the Nation and across various sports. The NCAA very late claimed to have said some things that were mandatory and that if there were problems, players would be able to call a hotline. But, if you go to the NCAA's webpage, they say if there are problems, call us and we will essentially ask your college and the conference to politely correct the situation. Not real enforcement.

Truly, when you look at whether or not—the NCAA is very calculated on this. When they want to enforce rules like on compensation, they are there the whole—it makes national headlines. They are hammering schools and players. When it comes to health and safety, they pretend like things are mandatory, when in actuality, there are no punishments. So, there is no indication whatsoever right now that there is anything that is enforceable when it comes to COVID and NCAA sports.

Senator MURRAY. Well, Dr. Blank, Coach Dennis, I want to follow-up with both of you on this issue. On August 11th, the Big Ten made the decision to postpone fall sports until 2021, but is now, a month later, revisiting that decision. And, like the college athletes in schools in my home State of Washington, I know that college athletes on your campuses also want to compete. But, I think we have to all agree that health and safety of these young people has to be a top priority. Has the NCAA or the Big Ten provided protocols to your schools in light of the coronavirus?

Dr. BLANK. Let me start. The most important policy that the NCAA has established and every school is following is that anyone who feels unsafe playing in an age of COVID can sit out this year. They will maintain their scholarship. They can return next year with no loss of eligibility and money. You know, we want anyone who does not feel comfortable playing to not be able to play, and we have communicated that very clearly to all of our athletes.

Senator MURRAY. Actually, not—you say play or not. I was asking more specifically are there any protocols that have been provided in terms of safety and health?

Dr. BLANK. My understanding is the conferences are each setting their individual protocols, and that is why the Big Ten, for instance, has made different choices than the SEC or some of the other conferences.

Senator MURRAY. Coach Dennis.

Ms. DENNIS. Senator Murray, thank you. There are some very strict protocol in place at The Ohio State University for return to play. Every student athlete is being tested, COVID tested. If they are found positive, then they are put into quarantine. They are contact tracing around them. There is a cardiac—a complete cardiology workup, including a cardiology MRI. If they are tested positive,

then they cannot return to play until there is approval from the cardiologist after all the workups and the MRI that they are safe to be able to come back to practice.

Senator MURRAY. Are those your school rules or are those—

Ms. DENNIS. That is at The Ohio State University. And I am going to tell you, the student athletes there, they—to me, they have 24/7 concierge medical attention. Our trainers are up at 3 in the morning if necessary. If they get a phone call, then they are being taken care of. So, I don't—I am sure there is some abuses around the Country, but in the Big Ten, for the most part, and at Ohio State, those abuses do not exist.

To Mr. Huma's credit, yes, it has been some unfortunate occurrences with heat indices, the rhabdo situation at Iowa. But, I tell you, after those kinds of things happen, you—I just don't believe, and they are not—they are not taken lightly, and additional protocols have been taken—have been put in place.

Senator MURRAY. Is that the NCAA, Big Ten, or private schools?

Ms. DENNIS. By Ohio State, as well as the Big Ten.

Senator MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am out of time, so I will submit additional questions. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Murray.

Senator Kaine.

Senator KAINE. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and to the Ranking Member, for holding this hearing.

One of the things I love about this Committee is some of the elements of our work are issues I have cared about and thought about a lot over the course of my life, career in technical education, as an example. But, some are issues that even if they are important to me as a citizen, I haven't really thought that much about the public policy side of it, and today's hearing would be an example of that. I just haven't thought that much about the public policy side of collegiate sports.

A couple of thoughts or questions because I want to be educated by the witnesses. In Virginia, the two largest schools, University of Virginia and Virginia Tech—actually, not largest, but two of our prominent institutions—are both part of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

The Atlantic Coast Conference has decided to play fall football. Virginia Tech's first game was scheduled last weekend on September 12th against North Carolina State. That game had to be postponed because of an outbreak of coronavirus among North Carolina State players. Virginia Tech's second game was to be this weekend against University of Virginia. That game has been postponed because of an outbreak of COVID among Virginia Tech players. But, the ACC is still playing football.

Why—if we have had to scrap the first two games, the Virginia Tech games, and obviously the other teams that were involved, I just would like to ask each of the witnesses, why are we working so hard to continue fall football if the results at least in the ACC are such that grave questions about the ability to do it safely are so obvious?

Dr. BLANK. I will jump into that. So, the Big Ten did decide to postpone its football season. It has postponed all its fall sports, and there were several main reasons for that. One was that we were

uncertain that we could do the level of testing and contact tracing that we needed to keep athletes safe.

Second, there was this growing evidence about heart-related myocarditis, and that evidence was uncertain and it wasn't clear what it meant, and we wanted to know more. There were a few other more minor reasons. But, you know, until we have answers to that, we will keep our season postponed. Once we have answers to that and to some of those issues and think that we have ways to deal with them effectively, we will try to plan a delayed season. But—

Senator KAINE. Chancellor Blank—

Dr. BLANK [continuing]. I share those concerns. It is one of the reasons we delayed our season.

Senator KAINE. Chancellor Blank, could I just ask you, some public reporting suggests that the Big Ten may vote this week to restore fall football. Are those reports accurate?

Dr. BLANK. I am not going to speak to that. You are going to have to let the Big Ten make that announcement when and if such a decision is made. When such a decision happens, your first question should be what has changed, and, you know, hopefully we will have answers to exactly the issues that I just raised.

Senator KAINE. Do you know whether a decision of that kind is going to be a unanimous—would require unanimous vote by the college presidents or some lesser vote?

Dr. BLANK. I can't say what the vote is going to look like. Decisions within the Big Ten are largely majority-based decisions. But I will be honest, we almost always decide everything by consensus. We very rarely take votes.

Senator KAINE. Is it not the case that at least two Big Ten presidents are epidemiologists or have expertise in public health, the presidents of both University of Michigan and Michigan State?

Dr. BLANK. That is true.

Senator KAINE. How about others who want to answer that question? You know, if—why are we working so hard? I am just using the ACC as an example. Why are we working so hard to maintain a fall football season if Virginia Tech—just using Tech as an example—has had to postpone its first two games because of COVID?

Mr. HUMA. I would like to weigh in.

Senator KAINE. Please.

Mr. HUMA. Really, it is very simple. It is big money and it is hard to pass up, and athletic directors and coaches have been pretty frank about that.

Another thing I will point out, as much as people like to think that maybe a conference is going to do right, or somehow things are going to be okay, the National Athletic Trainers' Association just put out a survey yesterday, finding that throughout all the different divisions and schools, less than half of the coaches and athletic staff are complying with their own COVID guidelines. Less than half. And you see outbreaks all over the Nation. Like you see game postponements, season postponements, and no one is talking about anything that is going to fundamentally change that without some real enforcement that is uniform nationally. And that is—there is nothing anywhere close to that.

The other thing that I will point out is that conferences really are not enforcement entities. When was the last time you saw a

conference enforce anything? So, even if the conference puts out guidelines—you know, the PAC-12 players were told by Larry Scott that it is impossible to enforce uniform guidelines within the conference across 12 schools. And that is basically how conferences have approached health and safety. So, they are very much ill-equipped and pretty much unwilling to do what is right in terms of enforcement when it comes to COVID and other health issues.

Senator KAINE. My time is up. I am going to have a question or two that I will ask for the record, but I appreciate the witnesses. This has been very enlightening. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Kaine.

Senator Scott.

Senator SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can you hear me okay?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, we can.

Senator SCOTT. Okay. Excellent.

Chancellor Blank, my question is a simple question. How do you preserve the amateur nature of collegiate athletics, while at the same time allowing student athletes to benefit monetarily from the use of their name, image, and likeness?

Dr. BLANK. That is exactly I think why we are concerned with the need for some Federal-legislated involvement in this.

There are several things that I think we need to have in place in order to preserve collegiate athletics. When—if, as name, image, and likeness payments become allowable, we cannot let a hodge-podge of State laws be in place. That makes it almost impossible to compete on even playing fields. So, some Federal preemption of those State laws with establishment of national standards.

We need a narrow trust exemption so that any rules that we set that, say, limit people from doing name, image, and likeness with the—within a—with a college gambling group, for instance, that we can enforce those sorts of laws.

We need—I think that law should explicitly indicate the importance of student—of the student-athlete model, that students are not employees, that they are students as well as sports players.

Then, finally, we have to address the Title IX laws.

Those sorts of things will indeed preserve the college athletic model, while still allowing some payments for name, image, and likeness.

Senator SCOTT. Chancellor, just a follow-up to that. Do you believe that it would be necessary in that Federal apparatus to have certain industries and/or areas of interest excluded from the list of places where a student athlete could use their name, image, or likeness?

Dr. BLANK. I do think there have to be guardrails around the ways in which student athletes can do here. There has to be transparency about who is paying them. They have to be able to show—we have to be able to show, and this is some regulatory process, that indeed they are receiving reasonable payments for what are genuine services; this is not a pretext for simply passing money under the table. Whether that is something you want to write into legislation is not clear to me. I think that is something that anybody that would be charged with regulating this law would want to establish those sorts of guardrails.

Senator SCOTT. So, you would suggest that the Federal legislation and/or vehicle would create a broad outline, and then having a governing authority, maybe empowered by that legislation, decree the uniform standard would be consistent with the philosophy that you are echoing?

Dr. BLANK. Yes, absolutely.

Senator SCOTT. Okay. Great. Thank you so much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Scott.

Senator ROSEN, we will go to you.

Senator ROSEN. Can you hear me okay?

The CHAIRMAN. We can.

Senator ROSEN. Perfect. Thank you. We have been having some problems with our computer lately, so thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing, and thank you to the witnesses for being here today.

I want to touch a little bit and build upon what some of my colleagues have talked about on COVID-19 concerns because that—college athlete compensation, it is an important issue that is central to our discussion today, but we also cannot lose sight of an even more pressing topic—the risks college athletes face due to COVID-19 pandemic.

Of course, we find ourselves in the opening school weeks of the year. The New York Times just this past Friday reported that in the prior week, there were 36,000 new cases of COVID-19 across the Country, bringing the total number of cases for college campuses to nearly 90,000. That is pretty high if you ask me.

Like the Big Ten, the PAC-10, the Mountain West Conference—so that is where UNLV and UNR play in Nevada—they postponed their games for the fall season, saying that the coronavirus just posed too many health risks. But, in a survey by ESPN, nearly half of the Power 5 conference schools declined to even provide data on the total number of positive COVID-19 tests that college athletes—and almost one-third of schools chose not to disclose information about their safety protocols, and I find this lack of transparency particularly alarming.

Back in July, in Commerce Committee, I called on the NCAA to issue nationwide guidance of COVID testing, and I was glad to see 2 weeks later that they had announced a comprehensive testing strategy. But, recent reports have me concerned that we are not following those guidelines.

Let me ask the witnesses here today, do you make COVID-19 information publically available? And, so, Dr. Blank, would you like to begin that?

Dr. BLANK. We have a dashboard that we update every day that provides information on our COVID-19 cases on campus, the positivity rates, how many tests we have run, all of the type of information that would allow you to track what is happening on campus. And, there is usually comments that are added to that to help people understand more about what we are seeing.

Senator ROSEN. And does everyone else on the panel—do you make COVID-19 information publically available? I would also like you to comment on what more needs to be done to be sure that

every college is transparent about their COVID-19 testing, tracing protocols, and their positivity rates.

Ms. DENNIS. Thank you, Senator Rosen. At Ohio State, we also are in receipt of COVID-19 information on a daily basis. The information comes from our medical community, through the—information through the CDC, and students—coaches are privy to that information every day.

Senator ROSEN. What about the parents and the students? Are they privy to that information so they know if it is a safe environment for them to be participating in?

Ms. DENNIS. I don't believe the information is private. It is on a website, so anything that is on a website to me has the ability to be transparent. And as far as—as far as I know, we are as transparent with our student athletes and our parent community because they are also very important. They are very important members of our Buckeye community.

Senator ROSEN. Well, I appreciate that. And, again, I guess to all the panelists, I just think about not just the student athletes, but the entire student community and those parents should be part of these conversations going forward because it is really important for everyone—the professors, all the people who work at your university, also have to make decisions based on the information that they find.

I guess we can move on unless somebody has something else to say about that.

Mr. HUMA. I would like to say that there are a number of athletes that have no idea what the infection rate is in their sports. Their programs are keeping it quiet. And, also, even players who have tested positive, sometimes they are not getting a retest before being reintroduced back into workouts.

I will also point out that even the conferences that have postponed football season, many players are still in workouts. Workouts still are not up to snuff when it comes to best practices on health and safety standards. So, even if there are not actual competitions going on, in some of these conferences, players are still working out in environments that they have a lack of information about. Even what a violation would look like, what the schools are even promising to do. And if they saw a violation, who do they call? The NCAA, which is just going to kind of ask politely for the schools to do something a little bit better, but there is not real enforcement.

Senator ROSEN. So, what do you think we should do in order to make this more uniform and protect not just our student athletes, all of our students and the staff, professors, and everyone who might be coming to our college campuses for whatever reason?

Mr. HUMA. There needs to be full transparency nationwide within athletic programs and on campuses. And when it comes to athletics, there needs to be a national, uniform standard that is actually enforced with the same figure that the schools and NCAA would enforce compensating college athletes.

Senator ROSEN. Thank you. I believe my time is up. I appreciate you all being here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Rosen.
Senator Jones.

Senator JONES [continuing]. Chairman, and thanks to all our witnesses today for being here. It is a fascinating subject. It is a—it really gets into a lot of many, many different areas, and I don't think people fully appreciate, you know, until they dig down.

For me, I have always believed that where we are headed for some type of compensation is a natural evolution of what has now become a huge, billions-of-dollar business in America and the economy. And, I also think we are leaving out some things, such as the ability to transfer back and forth a little bit easier than I think that these athletes enjoy right now.

But, I would like to ask—I want to go in a little bit different direction on cost. To Chancellor Blank and Mr. Hartwell, we hear a lot, and I think it is appropriate to talk about the value that these athletes get from the universities with their tuition, with their room and board, with—you know, all of the things. That has a value. But, I also know and have seen some criticisms about this transfer pricing model. Now, I will admit that I am not an accountant, but there has been some criticism that some of these models are not really giving a full, accurate picture of the actual cost to the universities for these athletes. We hear a lot of big numbers, and that may be the retail cost.

But, I would like for you to address the need for transparency in assessing this, because I think that what we are giving these athletes right now has to be weighed with what we ultimately do. But it needs to be transparent.

I would like for you to talk about the value and how you calculate that value at your institutions and where we need to be looking going forward.

Chancellor Blank. So, we are—we have a one-pager out that says here is all the things that athletes get. We actually use that both with donors, when we are asking them to support teams, as well as make it available to anyone else. You know, the tuition, books scholarship, as they say, is actually the lower end part of what students actually receive when you add in all of the coaching, the mental health, the free meals, the insurance coverage, plus the value of an education. And it is hard to cost some of those things out in a very clear way, so we tend not to have a full cost, all-in. We tend to talk about them separately.

Senator JONES. Mr. Hartwell.

Mr. HARTWELL. Ours is similar in that there is a clear dollar value given each year to the grant and aid agreement, the scholarship agreement, that is signed annually by our student athletes, which at Utah State is about \$36,000. That includes tuition, room, books, these—all of those things.

But, in addition, there is so much more that is provided. The individual strength and conditioning coaching, the academic tutors and help with registering. All of those things. The mental health counselors, the nutritionist. All of those things that there is a value to. Although, you know, we don't drill down individually and say, hey, each student athlete gets 2 hours of strength and conditioning individual training per week, or the medical care that is provided by our team physicians and sports medicine specialists. So, it is significantly more than that \$37,000.

I think another really key factor here, and I will speak from personal experience, is, you know, I can remember in my mid-thirties, which was quite a few years ago, talking to peers and colleagues, and they still had student loans that they were paying off. One of the great assets of being a collegiate athlete, not only do you get to play a sport you love, but you get to do it debt-free in a lot of cases for those that are on full scholarship. And again, the financial challenges that come up 8, 10, 12 years down the road for those still paying student loans off, a lot of collegiate student athletes don't have that debt to pay.

Senator JONES. Well, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, before I ask the next question—I have a little bit of time. This letter from Southeastern Conference Commissioner, Greg Sankey, is probably part of the record for this Commerce Committee, but with the—I am asking unanimous consent that we make this a part of the record for our hearing today, if that is okay.

The CHAIRMAN. So ordered.

Senator JONES. Mr. Huma, let me ask you one quick question in the limited time we have. One issue for a lot of these conferences, a lot of these schools, is liability—liability for athletes that have gone before them that have not been able to benefit from this. There have been different proposals there, and I would like to get your thoughts on whether there are safe harbor provisions you would support from a players' association, safe harbor provisions that would allow this to be implemented without subjecting these schools to liability from past—you know, past athletes, or any kind of alternative.

My time is up, so just very quickly, please, sir.

Mr. HUMA. Just quickly, I don't think players should be denied—past players should be denied opportunities to access the legal system. I think when we get into these spaces, we talk about how to carve college athletes out of basic protections and even legal rights. I don't think that is an appropriate measure. And, I think if they bring suits and go try to pursue things, it will have to work itself out that way. Because if the NCAA was breaking the law for decades, there needs to be some kind of restitution, and I think the courts are well-positioned to rule on that.

Senator JONES. Alright. Well, thank you. I may send that question around for the others to answer, as well, because I am sure we will potentially get different answers there.

But, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks to all of the witnesses. I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Jones.

Senator HASSAN.

Senator HASSAN. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and to you and Ranking Member Murray for holding this hearing. And thank you for the witnesses for being here to testify today.

I am going to note before I get to my questions that I am concerned that there continues to be an inconsistent approach across colleges and universities and conferences to holding sporting events during the COVID-19 pandemic. Some sports and conferences are not playing, while others are moving forward, even on campuses with some of the highest rates of infection, and there are varying levels of safety measures in place. The health of—and safety of col-

lege athletes and their communities must determine when and how college sports continue during this pandemic.

My first question is for Ms. Blank. As you know, decisions about how college sports will proceed are being made as infectious disease experts and researchers continue to identify and warn about the long-term health impacts of COVID-19, even on young, healthy adults. One recent study of college athletes in particular found that there are potential, long-term risks to heart health, even for those who recover from COVID-19.

Chancellor Blank, I will ask you first, can you explain if your school has considered the potential long-term health impacts of COVID-19 on your athletes? And if so, how are you preparing to address these long-term healthcare needs for college athletes who may become infected with the virus?

Dr. BLANK. Thank you for that question. We definitely consider that. We have a group of medical experts, who have worked closely with our athletic department as they put together their procedures for how you do any training. As you know, the Big Ten has decided at this point to postpone its season. Part of its concern was exactly out of the unsettled evidence that we were getting on myocarditis and on heart-related issues, and, you know, our continued consult that—

The Big Ten also has a panel of experts from across our schools from all of the medical—our various hospitals and medical schools that are consulting with the Big Ten on the decisions that they are making. So, you know, our concern is that we do this according to the best science and the best medical advice possible.

Senator HASSAN. Well, it raises, too—thank you. It raises, though, too, this issue—and then I will ask Mr. Hartwell and Ms. Dennis to comment—on are you making plans to take care of health-related—health effects that could last for the rest of an athlete's life if they play?

Will the university system, for instance, be covering those costs or somehow acknowledging that if you ask an athlete to take on the risk of playing during COVID that you have some responsibility for the long-term impacts of the health effects?

Chancellor, do you want to—

Dr. BLANK. Oh, yes. I am happy to respond. I'm sorry. I thought you were directing that at the other two.

Yes. We provide insurance to our—all of our athletes. At a minimum, we cover them for anything that happens to them while they are student athletes for up to 2 years after that. In a number of cases—you know, COVID is an interesting situation. Usually, we are talking about more, you know, physical damage injuries, which are generated on the field in some way. We have, in a number of cases, covered athletes much longer who had injuries that they needed help on far beyond 2 years. Our expectation is if we have someone who has serious COVID-related issues that they contract with while they are playing, we would cover them.

Senator HASSAN. Alright. Well, thank you for that. And I think I will go to another question to Mr. Huma and ask Mr. Hartwell and Ms. Dennis to respond to what I just asked the chancellor in writing at a later time.

Because, Mr. Huma, I want to talk a little bit about concussions. I am introducing the bipartisan resolution with Republican Senator Shelley Moore Capito of West Virginia, recognizing this Friday, September 18th, as concussion awareness day to raise awareness of the impact of concussions and traumatic brain injuries.

According to the CDC, there are between 1.6 and 3.8 million sports-related concussions each year, and our current data sources may only account for a small percentage of the total instances of concussions. Concussions and traumatic brain injuries are an important health concern for children, teens, and adults, including many college athletes, and we need to improve research, diagnosis, overall understanding, and management of concussions.

Mr. Huma, what is your organization doing to work with college athletes to raise awareness of the long-term effects of concussions? How should we consider these long-term health risks specific to college athletes when we talk about compensation, including benefits like healthcare and employment-related disability?

Mr. HUMA. First, I would just like to thank you for the work that you are doing. It is an important issue.

Health and safety is our top priority, and traumatic brain injury is one that has gone unaddressed in college sports, unfortunately, and raising awareness among athletes is a top priority, and how that can lead to CTE, chronic traumatic encephalopathy. That has been found in college athletes. They have committed suicide and found to have had CTE in their brains, as well.

In addition, part of what we do with college athletes is to get them to realize as much as possible they have to be their own advocates because, again, the National Athletic Trainers' Association, it is very consistent. Athletic staff lean on trainers, they pressure trainers, to return players with concussion to the same game. That has been going on for quite some time. So, those are the very important issues.

I forgot. What was the second part of your question?

Senator HASSAN. Well, it was really—and I am running out of time, so I will follow-up with you in deference to the Chair. But it was really about what kind of long-term disability plans or planning should colleges and college athletes engage in, and whose financial obligation is it. So, I will follow-up with you on that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Hassan.

I want to thank the witnesses for a very illuminating hearing today, and the Senators for their broad participation and good questions.

Before we wrap up, Senator Murray, do you have additional comments or questions?

Senator MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I did want to ask unanimous consent to include in the hearing record a number of supplemental documents that were submitted by Mr. Huma as part of his testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. So ordered.

[The following information can be found on pages 59-189 in the Additional Material]

Senator MURRAY. I appreciate that. And I want to thank all of our witnesses, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this important discussion today.

As I said in my opening statement, you have a long history on this Committee of leading bipartisan conversations on important issues. Today was no different.

I think it is clear that college athletes are being exploited, and while NCAA officials and coaches make millions, they don't. Congress needs to look at this and address these injustices and finally ensure that college athletes get, at a minimum, a fair share of the revenue generated from their own name and image and likeness, and their voice should be heard in the decisionmaking. But, also, that they are protected by enforceable health and safety standards and have access to affordable healthcare and receive a quality education.

I think we have a lot work ahead of us, and I look forward to working with all of you. And, again, thank you to our witnesses for being here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Murray. And I want to thank you and your staff for working with us to create this opportunity today. We will—we are coordinating with the Commerce Committee, which has principal jurisdiction over this issue and the comments and the testimony today will be helpful to the Commerce Committee as it considers what action Congress should take.

I would like to ask one last question before we wrap up. Assuming that Congress were to act to provide—create an entity who had the job of writing rules for compensation for name, image, and likeness, what should that—who should that entity be?

Chancellor Blank.

Dr. BLANK. So, I would be willing to talk about a variety of options here. I think the worst choice would be to create a new regulatory body, which will only expand its role over time in ways that probably will not be helpful to anyone.

My first choice would be to let the NCAA do this. They have the most expertise and, as you pointed out, have the ability to do this.

There may be other existing government agencies that would look attractive to some people on this Committee. That would be fine, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Dennis.

Ms. DENNIS. Senator Alexander, I am not really sure which governmental agency would this fall under. What I am sure of is that, as a coach, I have got enough challenges, and I don't want to navigate my way through a labyrinth of different laws during the recruiting process because everything I do is challenging enough without having to try to figure out from which perspective this law is going to affect my recruiting efforts, as well as all of our—as coaches, our recruiting efforts.

I would just hope that the Committee will consider something that is more uniform, something that is more standard and central; a set of rules that could guide coaches through the next phase of this movement to hopefully create some manner of compensation for our student athletes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hartwell, who should—what entity should write the rules?

Mr. HARTWELL. Senator Alexander, I believe it should be Congress and Federal legislation that writes the rules, working in close conjunction with the NCAA. Because the worst thing that can happen for collegiate athletics and for prospective student athletes is to have 50 different iterations at the various State levels of rules and regulations regarding NIL. I think a consistent, national package in conjunction with the NCAA would be optimal.

The CHAIRMAN. And Mr. Huma, who—what entity should write rules if there are rules to be written?

Mr. HUMA. I don't think it should be the NCAA. The NCAA has absolutely failed in these areas when it comes to college athletes' rights, and that is why we are here. I think that if it was an entity, it should be completely independent from the schools because they are—at the core of the problem is the conflict of interest that schools have. The NCAA is an association of schools, and it is run primarily by athletic directors in terms of, you know, direction. And the schools just have a conflict of interest, so there needs to be a neutral third party. And I think players need to be incorporated in that, whether it be former players, current players, but players need to be primarily in and around areas when it comes to college athletes' rights. A big—another big reason why we are here is because players have never really had that opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, and thanks to all four of you for—I know all of you are busy, have important responsibilities, and you have given us a big chunk of your time.

My own view, which I stated in my opening statement, is that Congress should act and that it should authorize an entity to be safe from litigation to write the rules about name, image, and likeness. And, my recommendation would be that entity should be the NCAA.

The alternatives are much worse. I mean, the alternatives are to create a new entity, and I have had some experience in watching new commissions created by the Federal Government. It takes a long time to do that, for one.

Second, an entity like the Federal Trade Commission would have no expertise in higher education or student athletes, and no responsibility really for higher education.

I think the worst thing would be for the Congress itself to write the rules. I mean, if anybody has watched 15 or 20 Senators try to agree on a press release, imagine what 535 Member of Congress would be like trying to write detailed rules in an area.

What Congress should do, in my opinion, is authorize an entity to write the rules, and then Congress should do what Congress does best, which is aggressive oversight to put the spotlight on what is happening and then change whatever needs to be changed.

My recommendation for the entity would be the NCAA. It is not supposed to be run by athletic directors. It is supposed to be run by presidents and chancellors of institutions. And, if they are not, they are not doing their job; and if it needs to be reformed, it ought to be reformed. And, while the NCAA is not perfect and is controversial, any entity, as I said earlier, who writes rules for intercollegiate athletics is going to be controversial.

My own view, as expressed earlier, on this is that while there are a number of things I would like to see the NCAA do, such as take

increased television revenues and make sure they go for the benefit of student athletes and their programs and their academic support rather than higher salaries for coaches and administrative tasks.

I don't really want to see individual athletes have an opportunity to profit while they are student athletes from their name, image, and likeness. They may want to be rewarded for their name, image, or likeness, but in my view, those dollars, like other endorsement dollars at most institutions, should be distributed for the benefit of all the student athletes at that institution.

If an individual athlete prefers to keep the money that he or she might earn from a name, image, or likeness that the—that that person should go professional. I think that is much better than jeopardizing the entire tradition of student athletes.

I like the direction in which Major League Baseball and the NCAA have taken baseball players. I mean, programs like Vanderbilt and Virginia and others, as well, are really of minor league quality. I mean, the Vanderbilt baseball team is at least Triple A most of the time, and some of its players, as we mentioned earlier, could have gone directly from high school into professional leagues. They chose not to. They chose to take the undergraduate experience, the 4-year degree, the coach—the education from coaches, who are among the best teachers in the Country, and the other support and stay for at least 3 years in undergraduate school, and then go on to have highly successful professional careers.

That direction, those sorts of choices, seem to me to be right. It does not restrict any high school student's ability to be a professional. They can go do that if they wish. But, if they want to be a student athlete for a period of time, say, 3 years in the case of baseball, then they must play by the rules of student athletes and by that tradition, which is well engrained, and which millions of Americans have benefited from.

The hearing will remain—the hearing record will remain open for 10 days. Members may submit additional information for the record within that time if they would like.

Our Committee will meet again on Thursday, on September 17 at 10 a.m. for a hearing on higher education entitled "Time to Finish Fixing the FAFSA."

As all of the witnesses know well, the Federal aid application form is filled out every year by 20 million families. For 6 years, Senator Murray and I and our Committee and various Members, including Senator Jones, Senator Bennet, Senator Collins, and others, have been working to reduce the number of questions, decrease the flexibility, so that we can increase the number of students who take advantage of Federal aid for a higher education. We have taken some important steps toward that. This hearing is about finishing that job.

Thank you for being here today. The Committee will stand adjourned.

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL



Websites: csri-sc.org
csriconference.org
Twitter: @csrisouthall; @csriconference; @mnagelusc
Phone: (803) 777-5550
Email: southall@hrsm.sc.edu

Media Contacts:

- **Dr. Richard M. Southall**, Director: College Sport Research Institute - University of South Carolina 803-777-5550 (office) 901-240-7197 (cell) southall@hrsm.sc.edu, @CSRISouthall
- **Dr. Mark S. Nagel**, Associate Director: College Sport Research Institute - University of South Carolina 803-777-3751 (office) 770-891-9714 (cell) nagel@sc.edu, @mnagelusc
- **Allen Wallace**, Communications Manager: College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management - University of South Carolina 803-777-5667 (office) 706-267-0959 (cell) awallace@sc.edu, @allenwallace

2019 Adjusted Graduation Gap Report: NCAA FBS Football

College Football Playoff Top-10 cumulative AGG -26.9

Overall Power-5 Black players -21.6; Power-5 White players -1.0

Columbia, SC – January 10, 2020... The College Sport Research Institute (CSRI) at the University of South Carolina in Columbia, SC, released its tenth-annual National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) Football Adjusted Graduation Gap (AGG) report today. Not surprisingly, given their nearly singular focus on qualifying for the College Football Playoff (CFP), the CFP Top-10 has a cumulative AGG of -26.9. In addition, the cumulative AGG for Power-5 Black players is -21.6, while the cumulative AGG of White players on Power-5 rosters is only -1.0 (See Table 2 in appendix.).

For the tenth year in a row, there is a significant discrepancy between FBS Football players' graduation rates and those of full-time male students. The 2019 Power-5 Conferences AGG mean remains sizable and significant at -16.5, interrupting a gradual improving trend over the previous five years, while the Group-of-5's AGG average is -8.5.

It is worth noting the growing disparity between the Power-5 (-16.5) and Group-of-5 (-8.5) Conferences AGG average. The difference of 8-points is the largest in the ten-years CSRI has been reporting AGG. In addition, for the first time, the best Power-5 Conference AGG (-12.9) is about the same as the worst Group-of-5 AGG (-13.0).

Study Highlights

(See tables and chart in appendix for additional information.)

- ❖ Power-5 Conference AGGs continue to be large: the football player graduation rate in these conferences averages 16.5 percentage points lower than the general male student body.
- ❖ The Power-5 average AGG of -16.5 is slightly worse than last year's -16.4, interrupting a gradual improving trend over the previous five years
- ❖ Black and White Power-5 AGG difference remains striking. The Black AGG is -21.6 compared to only -1.0 for the White AGG, over 20 percentage points worse.
- ❖ The College Football Playoff Top-10 has an average AGG of -26.9, as compared to -14.6 for the other Power-5 schools.
- ❖ The Group-of-5 Conference average AGG remains sizable at -8.5. Nevertheless, it is 8.0 points better than the Power-5, the largest difference in our 10 years of reporting.
- ❖ The Group-of-5/Power-5 AGG difference is caused almost entirely by a difference in Black AGGs, as White AGGs are almost the same for the two sets of schools.
- ❖ The Group-of-5, unlike the Power-5, continues to show a gradual improving trend (see graph below). Compared to 2013, The Group-of-5 AGG is 6.2 percentage points better, about one point per year.
- ❖ Among the Power-5, the Big Ten has the best AGG at -12.9, and for the 6th time in the past 7 years, the PAC-12 has the worst at -18.7.
- ❖ The Sun Belt has the best Group-of-Five AGG at -2.1. The American has the worst at -13.0, although it is about the same as the best Power-5 conference.

CSRI Position on Graduation Rates

In 1990, Congress mandated full disclosure of graduation rates at schools that award athletically related aid and receive federal financial aid. The Federal Graduation Rate (FGR) reflects the percentage of students (athletes and non-athletes) who graduate within six years from the school where they initially enrolled as a full-time student. The FGR measures the extent to which colleges and universities retain and graduate recruited athletes, thus providing one measure of whether they are fulfilling the NCAA's mission of maintaining athletes as an integral part of their student body. The strength of the FGR is its focus on student retention.

Another useful graduation rate measure, created by the NCAA to track athletes, is called the Graduation Success Rate (GSR). The GSR excludes from its calculation athletes—including transfers—who leave a particular school prior to graduating (i.e., early), while in good academic standing. The NCAA methodology also includes athletes who transfer into an institution in a program's GSR. The GSR recognizes college athletes may take a different path to graduation than other full-time students. However, a limitation of the GSR is that currently no comparable "graduation" rate exists for the general student body. In other words, the GSR and FGR measures are not comparable.

The AGG was developed to partly address FGR and GSR limitations. The AGG compares an adjusted FGR for full-time students and the reported FGR for college athletes for the following NCAA Division-I sports: FBS football, D-I men's & women's basketball, D-I softball, and baseball. Reports for each sport are released at various times during the year.

The College Sport Research Institute believes in the full disclosure of all measures pertaining to college athlete graduation, including the FGR, GSR, and AGG since one measure is not "better" or somehow "fairer" than the others as each measure different things. The FGR focuses on an institution's ability to retain and graduate students it admits,

while the GSR attempts to account for athletes who leave a school that initially admitted them.

Historically, standard evaluations of NCAA athlete graduation rates have involved comparisons with general student body rates presumed to pertain to full-time students. However, many schools' general student body rates include a significant number of part-time students. This is problematic because all NCAA athletes must be "full-time" and should therefore be compared with other full-time students. The downward "part-timer bias" in the student-body FGR distorts this comparison. Because part-time students take longer to graduate, this significantly reduces the measured general student-body FGR, making the relative rate of college athletes at many schools and conferences appear more favorable. CSRI's Adjusted Graduation Gap methodology addresses this "part-timer bias" using regression-based adjustments for the percentage of part-time students enrolled at an institution. The adjustments also account for the aggregate influence of school-specific factors such as location and student demographics. These estimates then become the basis for the AGG comparison.

CSRI

The College Sport Research Institute (CSRI) is housed within the Department of Sport and Entertainment Management at the University of South Carolina – Columbia. CSRI is dedicated to conducting and supporting independent data collection and analysis related to college-sport issues.

Along with conducting and disseminating in-house research on college athletes' graduation rates, post-athletic transition issues, and oscillating migration patterns, CSRI hosts the annual CSRI Conference on College Sport in Columbia, SC. This conference provides a forum for research of current college-sport issues and possible solutions to these challenges. CSRI also publishes a peer-reviewed scholarly journal entitled: *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics (JIIA)*, which provides an additional outlet for research related to college-sport issues.

This is the tenth-annual installment of the CSRI's AGG FBS Football Report. We hope this information encourages continuing research and discussion regarding both graduation rates and the quality and type of educational opportunities offered college athletes.

CSRI Student Researchers and Research Team

Student Researchers

Mr. Chris Corr – 2nd Year PhD student in the Department of Sport and Entertainment Management (SPTE) at the University of South Carolina – supervised data collection for this year's Football AGG Report. Mr. Corr also wrote the initial draft of this year's "Study Highlights" sections.

Mr. Richard Hart – CSRI Research Assistant – assisted with data collection.

Mr. James R. Brown – Master's student in the Department of Sport and Entertainment Management (SPTE) at the University of South Carolina – assisted with data collection.

Research Team

Dr. Richard M. Southall is Director: College Sport Research Institute and Professor, Department of Sport and Entertainment Management, University of South Carolina.

Dr. E. Woodrow Eckard is Professor of Economics, Business School, University of Colorado – Denver.

Dr. Mark S. Nagel is Associate Director: College Sport Research Institute and Professor, Department of Sport and Entertainment Management, University of South Carolina.

Appendix**Table 1-2019 Football Bowl Sub-division (FBS) Power-5 and Group-of-5 AGGs**

Power-5 Conference	B+W Mean	Black Mean	White Mean
Big Ten	-12.9	-20.3	+0.4
Big XII	-13.9	-17.1	-0.9
Southeastern	-18.3	-24.3	+5.0
Atlantic Coast	-18.5	-23.5	-2.9
PAC-12	-18.7	-23.0	-6.7
Average	-16.5	-21.6	-1.0

Group-of-5 Conference	B+W Mean	Black Mean	White Mean
Sun Belt	-2.1	-4.4	+8.1
Mid-American	-6.3	-9.6	+1.9
Conference-USA	-10.5	-12.2	-0.3
Mountain West	-10.6	-17.6	-3.0
American	-13.0	-14.1	-6.7
Average	-8.5	-11.6	0.0


Notes:

- ❖ Power-5
 - Notre Dame excluded - Independent in FB
- ❖ Group-of-5
 - Charlotte excluded - No FB FGRs
 - Air Force & Navy excluded - Data not comparable to civilian schools

Table 2 – 2019 College Football Playoff Ranking AGGs

College Football Playoff	B+W Mean	Black Mean	White Mean
Top-10	-26.9	-33.9	-7.6
Non-Top 10	-14.6	-19.6	+0.4

Chart 1 – Ten-year Trend-lines: Power-5 and Group-of-5 AGGs*



* "AGG Trends" means are based on individual school AGGs, not conference mean AGGs. Consequently, means may differ slightly from "Conference Summary" means.



Websites: csri-sc.org
csriconference.org
Twitter: @csrisouthall; @csriconference: @mnagelusc
Phone: (803) 777-5550
Email: southall@hrsm.sc.edu

Media Contacts:

- **Dr. Richard M. Southall**, Director: College Sport Research Institute – University of South Carolina 803-777-5550 (office) 901-240-7197 (cell) southall@hrsm.sc.edu, @CSRISouthall
- **Dr. Mark S. Nagel**, Associate Director: College Sport Research Institute – University of South Carolina 803-777-3751 (office) 770-891-9714 (cell) nagel@sc.edu, @mnagelusc
- **Allen Wallace**, Communications Manager: College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management – University of South Carolina 803-777-5667 (office) 706-267-0959 (cell) awallace@sc.edu, @allenwallace

2019 Adjusted Graduation Gap Report: NCAA Division-I Basketball

Columbia, SC – September 20, 2019... The College Sport Research Institute's (CSRI) annual analysis of NCAA Division-I (D-I) men's (-23.3) and women's (-12.4) basketball players' Adjusted Graduation Gaps (AGGs) reveals players' AGGs continue a negative trend. Since first reporting results in 2011, the overall men's AGG has become 3.3 percentage points *larger*, while the women's has increased by 3.9 points. The AGG is especially troubling for Black male basketball players in Major conferences, at -37.2 percentage points. This is 10.3 points worse than the (-26.9) AGG for White players. Among all D-I conferences for both men and women, the best performers continue to be the

SWAC men's (-1.5) and women's (+8.5) and Mid-Eastern (MEAC) men's (-3.0), conferences comprised of historically black colleges and universities (HBCU).

The AGG results are in contrast to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) recent reports of increasing graduation rates and the use of Division I college athletics as vehicles of opportunity for "student-athletes" to matriculate and gain a meaningful degree. The conflicting results indicate the need to further study graduation rates across all D-I programs.

CSRI Research-Team Statement

Since its inception, CSRI's analysis of NCAA D-I players' graduation rates has consistently shown men's and women's basketball players do not graduate at rates comparable to other full-time students at their universities.

Study Highlights

The present results indicate that graduation rates for D-I basketball players, who must maintain full-time status, are significantly lower than other full-time students. The results support concerns regarding the overall state of D-I basketball players' academic performance. In addition, the results provide additional reasons to further investigate various NCAA D-I MBB academic scandals, many of which have occurred in programs that have positive graduation rates when analyzed with NCAA metrics. The study of classroom performance beyond eligibility maintenance remains an important research priority.

MBB AGG Summary:

- The overall D-I MBB AGG remains large, at -23.3 percentage points (i.e., 23.3 points below the adjusted general male student body graduation rate).

- The Major conference AGG of -35.1 percentage points is very large and is nearly twice the Mid-Major conference AGG of -17.6 points.¹
- The D-I MBB Black AGG of -24.3 percentage points is 5.4 points worse than the White AGG of -18.9, a statistically significant difference.
- The Major conference Black AGG of -37.2 percentage points is 10.3 points worse than the White AGG of -26.9, albeit with marginal statistical significance.
- Among Major conferences, the best performers are the Atlantic 10 (-22.1) and the Big East (-30.6). Thus, the best performing Major conference graduates MBB athletes more than 22 percentage points below the general student body.
- Among all D-I conferences, the best performers are the SWAC (-1.5) and the Mid-Eastern (-3.0), both comprised of HBCUs.
- Among all D-I conferences, the worst performers are the PAC-12 (-47.2), Big West (-41.8), Big 12 (-39.8), and American (-38.2).
- All 31 D-I conferences have negative AGGs (i.e., not one D-I conference basketball graduation rate equals, let alone exceeds, the adjusted general male student body rate).
- For the Power-5 conferences, the average men's MBB AGG (-16.4) is more than twice the 2018-2019 FB AGG (-38.1).²

¹ The designations of Major and Mid-Major follow those on collegeinsider.com.

² See the 2018 Adjusted Graduation Gap Report: NCAA FBS Football.

MBB AGG Trends:

- The D-I MBB AGGs continue to show a negative trend since our initial report in 2011, i.e., the full-time athlete-student body gaps are getting worse. This includes D-I overall, as well as the major and mid-major conferences.
- Though gradual, all three negative trends are statistically significant.
- The DI MBB AGG of -23.3 is 3.3 percentage points worse than in 2011.
- The Major conference AGG of -35.1 points is 4.2 points worse than in 2011, the lowest annual value of the 9-year period.
- These results contrast sharply with the NCAA's narrative of a long-term trend toward a significant closure of the gap between athlete graduation rates and general student body rates.

WBB AGG Summary:

- The overall D-I women's AGG is sizable, at -12.4 percentage points.
- D-I women's AGGs nevertheless are much better than men's AGGs, overall and for all analyzed sub-groups. For example, the women's overall D-I AGG is roughly half of the men's AGG (-12.4 vs -23.3).
- The women's Major conference AGG of -17.9 points is 8.1 points worse than the Mid-Major AGG of -9.8 points.
- The Major vs mid-major AGG difference is larger for Blacks than for Whites, similar to men's D-I basketball.
- The women's D-I Black and White AGGs are essentially the same, in contrast to men's D-I basketball where Black AGGs are significantly worse.

- Among Major conferences, the best performers are the Big East (-11.7) and Big 12 (-14.3).
- Among all D-I conferences, the best are the SWAC (+8.5) and Metro Atlantic (-1.2).
- Among all D-I conferences, the worst are the American (-25.2) and the Mountain West (-21.6).
- Only one of 31 D-I conferences has a positive AGG. In other words, only one D-I conference has a women's basketball graduation rate that is higher than the adjusted full-time female student body graduation rate.

WBB AGG Trends:

- The women's D-I basketball AGGs continue to show negative trends, similar to men's basketball. In other words, the athlete-full-time student body graduation gaps are getting worse.
- Though gradual, the negative trends nevertheless are statistically significant.
- The women's AGG is 3.5 percentage points larger than in our initial report of 2011.
- These results contrast sharply with the NCAA's narrative that athlete graduation rates are improving relative to general student body rates.

Updated: CSRI Position on Graduation Rates

In 1990, Congress mandated full disclosure of graduation rates at schools that award athletically related aid and receive federal financial aid. The **Federal Graduation Rate (FGR)** reflects the percentage of students (athletes and non-athletes) who graduate within six years from the school where they initially enrolled as a full-time student. The FGR measures the extent to which colleges and universities retain and graduate recruited athletes, thus providing one measure of whether they are fulfilling the NCAA's mission of

maintaining athletes as an integral part of their student body. The strength of the FGR is its focus on student retention.

Another graduation rate measure, created by the NCAA to track only NCAA athletes, is called the **Graduation Success Rate (GSR)**. The GSR excludes from its calculation all athletes—including transfers—who leave a school prior to graduating, but in good academic standing (Left Eligibles - LEs). The NCAA methodology also includes athletes who transfer into an institution in that program's GSR. Essentially, the GSR removes athletes who leave and adds athletes who enter. The NCAA argues the GSR is more accurate than the FGR. However, the GSR is itself flawed, significantly *exaggerating* athlete graduation rates. The NCAA contends "student-athletes who depart a school while in good academic standing, Left Eligibles (LEs) ... are essentially passed from that school's cohort to another school's cohort".³ However, the NCAA does not acknowledge the number of transfers-in is significantly smaller than the number of LEs. Contrary to the NCAA's claims, most LEs are not just passed to another school's cohort.

The number of missing LEs is large, causing the GSR to be significantly inflated. The NCAA does not make public GSR data or calculations for FBS football and men's basketball, where public concern about athlete exploitation is the greatest. However, it does provide aggregated data for *all* Division I male and female sports.⁴ For the cohort comprised of the 2015-2018 graduating classes (the latest available GSR calculation), the total number of athletes is 95,286 and the GSR is 88%. What the NCAA does not reveal is that its dataset includes 24,298 LEs, but only 7,945 transfers-in. In other words, there are 16,353 more LE's than transfers-in. Thus, about two-thirds of all LEs are unaccounted for in the NCAA's graduation "success" data.⁵

³ NCAA, "How are NCAA Graduation Rates Calculated?" (November 2018), pg. 9

https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/gradrates/2018NCAARES_HowGradRatesCalculated.pdf

⁴ NCAA Research, "Trends in Graduation Success Rates and Federal Graduation Rates at NCAA Division I Institutions" (November 2016), page 5.

http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/2016RES_GSRandFedTrends-Final_sc_20161114.pdf

⁵ CSRI calculations based on data from NCAA GSR table.

In addition, a fundamental limitation of the GSR is that currently no comparable graduation rate exists for the general student body. In other words, the GSR and FGR measures are not comparable.

The **Adjusted Graduation Gap (AGG)** was developed to address FGR and GSR limitations. The FGR focuses on an institution's ability to retain students it admits, while the GSR attempts to account for athletes who leave a school that initially admitted them. The AGG compares an adjusted FGR for full-time students and the reported FGR for college athletes from the following NCAA Division-I sports: FBS football, D-I men's and women's basketball, and D-I softball and baseball. Reports regarding each sport are released at various times during the year.

Historically, standard evaluations of NCAA athlete graduation rates have involved comparisons with general student body rates presumed to pertain to full-time students. However, many schools' general student body rates include a significant number of part-time students. This is problematic because all NCAA athletes must be "full-time" and should therefore be compared with other full-time students. The downward "part-timer bias" in the student-body FGR distorts this comparison. Because part-time students take longer to graduate, this significantly reduces the measured general student-body FGR, making the relative rate of college athletes at many schools and conferences appear more favorable. CSRI's AGG methodology addresses this "part-timer bias" using regression-based adjustments for the percentage of part-time students enrolled at an institution. The adjustments also account for the aggregate influence of school-specific factors such as location and student demographics. These estimates are the basis for the AGG comparison.⁶

CSRI

Founded in 2007, the College Sport Research Institute (CSRI) is housed within the Department of Sport and Entertainment Management at the University of South Carolina – Columbia. CSRI is dedicated to conducting and supporting independent research related to

⁶Technical details can be found in E. Woodrow Eckard, "NCAA Athlete Graduation Rates: Less than Meets the Eye," *Journal of Sport Management*, January 2010, pp. 45-58.

college-sport issues.

Along with conducting and disseminating in-house research, CSRI hosts the annual **CSRI Conference on College Sport** each April in Columbia, SC. This conference provides college-sport scholars and intercollegiate athletics practitioners a forum to present and discuss research related to current college-sport issues and possible solutions. CSRI also publishes the peer-reviewed *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics (JIIA)*, which provides an outlet for theoretical and data-driven college-sport research manuscripts.

This is the ninth-annual installment of CSRI's Adjusted Graduation Gap (AGG) NCAA D-I Men's and Women's Basketball Report. We hope this report not only sheds light on the collection, analysis and reporting of college athlete graduation rates, but also specifically encourages open and honest discussion regarding the quality and type of educational opportunities offered to NCAA D-I men's and women's basketball players – the labor that fuels the NCAA's March Madness™.

CSRI Student Researchers and Research Team

Student Researchers

Mr. Richard Hart – CSRI Research Assistant – was in charge of data collection for this year's Basketball AGG Report. Mr. Hart also wrote the initial draft of this year's "Study Highlights" sections.

Mr. Chris Corr – 2nd Year PhD student in the Department of Sport and Entertainment Management (SPTE) at University of South Carolina – assisted with data collection.

Mr. James R. Brown – Master's student in the Department of Sport and Entertainment Management (SPTE) at University of South Carolina – assisted with data collection

Research Team

Dr. Richard M. Southall is Director – College Sport Research Institute and Professor, Department of Sport and Entertainment Management, University of South Carolina.

Dr. E. Woodrow Eckard is Professor of Economics, Business School, University of Colorado – Denver.

Dr. Mark S. Nagel is Associate Director – College Sport Research Institute and Professor, Department of Sport and Entertainment Management, University of South Carolina.

Appendix

TABLE 1- 2018-19 NCAA D-I MAJOR AND MID-MAJOR (MM) SUMMARIES

Men: Major vs Mid-Major

	BW_AGG	B_AGG	W_AGG
All DI	-23.3	-24.3	-18.9
Major	-35.1	-37.2	-26.9
Mid-Major	-17.6	-18.1	-14.7
Major - MM =	-17.5	-19.1	-12.2

Men: Black vs White

	All DI	Major	Mid-Major
Black_AGG	-24.3	-37.2	-18.1
White_AGG	-18.9	-26.9	-14.7
Black - White =	-5.4	-10.3	-3.5

Women: Major vs Mid-Major

	BW_AGG	B_AGG	W_AGG
All D-I	-12.39	-12.06	-12.24
Major	-17.90	-21.21	-17.11
Mid-Major	-9.76	-7.71	-9.67
Major - MM =	-8.14	-13.51	-7.43

Women: Black vs White

	All DI	Major	Mid-Major
B_AGG	-12.06	-21.21	-7.71
W_AGG	-12.24	-17.11	-9.67
Black - White =	0.17	4.11	-1.97



TABLE 2 – 2018-19 NCAA D-I CONFERENCE AVERAGE AGGS

MEN'S			
	AGG	B AGG	W AGG
MAJOR			
Atlantic 10	-22.1	-15.5	-39.1
Big East	-30.6	-33.3	1.3
Big Ten	-31.2	-39.3	-21.5
Conference-USA	-33.8	-27.5	-38.4
Southeastern	-35.9	-38.4	-29.0
Mountain West	-36.0	-41.1	-34.7
Atlantic Coast	-36.3	-39.7	-20.5
American	-38.2	-39.4	-33.9
Big 12	-39.8	-41.9	-11.5
PAC-12	-47.2	-56.2	-41.4
MAJOR AVG.	-35.1	-37.2	-26.9
MID-MAJOR			
SWAC	-1.5	0.2	N/A
Mid-Eastern	-3.0	-1.0	N/A
Patriot	-3.2	-3.6	-4.1
Metro Atlantic	-8.5	-17.1	-8.5
Big South	-10.0	-2.1	-19.8
Northeast	-10.0	-5.1	1.4
Southland	-12.3	-13.8	-12.5
Summit	-13.4	-4.4	-5.8
Southern	-14.9	-7.4	-3.1
Ohio Valley	-17.6	-24.4	-18.6
America East	-17.6	-26.6	-3.0
Horizon	-19.5	-28.8	3.4
Sun Belt	-19.5	-12.9	-36.3
Missouri Valley	-19.6	-34.2	-10.8
Colonial Athletic	-21.2	-16.7	-27.3
Mid-American	-22.0	-24.7	-16.0
West Coast	-23.8	-27.9	-19.7
WAC	-29.1	-33.7	-22.2
Big Sky	-30.6	-14.7	-24.2
Atlantic Sun	-30.7	-36.1	-31.5
Big West	-41.8	-45.9	-20.2
MID-MAJOR AVG.	-17.6	-18.1	-14.7
DIVISION-I AVG.	-23.3	-24.3	-18.9

WOMEN'S

	AGG	B_AGG	W_AGG
MAJOR			
Big East	-11.7	-20.8	-15.5
Big 12	-14.3	-12.3	-20.2
Big Ten	-15.2	-29.3	-1.7
Southeastern	-15.6	-14.2	-11.4
Atlantic 10	-16.3	-16.5	-12.2
PAC-12	-18.5	-23.1	-17.4
Conference-USA	-20.1	-14.8	-40.8
Atlantic Coast	-20.6	-23.9	-14.5
Mountain West	-21.6	-31.6	-21.6
American	-25.2	-25.8	-15.8
MAJOR AVG.	-17.9	-21.2	-17.1
MID-MAJOR			
SWAC	8.5	13.4	N/A
Metro Atlantic	-1.2	3.7	-5.0
Patriot	-3.3	-1.4	-4.7
West Coast	-4.5	-0.4	-4.9
Mid-Eastern	-5.4	3.6	N/A
Northeast	-5.8	7.5	-6.6
Missouri Valley	-8.0	-20.8	-2.2
Horizon	-8.4	-3.0	-7.5
Southern	-8.5	-4.6	-11.1
Mid-American	-9.7	-17.0	1.9
Big South	-10.0	-6.4	-7.2
America East	-10.5	-4.5	-2.9
Ohio Valley	-11.9	-14.7	-9.9
Colonial Athletic	-12.2	-11.0	-4.3
Southland	-13.8	-14.0	-26.9
Summit	-14.1	-22.5	-13.8
Sun Belt	-16.2	-11.5	-33.0
WAC	-16.2	-26.4	-8.7
Big Sky	-16.6	-7.4	-14.0
Atlantic Sun	-16.7	-5.7	-18.2
Big West	-20.4	-18.8	-4.9
MID-MAJOR AVG.	-9.8	-7.7	-9.7
DIVISION-1 AVG.	-12.4	-12.1	-12.2

CHART 1- NINE-YEAR AGG TREND-LINES



**Lavish Spending, 2016-17 Division I EXPENSE
COMPARISONS, FBS v. FCS**

(SCROLL DOWN FOR EXPENSE DATA ON EACH FBS & FCS SPORT)

All Comparable Sports

Total FBS Excess Expenses Nationwide	\$4,429,254,950
Number of FBS Colleges	127
Total Ave Excess Expense at Each FBS College	\$34,876,023

Comparison: Men's Basketball

Total FBS Excess Expenses Nationwide	607,847,627
Number of FBS Colleges	127
Total Ave Excess Expense at Each FBS College	4,738,472

Comparison: Football

Total FBS Excess Expenses Nationwide	2,260,723,880
Number of FBS Colleges	127
Total Ave Excess Expense at Each FBS College	17,675,513

Comparable Non Revenue Sports

Total FBS Excess Expenses Nationwide	1,560,683,443
Number of FBS Colleges	127
Total Ave Excess Expense at Each FBS College	12,288,846

Comparable Male Non Rev Sports

Total FBS Excess Expenses Nationwide	\$520,413,118
Number of FBS Colleges	127
Total Ave Excess Expense at Each FBS College	\$4,097,741

Comparable Female Non Rev Sports

Total FBS Excess Expenses Nationwide	\$1,040,270,325
Number of FBS Colleges	127
Total Ave Excess Expense at Each FBS College	\$8,191,105

Category	MEN_Baseball
FBS Division (I-A)	\$264,460,419
FCS Division (I-AA)	\$86,334,172
Total Excess Expenses at FBS Colleges	\$178,126,247
FBS Teams Reporting Expenses	112
FCS Teams Reporting Expenses	101
Ave Expense Per FBS Team	\$2,361,254
Ave Expense Per FCS Team	\$854,794
Ave Excess Expense/FBS Team	\$1,506,460

Team # 1

MEN_Bskball	MEN_Trckcomb	MEN_Fencing	MEN_Football	MEN_Golf
\$858,399,761	\$134,532,835	\$3,414,713	\$2,750,687,191	\$79,511,340
\$250,552,134	\$50,803,216	\$118,156	\$489,963,311	\$25,163,249
\$607,847,627	\$83,729,619	\$3,296,557	\$2,260,723,880	\$54,348,091
127	94	7	127	117
124	94	4	123	98
\$6,759,053	\$1,431,200	\$487,816	\$21,658,954	\$679,584
\$2,020,582	\$540,460	\$29,539	\$3,983,442	\$256,768
\$4,738,472	\$890,741	\$458,277	\$17,675,513	\$422,816
2	3	4	5	6

MEN_Gymn	MEN_IceHcky	MEN_Lacrsse	MEN_Rifle	MEN_Rowing	MEN_Skiing
\$10,120,994	\$53,288,768	\$22,178,383	NA	\$9,266,811	\$2,414,390
\$240,555	\$23,963,677	\$29,222,213	NA	\$10,886,734	\$1,569,736
\$9,880,439	\$29,325,091	(\$7,043,830)	NA	(\$1,619,923)	\$844,654
10	14	11	NA	7	4
1	13	30	NA	14	4
\$1,012,099	\$3,806,341	\$2,016,217	NA	\$1,323,830	\$603,598
\$240,555	\$1,843,360	\$974,074	NA	\$777,624	\$392,434
\$771,544	\$1,962,981	\$1,042,143	NA	\$546,206	\$211,164
7	8	9	10	11	12

MEN_Soccer	MEN_SwimDivng	MEN_Swimming	MEN_Tennis	MEN_TrkFldIn
\$67,036,307	\$58,480,985	\$5,533,914	\$70,300,735	\$1,536,037
\$42,363,433	\$10,158,415	\$1,238,206	\$24,212,751	\$1,722,899
\$24,672,874	\$48,322,570	\$4,295,708	\$46,087,984	(\$186,862)
56	49	4	93	5
60	30	6	88	10
\$1,197,077	\$1,193,489	\$1,383,479	\$755,922	\$307,207
\$706,057	\$338,614	\$206,368	\$275,145	\$172,290
\$491,020	\$854,876	\$1,177,111	\$480,777	\$134,918
13	14	15	16	17

MEN_TrkFidOut	MEN_XCountry	MEN_Vollball	MEN_WaterPc	MEN_Wrestling
\$4,287,091	\$2,824,556	\$8,194,572	\$3,914,793	\$49,375,251
\$2,771,723	\$3,301,403	\$994,587	\$2,078,096	\$13,292,191
\$1,515,368	(\$476,847)	\$7,199,985	\$1,836,697	\$36,083,060
7	13	8	5	37
11	25	4	8	20
\$612,442	\$217,274	\$1,024,322	\$782,959	\$1,334,466
\$251,975	\$132,056	\$248,647	\$259,762	\$664,610
\$360,467	\$85,217	\$775,675	\$523,197	\$669,857
18	19	20	21	22

MEN_Rodeo	MEN_Sailin	WOMEN_Bskbal	WOMEN_Trckcon	WOMEN_Fencin
NA	\$291,784	\$431,618,581	\$188,023,402	\$3,414,713
NA	\$116,148	\$162,352,059	\$76,747,961	\$2,067,990
NA	\$175,636	\$269,266,522	\$111,275,441	\$1,346,723
NA	2	127	118	9
NA	1	122	108	10
NA	\$145,892	\$3,398,572	\$1,593,419	\$379,413
NA	\$116,148	\$1,330,755	\$710,629	\$206,799
NA	\$29,744	\$2,067,817	\$882,789	\$172,614
23	24	25	26	27

WOMEN_FldHcky	WOMEN_Golf	WOMEN_Gymn	WOMEN_IceHcky	WOMEN_Lacrsse
\$35,538,083	\$77,190,568	\$68,777,286	\$16,415,124	\$43,787,086
\$20,779,883	\$25,524,022	\$6,845,068	\$12,206,986	\$37,662,570
\$14,758,200	\$51,666,546	\$61,932,218	\$4,208,138	\$6,124,516
29	112	46	7	31
30	89	11	12	49
\$1,225,451	\$689,202	\$1,495,158	\$2,345,018	\$1,412,487
\$692,663	\$286,787	\$622,279	\$1,017,249	\$768,624
\$532,788	\$402,415	\$872,879	\$1,327,769	\$643,863
28	29	30	31	32

WOMEN_Rifle	WOMEN_Rowing	WOMEN_Skiing	WOMEN_Soccer	WOMEN_Softball
\$2,474,436	\$76,174,787	\$1,872,342	\$177,809,341	\$156,126,135
\$191,973	\$17,695,228	\$1,787,705	\$82,671,486	\$75,265,283
\$2,282,463	\$58,479,559	\$84,637	\$95,137,855	\$80,860,852
5	40	4	124	127
3	28	5	115	113
\$494,887	\$1,904,370	\$468,086	\$1,433,946	\$1,229,340
\$63,991	\$631,972	\$357,541	\$718,882	\$666,064
\$430,896	\$1,272,397	\$110,545	\$715,064	\$563,275
33	34	35	36	37

WOMEN_Squash	WOMEN_SwimDivng	WOMEN_Swimming	WOMEN_Tennis
\$572,722	\$98,434,749	\$13,317,432	\$99,293,852
\$1,873,535	\$25,346,718	\$4,759,492	\$35,231,313
(\$1,300,813)	\$73,088,031	\$8,557,940	\$64,062,539
2	76	10	123
8	46	12	108
\$286,361	\$1,295,194	\$1,331,743	\$807,267
\$234,192	\$551,016	\$396,624	\$326,216
\$52,169	\$744,178	\$935,119	\$481,051
38	39	40	41

WOMEN_TrkFldIn	WOMEN_TrkFldOut	WOMEN_XCountry	WOMEN_Vollball
\$2,433,652	\$4,218,064	\$3,090,199	\$182,470,950
\$2,294,414	\$3,194,987	\$2,112,353	\$78,903,616
\$139,238	\$1,023,077	\$977,846	\$103,567,334
7	7	8	123
11	14	16	119
\$347,665	\$602,581	\$386,275	\$1,483,504
\$208,583	\$228,213	\$132,022	\$663,056
\$139,081	\$374,367	\$254,253	\$820,448
42	43	44	45

WOMEN_WaterPolo	WOMEN_BchVoll	WOMEN_Bowling	WOMEN_Eqstrian
\$10,590,643	\$11,236,007	\$3,105,344	\$20,816,295
\$4,180,462	\$1,971,833	\$4,900,340	\$2,111,566
\$6,410,181	\$9,264,174	(\$1,794,996)	\$18,704,729
11	23	6	9
11	12	22	7
\$962,786	\$488,522	\$517,557	\$2,312,922
\$380,042	\$164,319	\$222,743	\$301,652
\$582,744	\$324,203	\$294,815	\$2,011,269
46	47	48	49

WOMEN_Rodeo	WOMEN_Sailing
NA	\$1,030,200
NA	\$882,825
NA	\$147,375
NA	5
NA	3
NA	\$206,040
NA	\$294,275
NA	-\$88,235
50	51

FBS - Trends in Revenue, Participation, Expenses

Increase in Revenue	\$5,166,145,486
Decrease in Athletes	-306
Increase in Ast Coaches	1,523
Increase in Expenses (for Facilities, Admin, & Coach Salaries)	\$3,367,750,358
Est. Expense/Scholarship FB & MBB Plyr	\$216,061

Data based on US Department of Education's EADA reporting

Year	Increase FBS Revenue fo all varsity sports teams	Decrease in FBS athletes across all sports teams	Increase in Number of Assistant Coaches
Year 2003	\$2,442,845,861	64,456	5,634
Year 2018	\$7,608,991,347	64,150	7,157
Difference	\$5,166,145,486	-306	1,523

Data based on US Department of Education's EADA reporting

Year	Est Total Increase in Coaches' Salaries
Year 2003	\$529,093,430
Year 2018	\$1,637,873,788
Difference	\$1,108,780,358

Data from Kinght Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics

Year	Facilities & Equipment
Year 2005	\$623,480,000
Year 2018	\$1,881,270,000
Difference	\$1,257,790,000

Data from Kinght Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics

Year	Administration Expenses
Year 2005	572,730,000
Year 2018	1,573,910,000
Difference	1,001,180,000

Est Increase in Assistant Coaches' Salaries	Decrease in Number of Head Coaches	Est. Increase in Head Coaches' Salaries
277,606,760	2183	\$251,486,670
736,929,946	2162	\$900,943,842
459,323,186	-21	\$649,457,172

Home Page	Executive Summary 2018-19	Demographics by Gender	Demographics by Race/Ethnicity	Demographics by Gender & Race/Ethnicity	Coach and Student-Athlete Demographics by Sport
-----------	---------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------	---	---

COACH AND STUDENT-ATHLETE DEMOGRAPHICS BY SPORT

Championship or E. All	Select a Sport Men's Basketball	Select a Division Division I	Select a Subdivision All	Select a Conference All	<input type="checkbox"/> Male, White <input type="checkbox"/> Male, Black <input type="checkbox"/> Male, Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Female, White <input type="checkbox"/> Female, Black					
Men's Basketball Division: Division I Subdivision: All											
	Coaching Staff				Student-Athlete						
	Head Coach		Assistant Coach		Student-Athlete						
2019	69%	29%	47%	46%	23%	66%					
2018	70%	27%	47%	46%	25%	66%					
2017	76%	25%	48%	43%	30%	66%					
2016	72%	24%	51%	44%	28%	68%					
2015	72%	27%	51%	45%	29%	68%					
2014	71%	27%	51%	44%	27%	69%					
2013	76%	24%	50%	43%	27%	68%					
2012	74%	24%	53%	42%	27%	68%					
	Head Coach		Assistant Coach			Student-Athlete					
	Male, White	Male, Black	Male, Other	Male, White	Male, Black	Male, Other	Female, White	Female, Black	Male, White	Male, Black	Male, Other
2019	249	102	8	523	542	53		3	1,272	3,094	1,157
2018	250	97	8	517	523	50	5	1	1,316	3,125	1,096
2017	249	97	9	535	517	45	8	3	1,392	3,106	1,046
2016	254	91	8	558	481	48	10	1	1,385	3,191	973
2015	255	95	5	572	497	30	12	3	1,397	3,210	913
2014	252	96	6	566	491	43	5	6	1,487	3,192	833
2013	244	99	6	568	468	43	18	4	1,477	3,129	788
2012	256	86	5	576	452	36	12	5	1,439	3,138	670

Home Page	Executive Summary 2018-19	Demographics by Gender	Demographics by Race/Ethnicity	Demographics by Gender & Race/Ethnicity	Coach and Student-Athlete Demographics by Sport
-----------	---------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------	---	---

COACH AND STUDENT-ATHLETE DEMOGRAPHICS BY SPORT

Championship or E...	Select a Sport Men's Football	Select a Division Division I	Select a Subdivision DI FBS Non-Autono...	Select a Conference All	<input type="checkbox"/> Male, White <input type="checkbox"/> Male, Black <input type="checkbox"/> Male, Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Female, White <input type="checkbox"/> Female, Black <input type="checkbox"/> Female, Other
----------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	----------------------------	--	--

Men's Football
 Division: Division I
 Subdivision: DI FBS Non-Autonomy

Year	Coaching Staff						Student-Athlete				
	Head Coach	Defensive Coordinator		Offensive Coordinator	All Other Assistants		Graduate Assistant-Footb...		Student-Athlete		
2019	89%	86%	86%	86%	84%	39%	66%	22%	33%	50%	19%
2018	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	37%	61%	20%	33%	52%	19%
2017	83%	73%	29%	83%	83%	34%	64%	24%	33%	56%	14%
2016	83%	71%	24%	84%	84%	35%	64%	20%	37%	49%	14%
2015	83%	79%	21%	83%	81%	31%	70%	23%	37%	49%	14%
2014	84%	79%	16%	88%	81%	33%	69%	29%	39%	48%	13%
2013	79%	16%	24%	22%	81%	33%	68%	29%	30%	41%	29%
2012	79%	16%	24%	22%	81%	33%	72%	18%	46%	41%	13%

Year	Head Coach			Defensive Coordi...			Offensive Coordin...			All Other Assistants					Graduate Assistant-Football					Student-Athlete						
	Male	Male	Male	White	Black	Other	White	Black	Other	White	Black	Other	White	Black	Other	White	Black	Other	White	Black	Other	White	Black	Other	White	Black
2019	58	4	3	55	10	4	61	7	3	297	210	38	169	56	22	1	1	2,574	4,004	1,171						
2018	55	5	4	56	7	7	61	6	5	283	188	35						164	61	19				2,598	4,013	1,168
2017	54	6	6	52	14	5	68	3	3	267	182	31	5					158	58	24	4			2,625	3,720	1,137
2016	53	5	6	50	17	3	73	2	3	271	162	29	4	3				153	61	24				2,738	3,661	1,058
2015	51	5	4	50	13		57	2	2	264	141	28	9					153	50	17				2,626	3,492	1,063
2014	52	6	4	50	10	3	60	4	4	259	140	21	5					151	54	13	2			2,747	3,404	896
2013	50	10	4	55	16	3	59	10	4	258	143	32	2	1				148	49	13	6	1		2,770	3,329	926
2012	48	11	2	51	15	3	64	7	1	292	145	22	5	1				96	24	8	5			2,831	3,453	889




Table of Contents



Executive Summary.....	1
Report Highlights.....	7
Overall Grades.....	12
Grades By Category.....	13
Conference Commissioners.....	13
Student Athletes.....	14
NCAA National Office.....	17
Division I Head Coaches.....	19
Division I Assistant Coaches.....	24
Division I Athletics Directors.....	25
Division I Associate and Assistant Athletics Directors.....	27
Senior Woman Administrators.....	28
Faculty Athletics Representatives.....	28
Sports Information Directors.....	29
Professional Administration.....	29
NCAA Diversity Initiatives.....	31
How Grades Were Calculated, Methodology, About the Report Card....	32
The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport.....	33
DeVos Sport Business Management Program.....	34
Appendix I - NCAA Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives.....	35
Appendix II - Divisions I, II and III Comparisons.....	42
Appendix III - Data Tables.....	49

THE 2019 RACIAL AND GENDER REPORT CARD:

COLLEGE SPORT

Media Contacts:

Nicholas Mutebi, (313) 289-3362, nicholas.mutebi@ucf.edu
David Morrin, (727) 667-6287, david.morrin@ucf.edu

Executive Summary

Orlando, FL - June 3, 2020

The 2019 College Sport Racial and Gender Report Card (CSRGRC) was issued today by The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES) at the University of Central Florida (UCF). The report showed the record of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and its member institutions for gender hiring practices, racial hiring practices, and the combined grade.

College Sport received a B for racial hiring practices by earning 81.6 points, an increase from 79.6 points in the 2018 CSRGRC. College Sport received a C+ for gender hiring practices by earning 75.8 points, an increase from 75.1 points in the 2018 CSRGRC. The combined grade for the 2019 CSRGRC was a C+ with 78.7 points, up from 77.3 points in 2018. Each of these scores were the highest College Sport has earned since the grading scale was revised in 2016 due to changing American demographics.

Richard Lapchick, the Director of TIDES and the primary author of the CSRGRC, said, "College Sport has historically not been good at increasing opportunities for women and people of color. Outside of HBCU institutions, the representation of women and people of color in leadership positions within collegiate athletics has been weak. This year has been a year of growth for College Sport as race, gender, and overall grades have all seen increases. Even with this bright spot, College Sport continues to be behind professional sport as seen in the respective Racial and Gender Report Cards.

Overall Grade

C+

Racial Hiring

B

Gender Hiring

C+

This academic year saw a record of unprecedented landmarks within the collegiate athletics space. We saw a momentum culture shift as the NCAA Board of Governors, per recommendations from the appointed working group, expressed support for rule changes to be implemented for student-athletes to receive compensation for their name, image, and likeness. We have seen the Men's and Women's Basketball Tournament, as well as all of spring sports, be cancelled by a global pandemic due to COVID-19. We have seen athletics programs cut due to the loss of funding as a result of this virus. In times like this, it is necessary to have leadership that brings diverse thought and gives both the athletes and staff confidence that the right decisions are being made during these uncertain times."

The areas covered in the College Sport RGRC which had grade increases were the NCAA National Office and Division I Women's Basketball Head Coaches. The NCAA National Office had a B+ for race in both senior leadership and professional positions and an A or better for gender in both areas. Lapchick noted "that athletic departments at the Division I, II, and III levels need to follow the example being set by the NCAA National Office. It is embarrassing to see the collegiate institutions who pride themselves on the idea of diverse and inclusive hiring practices not hold their athletic departments accountable in the same regard."

Lapchick emphasized, "Whites still dominate the head coaching ranks. However, there has been slight movement in a positive direction for coaches of color and the opportunities given to them to shine as we saw decreases across two of the three divisions for white coaches. For the 2018-2019 collection of data, 85.0 percent of Division I, 86.9 percent of Division II and 91.1 percent of Division III men's coaches were white, with Division III seeing the only increase compared to the 2017-18 report. On the women's side, whites held 83.2 percent, 85.5 percent and 91.2 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively."

The representation of African-Americans as head coaches for all sports in Division I showed some improvement but continued to be unacceptable in 2018-19. African-Americans held 9.1 percent, 5.7 percent, and 5.0 percent of the head coaching positions for men's teams in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Compared to the

**College Sport RGRC
at a Glance**

*Racial Hiring
NCAA VP and Above*




*Gender Hiring
NCAA VP and Above*



*Racial Hiring
Conference Commissioners (DI)*



*Gender Hiring
Conference Commissioners (DI)*



**College Sport RGRC
at a Glance**

*Racial Hiring
DI Athletic Directors*



*Gender Hiring
DI Athletic Directors*



*Racial Participation
DI, DII & DIII Student Athletes*



*Gender Participation
DI, DII & DIII Student Athletes*



figures in 2017-2018, African-Americans coaching men's teams increased by 1.0 percentage point in Division I, 1.1 percentage points in Division II, and by 0.1 percentage points in Division III.

Whites made up 82.3 percent, 90.6 percent, and 94.6 percent of men's basketball, football, and baseball head coaching positions, respectively, in all divisions combined during 2018-2019.

In men's Division I basketball, 23.6 percent of all head coaches were African-American. That is up 1.2 percentage points from last year but remains 1.6 percentage points shy of the all-time high of 25.2 percent reported in 2005-2006. To be behind where we were 13 years ago is not acceptable considering how much emphasis we are supposedly placing on diversity and inclusion in higher education.

Overall, 26.0 percent of the Division I men's basketball coaches were coaches of color which is an increase of 1.2 percentage points from 2017-2018. In 2018-2019, Division I men's basketball African-American student-athletes made up 53.2 percent, compared to the 23.6 percent of African-American head coaches. There are still currently no women as head coaches of men's basketball teams at any level.

In 2018-19, Division I women's basketball African-American student-athletes made up 41.9 percent of the total, but only 14.0 percent of the head coaches are African-American women. African-American men held 5.5 percent of the Division I women's basketball positions for a combined percentage of 19.5 percent, a 2.4 percentage point increase from 2018-2019. Having such representation from a coaching standpoint does positively affect the student athlete success within the classroom and on the court. This was seen to be true in the TIDES released report on APR and GSR for Men's and Women's Basketball earlier this year.

The number of head football coaches of color at the FBS level decreased from 19 in 2018 to 18 in 2019. White men represented 112 of the 130 (86.2 percent) head coaches at the FBS level.

In Division I baseball, whites made up 78.9 percent of the student-athletes. Only 7.1 percent of Division I head

baseball coaches were people of color, a 0.1 percentage point decrease from the 2018 report. Collegiate baseball has shown repeatedly that improving representation from a coaching standpoint is not a priority.

Overall, Division III institutions continue to show improvements in terms of race and gender. But some results show how very far we have to go. African-Americans were so underrepresented as head coaches in Division III that the percentage of women coaching Division III men's teams was higher than the percentage of African-Americans coaching Division III men's teams (6.9 percent vs. 5.0 percent).

Women held only 40.6 percent of the head coaching jobs of women's teams in Division I, 36.3 percent in Division II and 44.5 percent in Division III. Overall women held 41.2 percent of head coaching positions for women's teams across all three divisions combined. Women held 46.8 percent, 49.8 percent, and 52.1 percent of assistant coaching positions of women's teams in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. This remains grossly unacceptable 47 years after the passage of Title IX.

While it has been common practice for men to coach women's teams, it is rare for a woman to coach a men's team.


The percentage of women head coaches for men's teams inched up to its all-time high in Division III institutions in 2018-2019 at 6.9 percent, an increase of 0.1 percentage points from last year. This is noteworthy, seeing that 277 women coach men's sports within Division III. This shows how relatively progressive the division is in comparison to Division I and II in this regard. Women held 4.0 percent and 4.1 percent of head coaching positions of men's teams in Divisions I and II, respectively.

White men held the overwhelming percent of the decision-making athletics director positions during the 2018-2019 year at 73.6 percent, 74.0 percent, and 63.1 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Women made up 13.6 percent of Division I athletics directors, an increase from 10.5 percent in 2017-2018. Women held 17.5 percent of the AD positions in Division II and 31.7 percent in Division III.

The 2019 report notes nine women and four people of color as conference commissioners in all of Division I out of

**College Sport RGRC
at a Glance**

*Racial Hiring
Head Coaches
(DI Football Teams)*




*Racial Hiring
Head Coaches
(DI Men's Basketball Teams)*



*Racial Hiring
Head Coaches
(DI Women's Basketball Teams)*



*Gender Hiring
Head Coaches
(DI Women's Basketball Teams)*



**College Sport RGRC
at a Glance**

*Racial Hiring
Head Coaches
(All DI Men's Teams)*

13.8% ↑ **15.0%**
People of Color 2018 People of Color 2019

*Racial Hiring
Head Coaches
(All DI Women's Teams)*

15.0% ↑ **16.8%**
People of Color 2018 People of Color 2019

*Gender Hiring
Head Coaches
(All DI Women's Teams)*

40.1% ↑ **40.6%**
Women 2018 Women 2019

30 conferences. This indicates some progress for gender hiring in this male-dominated position. However, in the FBS there was only one female commissioner and two commissioners of color out of ten conferences. The two African-American FBS commissioners appointed in the last year was a significant breakthrough.

Every year, the NCAA updates their NCAA Demographics Database which includes self-reported data from active NCAA member schools via the NCAA Sport Sponsorship and Demographic forms given to each school to complete. Once the data is collected, it is then aggregated and filtered into various categories among both professional staff and the student athlete population. This data is used to examine the racial and gender demographics of NCAA head and assistant coaches, athletics directors, associate and assistant athletics directors, senior woman administrators, academic advisors, compliance coordinators and managers for business development, fundraising, facilities, marketing, ticket sales, media relations and an array of assistants and support staff.

The 2019 College Sport Racial and Gender Report Card featured updated racial and gender personnel data at the NCAA National Office, university presidents, athletics directors, coaching demographics within prominent Division I sports (Basketball, Football, Baseball), administrative staff throughout all athletic divisions, and faculty athletics representatives at the 130 institutions in the Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS). There are also updated sections pertaining to conference commissioners and NCAA student-athletes throughout all athletic divisions. The data utilized to update the 2019 Report Card sections were collected from several sources, including a NCAA Demographics Database provided by the NCAA National Office, the Division I FBS Campus Leadership Study published by TIDES in December 2019 titled The 2019 Racial and Gender Report Card: DI FBS Leadership, self-reported demographic data from NCAA National Office personnel for the fiscal year 2018-2019, and information contained in previous studies by TIDES. In all cases regarding employment in college athletics, the data reported throughout the 2019 College Sport Racial and Gender Report Card excluded Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

It is important to note that the omission of Historically Black Colleges and Universities within this report is not

to further the exclusion of these institutions, but rather to highlight the disproportionate hiring practices that are reflected across college sports. Notably, HBCU athletic departments have high percentages of both ethnic minorities and women. If these institutions were accounted for within this report the data would be skewed—and ultimately misleading and ineffective.

Tables for the College Sport Racial and Gender Report Card are included in Appendix III.

Lapchick noted that, “College sport provides far more career prospects as compared to those in the professional sports space. With more jobs available, it is critical for us to create additional opportunities in college sport for women and people of color. What we have done in the past is not working. We need to create new avenues to provide women and people of color the opportunity to flourish within collegiate athletic administrative positions.”

TIDES, at the University of Central Florida, publishes the Racial and Gender Report Card to not only indicate areas of improvement, stagnation and regression in the racial and gender composition of professional and college sports personnel but also to contribute to increasing gender and racial diversity in front office and college athletic department positions.

TIDES strives to emphasize the value of diversity within athletic departments when they choose their office leadership teams in their office environments. Initiatives such as diversity management training can help change attitudes and increase the applicant pool for open positions. While it is the choice of the institution regarding which applicant is the best fit for their department, TIDES intends to illustrate the importance of having a diverse and inclusive organization with different races and/or genders. This element of diversity can provide a different perspective and ultimately a competitive advantage in the executive offices and on the athletic fields of play.

The report was authored by TIDES Director, Dr. Richard Lapchick, with significant contributions from Pedro Ariza, Carter Ellis, Dylan Gladney, Ivan Hudson, Mallika Mall, David Morin, Nicholas Mantei, Andre Vasquez, and David Zimmerman. This CSRGRC is the final Racial and Gender Report Card for 2019. The Complete 2019 Racial and Gender Report Card will be published later this year.

It should be noted that in 2016, TIDES officially changed the grading scale for the first time in the nearly 20 years of the Report Card because of America’s changing demographics. Please note the changes in the section at the end of the report for “How Grades Are Calculated.” The result was that the 2016 grades for the 2016, 2017, 2018 and now 2019 College Sport Racial and Gender Report Cards were calculated at a higher standard than in previous reports. The increase was only a partial increase from our previous standards and in the coming years we will increase the requirements to fully reflect new census data.



Report Highlights

University Leadership Positions at Football Bowl Subdivision Institutions

- The percentage of female presidents at the 130 FBS institutions was 13.8 percent, down from 16.9 percent in 2018.
- The percentage of presidents who were people of color at the 130 FBS institutions was 11.5 percent, compared to 13.9 percent in 2018.
- 88.5 percent (115) of FBS university presidents were white compared to 86.1 percent in 2018.
- There were five African-American presidents, six Asian presidents, and four Hispanic/Latino presidents. There were no American Indian or Alaskan Native university presidents.
- The number of athletics directors of color at FBS schools increased from 20 in 2018 to 24 in 2019. In 2019, there were 14 African-Americans, seven Hispanics/Latinos/Latinas, two of two or more races, and one Asian holding the position of Athletic Director at FBS schools.

NCAA National Office

- At the NCAA National Office, the percentage of women increased from last year at the Vice President and above level and the managing director/director level and increased from 58.7 percent in 2018 to 58.8 percent in 2019 at the professional administrator level. Overall, the total percentage of women serving in NCAA full-time staff positions increased.
- At the NCAA National Office, the percentages of people of color and women in the positions of executive vice president, senior vice president, and vice president increased in 2019 from 29.4 percent to 31.6 percent and from 35.3 percent to 42.1 percent, respectively. African-Americans were the only people of color (six) to hold these positions.

- The percentage of executives at the managing director/director positions who were people of color was 22.1 percent in 2019, an increase of 2.8 percentage points from 2018. Women accounted for 50.0 percent of these positions in 2019, an increase of 2.3 percentage points from last year's report.

- At the professional administrator level, the percentage of people of color increased from 22.5 percent in 2018 to 23.1 percent in 2019. The representation of women serving at this level also saw a slight increase of 0.1 percentage points to 58.8 percent.

Conference Commissioners

- Seven (70.0 percent) of the ten Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) conference commissioners were white men, a decrease of 20 percentage points from last year. One (10.0 percent) of the FBS conference commissioners was a white woman. Judy MacLeod was named C-USA commissioner in October 2015, making her the first woman to lead an FBS conference. There has never been a woman of color who has held the commissioner position for an FBS conference.
- For the first time in history in 2019, there were African-Americans in the position of conference commissioner in the FBS. Keith Gill and Kevin Warren made history when they were chosen to lead the Sun Belt and Big Ten conferences, respectively.

- Looking at all Division I conferences, excluding Historically Black Conferences, 26 of 30 commissioners were white. Nine were women.

Student-Athletes

- During the 2018-2019 year, 44.2 percent of all NCAA Division I, II, and III student-athletes combined were female and 55.8 percent were male. The percentage rose for female student-athletes and fell for male student-athletes by 0.3 percentage points from 2017-2018.
- Of all student-athletes in Division I football at the FBS level in 2019, 48.5 percent were African-Americans, 34.8 percent were white, 2.6 percent were Hispanic/Latino, 0.4 percent were Asian, 0.4 percent

were American Indian or Alaskan Native, 1.9 percent were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 6.1 were two or more races, and 5.3 percent of male Division I football student-athletes were classified as Other.

- Of the total student-athletes in all of Division I football, 45.1 percent were African-American, 39.4 percent were white, 3.0 percent were Hispanic/Latino, 0.4 percent were Asian, 1.5 percent were Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 0.4 percent were American Indian or Alaskan Native. Six percent identified as Two or More Races, 0.8 percent as Non-Resident Aliens, and 3.5 percent as Other.
- Of the total student-athletes in Division I men's basketball, African-Americans accounted for 53.2 percent while white athletes accounted for 24.7 percent.
- Of the total student-athletes in Division I women's basketball, African-American athletes decreased from 43.0 percent in 2017-2018 to 41.9 percent in 2018-2019. White athletes increased from 33.8 percent in 2017-2018 to 34.0 percent in 2018-2019.
- Of the total student-athletes in Division I baseball, white athletes decreased from 79.9 percent in 2017-2018 to 78.9 percent in 2018-2019. The percentage of African-American athletes in 2018-2019 was 4.1 percent, an increase of 0.4 percentage points from 2017-2018. The percentage of Hispanic/Latino baseball student-athletes increased from 6.9 percent in 2017-2018 to 7.2 percent in 2018-2019.
- Of the total number of student-athletes in Division I softball, people of color represented 27.4 percent of the softball student-athletes, an increase from 26.9 percent in 2017-2018. The percentage of African-American softball student-athletes was 4.0 percent, the same as in 2017-2018. Hispanics/Latinas represented 9.8 percent of softball student-athletes, remaining constant with last year's figure. Asians, Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, and American Indian or Alaskan Natives were 1.3 percent, 1.0 percent, and 0.8 percent of softball student-athletes, respectively.
- Of the total male student-athletes in Division I athletics, whites decreased 1.1 percentage points from 55.6 percent in 2017-2018 to 54.5 percent in 2018-

2019, while the percentage of African-Americans increased 0.8 percentage points from 22.6 in 2017-2018 to 23.4 percent in 2018-2019.

- Of the total male student-athletes in Divisions I, II, and III combined in 2018-2019, whites represented 62.0 percent, 18.1 percent were African-American, Hispanic/Latinos represented 6.1 percent, 1.6 percent were Asian, 0.4 percent were Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and American Indians and Alaskan Natives represented 0.4 percent. Student-athletes that identified as Two or More Races, Other, and Non-Resident Aliens combined to represent 11.5 percent.
- Of the total female student-athletes in Division I athletics, whites decreased 0.8 percentage points from 64.1 percent in 2017-2018 to 63.3 percent in 2018-2019, while African-Americans decreased 0.2 percentage points from 12.4 percent in 2017-2018 to 12.2 percent in 2018-2019.
- Of the total female student-athletes in Divisions I, II, and III combined in 2018-2019, white women represented 70.2 percent, African-American women represented 9.3 percent, Hispanics/Latinas represented 5.8 percent, Asian women represented 2.2 percent, Hawaiian and Pacific Islander women represented 0.3 percent, and American Indian and Alaskan Native women represented 0.4 percent. Female student-athletes identifying as Two or More Races, Other, and Non-Resident Aliens represented 11.8 percent.

Coaching

- In 2018-2019, whites dominated the head coaching ranks on men's teams holding 85.0 percent, 86.9 percent, and 91.1 percent of all head coaching positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. That compared to 2017-2018 when whites held 86.2 percent, 87.4 percent, and 91.4 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. All three divisions saw more head coaches of color in this category.
- In 2018-2019, the percentage of African-American head coaches of men's teams increased in all three divisions. African-Americans held 9.1 percent, 5.7 percent, and 5.0 percent of the men's head coaching positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. This compared

- to 2017-2018 when African-Americans held 8.1 percent, 4.6 percent, and 4.9 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.
- In 2018-2019, whites held 83.2 percent, 85.5 percent, and 91.2 percent of the women's head coaching positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. In 2017-2018 whites held 85.0 percent, 85.6 percent, and 90.9 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.
 - In 2018-2019, African-Americans held 8.3 percent, 6.2 percent, and 4.6 percent of the women's head coaching positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. In 2017-2018, African-Americans held 7.3 percent, 5.5 percent, and 4.9 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.
 - The percentage of African-American head basketball coaches increased for men's teams in Divisions I, II, and III and women's teams in Divisions I and II, but slightly decreased for women's teams in Division III from 2017-2018.
 - In men's Division I basketball, 23.6 percent of all head coaches were African-American, which increased by 1.2 percentage points from 2017-2018. However, this was still 1.6 percentage points below the all-time high of 25.2 percent reported in 2005-2006. To be behind where we were 14 years ago is not acceptable considering how much emphasis we are supposedly placing on diversity and inclusion in higher education.
 - In all, 26.0 percent of the Division I men's basketball coaches were coaches of color. In women's Division I basketball, 19.5 percent of all head coaches were African-American, which increased by 2.4 percentage points from 2017-2018. Overall, 22.5 percent of the Division I women's basketball coaches were coaches of color.
 - The lack of opportunities for head basketball coaches of color is still a major area of concern when reviewing the Racial and Gender Report Card.
 - In men's Division I football, 10.3 percent of head coaches were people of color, which was a slight decrease of 0.1 percentage points from 2017-18. Whites made up 89.7 percent of Division I football head coaching positions while African-Americans were 7.3 percent, Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders were 0.9 percent, and American Indians or Alaskan Natives were 0.4 percent of those positions. There were no Asian or Hispanic/Latino head football coaches. Finally, 0.4 percent identified as Two or More Races and 1.3 percent identified as Other.
 - The lack of opportunities for head football coaches of color is an even bigger concern than for men's and women's Division I basketball. The results are simply unacceptable, especially in these sports where there are so many African-American student-athletes.
 - Only 7.1 percent of Division I head baseball coaches were people of color: 3.6 percent were Hispanic/Latino, 1.1 percent were African-American, 0.4 percent were Asian, 0.4 percent were Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 1.1 percent were classified as being Two or More Races, and 0.7 percent classified as Other. There were no American Indian or Alaskan Native head baseball coaches.
 - African-Americans were so unrepresented as head coaches in Division III that the percentage of women coaching men's teams was higher than the percentage of African-Americans coaching men's team (6.9 percent versus 4.6 percent).
 - Forty-seven years after the passage of Title IX, women still did not hold most coaching opportunities in women's sports. Women only held 40.6 percent of the head coaching jobs for women's sports in Division I, which was a 0.5 percentage point increase from 2017-2018. Women held 36.3 percent of the head coaching jobs for women's sports in Division II, which was an increase of 0.5 percentage points from 2017-2018. Women held 44.5 percent of the head coaching jobs for women's sports in Division III, which was a 0.2 percentage point increase from 2017-2018. Overall, women held 41.2 percent of the head coaching positions of women's teams across all three divisions combined. This remains grossly unacceptable 47 years after the passage of Title IX.
 - Women head coaches in Division I women's basketball increased from 59.6 percent in 2017-2018 to 62.3 percent in 2018-2019. Women holding head coaching po-

sitions in cross country, indoor track and outdoor track at the Division I level increased from 18.6 percent in 2017-2018 to 18.8 percent in 2018-2019. In all other women's sports at the Division I level, women held 46.9 percent of head coaching positions compared to the 53.1 percent held by men.

- In 2018-2019 Division I women's basketball, African-American student-athletes made up 41.9 percent of the total, but only 14.0 percent of the head coaches are African-American women. African-American men held 5.5 percent of the Division I women's basketball positions for a combined percentage of 19.5 percent, a 2.4 percentage point increase from 2017-2018. Just as in football and men's basketball, this does not compare to the representation of African-American women's basketball student-athletes in 2018-2019.
- In 2018-2019, women held 4.0, 4.1, and 6.9 percent of head coaching positions for men's teams across Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. For Divisions II and III, these percentages increased by 0.1 percentage points each from 2017-2018. The percentage for Division I remained the same as last year. All these percentages either match or set the highest recorded marks in the report's history, but remain extremely low.
- Of the total assistant coaching positions held on men's teams in Divisions I, II, and III during 2018-2019, white assistant coaches represented 69.4 percent, 71.5 percent, and 83.0 percent, respectively.
- African-Americans represented 21 percent, 15.2 percent, and 10.2 percent of the total assistant coaching positions held on men's teams in Divisions I, II, and III in 2018-2019, respectively. In 2017-2018, African-Americans represented 20.3 percent, 13.9 percent, and 10 percent, respectively.
- Of the total assistant coaching positions on women's teams in Divisions I, II, and III during 2018-2019, white assistant coaches represented 72.6 percent, 73.2 percent, and 85.8 percent, respectively. African-Americans held 14.8 percent, 11.7 percent, and 7.5 percent for Divisions I, II, and III, respectively compared to 2017-18 when African-Americans held 15.1 percent, 11.1 percent, and 7.3 percent for Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

- As assistant coaches in women's sports, women in the 2018-2019 year held 46.8 percent of the positions in Division I, 49.8 percent in Division II, and 52.1 percent in Division III. Overall, women held 49.6 percent of the assistant coaching positions of women's teams across all three divisions combined. Less than half of all the assistant coaching positions of women's teams across all three divisions are held by women. Forty-seven years after the passage of Title IX.

Athletics Directors

- In 2018-2019, whites continue to dominate the athletics director positions in all divisions. During 2018-2019, 84.5 percent, 89.8 percent, and 92.5 percent of all the athletics director positions were white in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. These percentages in Divisions I increased slightly from 84.3 in 2017-18 and decreased slightly in Division II and III from 90.0 and 92.7 percent in 2017-2018.
- African-Americans held 8.8 percent, 5.3 percent, and 4.9 percent of the athletics director positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. There was an increase in Divisions I and II from the 2017-2018 year when African-Americans represented 8.7 and 4.1 percent, respectively. Division III saw the same amount of representation for African-American athletics directors compared to the percentage of the 2017-2018 year at 4.9 percent.
- Hispanics/Latinos accounted for 2.7 percent, 2.5 percent, and 1.5 percent of the athletics directors in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively, for the 2018-2019 year. Division I saw a decrease of 0.3 percent, Division II saw a 0.6 percentage point decrease and Division III saw a 0.4 percentage point increase when compared to the results in 2017-2018.
- Asians accounted for 0.3 percent, 0 percent, and 0.2 percent of the athletics directors at Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. There was no American Indian or Alaskan Native athletics director in Divisions I and II and 0.2 percent in Division III, which remained the same as in 2017-2018. There was no Hawaiian or Pacific Islander athletics director in Divisions I and III and 0.4 percent in Division II.

- The percentage of female athletics directors in Divisions I and III increased from 10.5 percent to 13.6 percent and from 31.1 percent to 31.7 percent, respectively, while decreasing in Division II from 18.3 percent to 17.5 percent in 2018-2019.

College Associate, Assistant Athletics Directors, Senior Woman Administrators, Faculty Athletics Representatives, and Sports Information Directors

- At the associate athletics director position, whites held 85.1 percent, 87.6 percent, and 92.6 percent of the positions in 2018-2019 in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. The percentage decreased in Divisions I and II from the 2017-2018 year, when 85.3 percent and 88.0 percent of associate athletics directors were white. In Division III, the percentage of white associate athletics directors increased from 91.7 in the 2017-18 year.
- This year, African-Americans held 9.5 percent, 5.8 percent, and 4.9 percent of the associate athletics director positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Hispanics/Latinos held 2.1 percent, 2.3 percent, and 0.5 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Asians held 0.9 percent, 0.8 percent, and 0.3 percent in Division I, II, and III, respectively. Hawaiian Pacific Islanders held 0.2 percent and 0.3 percent in Divisions I and II, and Division III had no representation. American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 0.6 percent in Division II and 0.5 percent in Division III and had no representation in Division I.
- The percentage of women who held associate athletics director positions increased in Division I while decreasing in Divisions II and III. In Division I, 32.3 percent of associate athletics director positions were held by women, 39.8 percent in Division II, and 50.5 percent in Division III in 2018-2019. This compared to 31.4, 40.9, and 51.3 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively in 2017-2018.
- At the assistant athletics director position, whites comprised 82.4 percent, 86.1 percent, and 92.1 percent at Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. African-Americans held 9.3 percent, 5.4 percent, and 5.1 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Hispanics/Latinos held 3.0 percent, 3.2 percent, and 1.0 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Asians held 1.5 percent,

1.6 percent, and 0.5 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders held 0.4 percent in Division I, 0.4 percent in Division II and 0.2 percent in Division III. American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 0.2 percent, 0.4 percent, and 0.2 percent of assistant athletics director positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Those who identified as Two or More Races, Non-Resident Alien, or Other held 3.2 percent, 3.0 percent, and 1.2 percent of these positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

- The percentage of women who held assistant athletics director positions was 31.0 percent in Division I, 37.1 percent in Division II, and 40.4 percent in Division III in 2018-2019, compared to 31.2, 36.3, and 39.0 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively in 2017-2018.

- White women continued to dominate the senior woman administrator (SWA) position holding 80.0 percent, 86.9 percent, and 91.1 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. African-American women represented 14.5 percent, 7.1 percent, and 4.6 percent of the SWA positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

- Whites continued to hold most of the faculty athletics representative (FAR) positions with 87.7 percent, 91.6 percent, and 93.4 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Women held 33.5 percent, 29.3 percent, and 38.4 percent of the FAR positions in 2018-2019 in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

- The sports information director position was overwhelmingly held by whites who occupied 92.3, 90.3, and 95.8 percent of the positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Women held 15.0, 7.6, and 12.8 percent of the sports information director positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.



Overall Grades

College Sport's 2019 combined grade for racial and gender hiring practices was a C+ with 78.7 points, up from 77.3 points in 2018.

College Sport received a B for racial hiring practices by earning 81.6 points, up from 79.6 points in the 2018 CSRGRC. College Sport received a C+ for gender hiring practices by earning 75.8 points, an increase from 75.1 points in the 2018 CSRGRC.

For racial hiring practices, student-athlete opportunities and Division I assistant coaches for all men's teams received an A+. The head coaches of men's basketball and assistant coaches for all women's teams in Division I earned an A-. Head coaches of Division I women's basketball teams, Division I senior woman administrator and professional administration positions, and senior leadership and professional administration positions at the NCAA National Office earned a B+. Head coaches for all Division I women's teams received a B-. Division I head coaches for men's teams and Division I athletics directors received a C+. Division I associate athletics director positions received a C. Division I conference commissioners received a C-. Division I faculty athletics representatives received a D+. Finally, Division I sports information directors, and head coaches for all Division I football teams received an F for racial hiring practices.

For gender hiring practices, professional administration positions and senior leadership positions at the NCAA National Office, as well as Division I senior woman administrator positions earned an A+. Division I women's basketball head coaches received an A. Student-athlete opportunities and Division I professional administration positions received a B-. Division I women's assistant coaches, associate athletics directors, and faculty athletics representatives earned a C+ while Division I conference commissioners earned a C- and Division I head coaches of women's teams earned a D. The following positions all received an F in gender hiring practices for the 2018-2019 reporting period: Division I men's head and assistant coaches, Division I athletics directors, Division I sports information directors, and Division I men's basketball head coaches.

The NCAA received an A+ for Diversity Initiatives.



Grades by Category

As in all cases regarding employment in college athletics, the data reported on associate and assistant athletics directors, senior woman administrators and faculty athletics representatives excludes HBCUs.

Conference Commissioners

Of the ten FBS conferences, seven (70.0 percent) were led by white men. One (ten percent) of the FBS conference commissioners was a white woman. Judy MacLeod was named C-USA commissioner in October 2015, making her the first woman to lead an FBS conference. For the first time in history in 2019, there were African-Americans in the position of conference commissioner in the FBS. Keith Gill and Kevin Warren made history when they were chosen to lead the Sun Belt and Big Ten conferences, respectively.

The conference commissioner serves as the chief administration officer, and those that head FBS conferences are among the most powerful and influential people in college sport. 2019 marked the first time where multiple people of color and a woman held the position within an FBS conference.

Looking across the board at all Division I Conferences, excluding Historically Black Conferences, 26 out of 30 commissioners were white. Amy Huchthausen of the American East, Gloria Nevarez of the West Coast Conference, Keith Gill of the Sun Belt Conference, and Kevin Warren of the Big Ten Conference were the only people of color who held commissioner positions. When the West Coast Conference hired Gloria Nevarez to serve as their Conference Commissioner in April 2018, she became the first Hispanic/Latina to serve as a Conference Commissioner in Division I.

There were nine women who were commissioners in the 2018-2019 year, which decreased by one from the 2017-2018 year.

- Amy Huchthausen, America East
- Bernadette V. McClade, Atlantic 10 Conference
- Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference
- Gloria Nevarez, West Coast Conference
- Jennifer Heppel, Patriot League
- Judy MacLeod, Conference USA
- Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference
- Robin Harris, Ivy League
- Val Ackerman, Big East


Racial Hiring Grade for DI Conference Commissioners

C-  **13.3%**
People of Color

Gender Hiring Grade for DI Conference Commissioners

C- **30.0%**
Women

See Table 5.



Student Athletes

All student-athlete data came from the Student-Athlete Data in the NCAA Demographics Database.

There were several changes in data categorizations, made by both the NCAA and TIDES, that are essential to be aware of before highlighting statistical observations over the past four years compared to prior years.

Starting in 2012-2013, data included the status of Non-Resident Alien to the NCAA Student-athlete Ethnicity Report detailing the resident alien status of the student-athletes separately from their race/ethnicity.



Total Male Student Athletes

For the total number of male student-athletes across all Division I sports in 2018-2019, the percentage of African-American participants increased by 0.8 percentage points to 23.4 percent of the total participants. Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and American Indian and Alaskan Native male student-athletes were 5.1 percent, 1.4 percent, 0.6 percent, and 0.3 percent, respectively, of all male student-athletes in Division I. Male stu-

dent-athletes of Two or More Races were 5.1 percent and Non-Resident Aliens were 5.9 percent, respectively, of all male student-athletes in Division I. The percentage of white male student-athletes decreased by 1.1 percentage points from 55.6 percent in 2017-2018 to 54.5 percent in 2018-2019.

Total Female Student Athletes

For the total number of female student-athletes across all Division I sports in 2018-2019, the percentage of African-American participants decreased by 0.2 percentage points to 12.2 percent of the total participants. Hispanic/Latina, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian and Alaskan Native female student-athletes comprised 5.4 percent, 2.1 percent, 0.4 percent, and 0.4 percent, respectively, of all female student-athletes in Division I. Female student-athletes of Two or More Races were 5.4 percent and Non-Resident Aliens were 7.2 percent of all female student-athletes in Division I. The percentage of white female student-athletes decreased by 0.8 percentage points from 64.1 percent in 2017-2018 to 63.3 percent in 2018-2019.



Each year, the Racial and Gender Report Card looks at three Division I sports and highlights trends for both male and female student-athletes. For the male student-athletes, the sports highlighted in the report are basketball, football, and baseball. The three female sports reported for the Division I observations were basketball, outdoor track, and softball. These sports have strong participation levels and comparatively high media attention in relation to other men's and women's sports, respectively.

Men's Basketball

In Division I men's basketball, the percentage of African-Americans decreased by 0.4 percentage points to 53.2 percent in 2018-2019. Hispanic/Latino representation increased 0.2 percentage points to 2.4 percent, combined Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander representation remained constant at 0.5 percent, American Indian and Alaskan Native representation was 0.3 percent, and white participation decreased 0.8 percentage points to 24.7 percent. The category Two or More Races showed an increase of 0.8 percentage points to 6.5 percent. The categories Non-Resident Alien and Other combined to make up 12.5 percent for 2018-2019.

Men's Football

The breakdown for all Division I football student-athletes is as follows: whites decreased from 40.1 percent in 2017-2018 to 39.4 percent in 2018-2019; African-Americans increased from 44.8 percent to 45.1 percent; Hispanics/Latinos decreased from 3.2 percent to 3.0 percent; the combination of Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders decreased from 2.0 percent to 1.9 percent, and American Indian and Alaskan Natives remained the same at 0.4 percent. Those describing themselves as Non-Resident Aliens increased from 0.6 percent to 0.8 percent while Two or More Races and Other increased from 8.9 percent to 9.5 percent.

In Division I football at the FBS level, African-Americans accounted for 48.5 percent of football student-athletes while whites made up 34.8 percent, Hispanics/Latinos made up 2.6 percent, Asians made up 0.4 percent, Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders made up 1.9 percent, American Indians and Alaskan Natives made up 0.4 percent, those of Two or More Races made up 6.1 percent, and those who did not disclose their race made up 5.3 percent.

Men's Baseball

In Division I men's baseball, the percentage of white student-athletes decreased slightly from 79.9 percent in 2017-2018 to 78.9 percent in 2018-2019. African-American participation slightly increased from 3.7 percent to 4.1 percent. Latino participation also experienced an increase from 6.9 percent to 7.2 percent.

Women's Basketball

In women's Division I basketball, the percentage represented by whites increased from 33.8 percent in 2017-2018 to 34.0 percent in 2018-2019. African-American participation decreased from 43.0 percent in 2017-2018 to 41.9 percent in 2018-2019. Hispanic/Latina representation remained the same at 2.8 percent, Asian/Pacific Islanders decreased from 1.1 percent to 1.0 percent combined, and American Indian and Alaskan Natives remained the same at 0.4 percent.

Women's Outdoor Track

In women's Division I outdoor track, 55.2 percent of student-athletes were white in 2018-2019, decreasing 1.0 percentage points from 2017-2018. African-American participation also decreased from 23.9 percent to 23.0 percent. Hispanic/Latina representation notably saw an increase from 4.6 percent to 5.3 percent. Asian/Pacific Islanders saw a decrease from 1.5 percent to 1.3 percent combined, and American Indian and Alaskan Native stayed the same at 0.4 percent.

Women's Softball

In women's Division I softball, the percentage of white student-athletes decreased by 0.5 percentage points from 2017-2018, representing 72.6 percent of the total in 2018-2019. African-American participants stayed the same and represented 4.0 percent of the total participants. Hispanic/Latina participants also stayed the same and represented 9.8 percent of the total participants. Asian/Pacific Islander participants stayed the same from 2017-2018, representing 2.3 percent of total participants in 2018-2019 combined. American Indian and Alaska Native participants stayed the same at 0.8 percent of total participants.

For representation of women as student-athletes, 50 percent earned an A, 45 percent earned a B, and 40 percent earned a C.

Grade for Student Athlete Participation - Race (DI, DII, and DIII)

A+ ↑ **34.4%**
People of Color

Grade for Student Athlete Participation - Gender (DI, DII, and DIII)

B- ↑ **44.2%**
Women

See Tables 6, 7, 8.
See Appendix II for Division I, II, and III comparisons
*Remaining differences in percentages are comprised of Two or More Races, Non-Resident Alien, and Other categories.

NCAA National Office

The data in this section on the NCAA National Office demographic breakdown was supplied by the NCAA Human Resources staff for 2019 and was compared to data collected from the NCAA for 2018. The data is current as of December 31, 2019 as submitted by NCAA Human Resources.

At the NCAA National Office, the number of people of color and women in positions of executive vice president, senior vice president and vice president each increased to six and eight, respectively in 2019. Out of this group, African-Americans were the only people of color to hold these positions in 2019. There continues to be no representation of Hispanics/Latinos or Asians in these positions. Whites held 68.4 percent of the positions in 2019, which decreased from 2018 when it was 70.6 percent.


The six African-Americans represented in the vice president role were:

- **Donald Remy**, Chief Operating Officer of Law, Policy, and Governance
- **Robert "Bob" Williams**, Senior Vice President of Communications
- **Stanley "Stan" Wilcox**, Executive Vice President of Regulatory Affairs
- **Felicia Martin**, Vice President of the Eligibility Center
- **Katrice Albert**, Executive Vice President, Office of Inclusion and Human Resources
- **Naima Stevenson**, Vice President of Hearing Operations

The eight women represented in the vice president role were:

- **Theresa "Terri" Gronau**, Vice President of Division II Governance
- **Lynn Holzman**, Vice President of Women's Basketball
- **Kathleen T. McNeely**, Chief Financial Officer of Administration
- **Joni Comstock**, Senior Vice President of Championships
- **Felicia Martin**, Vice President of the Eligibility Center
- **Dr. Katrice Albert**, Executive Vice President, NCAA Office of Inclusion and Human Resources
- **Naima Stevenson**, Vice President of Hearing Operations
- **Cari Van Senus**, Vice President of Vice President of Policy and Chief of Staff

The percentage of personnel at the managing director/director positions who were people of color is 22.1 percent in 2019, an increase of 2.8 percentage points from 2018. Women accounted for an impressive 50.0 percent of the positions in 2019, an increase from 47.7 percent in last year's report. Whites occupied 77.9 percent of the positions in 2019, which decreased by 2.8 percentage points from 2018. African-Americans represented 18.3 percent of the positions in 2019, which increased by 2.4 percentage points from 2018. The 2019 data shows that there was one Hispanic/Latino and three Asians in these positions. This represented an increase of one for Asians from 2018 and is the same total for Hispanics/Latinos from 2018. For the category of professional administrator positions, the total percentage of people of color increased from 22.5 percent in 2018 to 23.1 percent in 2019. The percentage



of African-Americans decreased from 16.3 percent in 2018 to 15.4 percent in 2019. The percentage of Hispanics/Latinos increased from 2.2 percent to 2.9 percent and Asians increased from 2.2 percent to 2.9 percent. Hawaiians or Pacific Islanders held 0.9 percent and those of Two or More Races held 0.9 percent of these positions. The percentage of white NCAA professional administrators decreased slightly from 77.5 percent in 2018 to 76.9 percent in 2019. The percentage of women in professional administrative positions slightly increased from 58.7 percent in 2018 to 58.8 percent in 2019.

The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport does not include support staff in any of the Racial and Gender Report Cards.

These numbers were recorded as of December 31, 2019. It should be noted that these statistics were a snapshot in time for the NCAA. As a result, there is some fluctuation that occurs based upon the time when staff are starting or departing. For example, Executive Vice President Dr. Katrice Albert left the NCAA early in 2020. She has not been replaced as of the publication of this report.

Racial Hiring Grade for NCAA Senior Leadership

B+ ↑ **23.6%**
People of Color

Gender Hiring Grade for NCAA Senior Leadership

A+ ↑ **48.8%**
Women

Racial Hiring Grade for NCAA Professional Administration

B+ ↑ **23.1%**
People of Color

Gender Hiring Grade for NCAA Professional Administration

A+ ↑ **58.8%**
Women

See Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Division I Head Coaches

Various sports are studied on an individual basis for men's and women's head coaching positions. This can help to obtain a balanced view of coaching positions throughout college sports. The College Sport Racial and Gender Report Card examines head coaching percentages in men's football, basketball, baseball, and women's basketball, cross-country and indoor/outdoor track programs.

Men's Teams

In 2018-2019, white coaches still dominated, holding 85.0 percent of the head coaching positions within men's sports in Division I. Opportunities for African-American head coaches had a slight increase from 8.1 percent in 2017-2018 to 9.1 percent in 2018-2019. Hispanics/Latinos maintained 1.9 percent of head coaching positions for men's teams during 2018-2019. Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders combined held 0.7 percent of the head coaching positions for men's teams, a decrease of 0.1 percentage points from last year. American Indian and Alaskan Native representation was again minimal, with the same 0.1 percent representation as in last year's report. People of Two or More Races, Non-Resident Aliens, and those classified as Other combined to make up 3.2 percent of head coaches for men's sports in Division I. These figures accounted for male and female head coaches of men's teams.

The percentage of female head coaches of men's teams was 4.0 percent, the same as last year's report.



Men's Basketball



A persistent area of concern for the Racial and Gender Report Card is the African-American coaching presence in men's Division I basketball. The trend for this group has increased ever so slightly, but these numbers are not where they need to be for an appropriate representation of coaches within the game compared to the representation of student-athletes. For 2018-2019, 23.6 percent of the men's Division I basketball coaches were African-American (up from 22.4 percent) and 26.0 percent were coaches of color, which was an increase of 1.2 percentage points from 2017-2018. The all-time high was 2005-2006, when 25.2 percent of all head coaches were African-American and 26.2 were people of color. The all-time low since college sport became a subject of the RGRC was 2011-2012, when only 18.6 percent were African-American and 19.5 percent were coaches of color. After much scrutiny was placed on the sport, 2012-2013 showed great improvement with an increase of 4.4 percentage points to 23 percent. Nonetheless, to be behind where we were 14 years ago is unacceptable considering how much emphasis we are supposedly placing on diversity and inclusion in higher education.

Whites made up 74.0 percent of head coaching positions, while Asians, Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders combined to make up 0.0 percent, Hispanics/Latinos were 0.6 percent, and American Indians and Alaskan Natives were 0.3 percent of those positions. Finally, 0.3 percent identified as Two or More Races and 1.2 percent identified as Other.

Men's Football

Another area that is a cause for concern is Division I football head coaches. Like basketball, there is a lack of appropriate representation of football coaches that align with the student-athlete representation. There was an overall decrease in the number of coaches of color in the sport. In 2019, 10.3 percent were coaches of color, which was a decrease of 0.1 percentage points from 2018. Whites made up 89.7 percent of head coaching positions, while African-Americans were 7.3 percent, Asians, Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders combined to make up 0.9 percent, Hispanics/Latinos were 0.0 percent, and American Indians and Alaskan Natives were 0.4 percent of those positions. Finally, 0.4 percent identified as Two or More Races and 1.3 percent identified as Other.





Men's Baseball

Only 7.1 percent of Division I baseball coaches were people of color in 2018-2019. Hispanics/Latinos comprised 3.6 percent, Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders 0.8 percent, African-Americans 1.1 percent, and 1.1 percent were classified as Two or More Races. There were 0.7 percent of Division I baseball coaches who identified as Other. Whites made up 92.9 percent of head coaching positions.

Women's Teams

Forty-seven years after the passage of Title IX, it too often remains common practice for men to coach women's teams. The percentage of women coaching women's teams remained far from being acceptable in Division I. In the case of head coaches for women's teams, it should be expected that women would hold at least half of these positions. Therefore, in that category, 60 percent would earn an A, 52 percent would earn a B, 44 percent would earn a C, and 40 percent would earn a D. This will be the sixth year that the grades for coaching positions will be taken into consideration for the CSRGRRC.

In 2018-2019, women held 40.6 percent of head coaching positions at the Division I level for women's sports, while they only held 4.0 percent of the head coaching positions at the Division I level for men sports. The latter is the same percentage as the 2017-2018 report's findings of 4.0 percent. This remains an unacceptable portion of the positions 47 years after the passage of Title IX.

Women head coaches in Division I women's basketball increased from 39.6 percent in 2017-2018 to 62.3 percent in 2018-2019. Women holding head coaching positions in cross-country, indoor track and outdoor track at the Division I level increased from 18.6 percent in 2017-2018 to 18.8 percent in 2018-2019.

Whites also dominated the head coaching positions in women's sports in Division I overall, holding 83.2 percent of head coaching positions, a 1.8 percent decrease in representation from last year.

In 2018-2019, African-Americans held 8.3 percent, Hispanic/Latinos held 2.5 percent, Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders held 2.0 percent, and American Indian and Alaskan Native representation was again minimal with 0.3 percent of the head coaching opportunities in Division I women's sports. Those identifying as Two or More Races, Non-Res-

ident Aliens, and Other represented 3.9 percent of these head coaching positions. These figures accounted for male and female head coaches of women's teams.

Women's Basketball

Women's head basketball coaching positions held by whites in Division I in 2018-2019 was 77.5 percent, a decrease from 2017-2018 when it was 79.8 percent. The percentage of white women coaching in Division I women's basketball increased from 45.9 to percent in 2017-2018 to 46.5 percent in 2018-2019. White men holding the same position in 2018-2019 decreased to 31.0 percent from 33.9 percent in 2017-2018. African-American women held 14.0 percent of head coaching positions in Division I women's basketball in 2018-2019, up from 11.9 percent in 2017-2018. African-American men held 5.5 percent of those positions in 2018-2019, up from 5.2 percent in 2017-2018, totaling 19.5 percent of head coaching positions within Division I women's basketball held by African-Americans. This was up from 17.1 percent in 2017-2018.

For the first time since the 2013-2014 report there is one American Indian or Alaskan Native head coach in Division I women's college basketball in 2018-2019. Four Hispanic/Latino(a) coaches, two males and two females, combined to make up 1.2 percent of all head coaches in Division I women's basketball in 2018-2019. This data stands in stark contrast to the 41.9 percent of student-athletes playing Division I women's basketball who were African-American.

Women's Cross-Country/Track

The highest percentage of head coaching positions held by people of color in women's college sport was found in the Division I cross country/track category. Whites held 77.2 percent of the head coaching positions in Division I women's cross country/track during 2018-2019, decreasing from the previous year's total of 79.2 percent. African-Americans held 17.7 percent in 2018-2019, which was an increase from the 15.7 percent mark of 2017-2018. Hispanics/Latinos held 1.8 percent in 2018-2019, an increase from 1.6 percent in 2017-2018. African-American women held 4.5 percent in Division I, an increase of 0.3 percentage points from 2017-2018, while white women decreased from 13.7 percent in 2017-2018 to 13.2 percent in 2018-2019.

**Racial Hiring Grade for
Head Coaches of All DI
Men's Teams**

C+ ↑ 15.0%
People of Color

**Gender Hiring Grade for
Head Coaches of All DI
Men's Teams**

F 4.0%
Women

**Racial Hiring Grade for
Head Coaches of All DI
Men's Basketball Teams**

A- ↑ 26.0%
People of Color

**Gender Hiring Grade for
Head Coaches of All DI
Men's Basketball Teams**

F 0.0%
Women

**Racial Hiring Grade for
Head Coaches of All DI
Women's Teams**

B- ↑ 16.8%
People of Color

**Gender Hiring Grade for
Head Coaches of All DI
Women's Teams**

D ↑ 40.6%
Women

**Racial Hiring Grade for
Head Coaches of All DI
Women's Basketball Teams**

B+ ↑ 22.5%
People of Color

**Gender Hiring Grade for
Head Coaches of All DI
Women's Basketball Teams**

A ↑ 62.3%
Women

Racial Hiring Grade for Head Coaches of All DI Football Teams

F ↓ **10.3%**
People of Color

See Tables 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.
See Appendix II for Division I, II, and III comparisons.
- It is important to note the NCAA data represents demographics by position, not in sum. There is potential for double counting race or people of color in some instances.

Division I Assistant Coaches

Men's Teams

In 2018-2019, whites held 69.4 percent of the assistant coach positions on men's teams in Division I, compared to 2017-2018 when whites held 70.3 percent. African-American assistant coaches for men's teams held 21.0 percent of the positions, compared to 2017-2018 when African-Americans held 20.3 percent. Hispanic/Latino assistant coaches for men's teams held 2.0 percent of the positions, compared to 2017-2018 when Hispanics/Latinos held 1.9 percent. In 2018-2019, Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders held a combined 1.3 percent of the total assistant coaching positions, the same as 2017-2018. American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 0.1 percent, the same as in 2017-2018.

The assistant coach position is often a stepping-stone to future head coaching positions. During the 2018-2019 year, African-Americans held 45.9 percent of the Division I assistant coach positions in men's basketball and 29.1 percent of the assistant coach positions in football. Hispanics/Latinos held 1.1 percent of the assistant coach positions in men's basketball and 1.2 percent of assistant coach positions in football. Of all Division I college baseball assistant coaching positions, 1.9 percent were held by African-Americans and 3.0 percent were held by Hispanics/Latinos.

Among the men's teams in 2018-2019, women held 9.4 percent of the assistance coaching positions in Division I. In 2017-2018, women held 8.6 percent of the positions.

Women's Teams

Among the women's teams in Divisions I in 2018-2019, whites held 72.6 percent of assistant coach positions, compared to 72.5 percent in 2017-2018. African-Americans held 14.8 percent of the women's assistant coach positions in Divisions I. Hispanics/Latinos held 2.7 percent of the assistant coach positions within women's sports in Divisions I. Asians/Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders held 1.9 percent. In 2018-2019, American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 0.1 percent of assistant coach positions within women's sports in Division I. Those who identified as Two or More Races, Non-Resident Aliens, and Other combined to make up 7.9 percent of these positions.


The percentage of women assistant coaches in women's sports increased in Division I from 46.1 percent to 46.8 percent. This remains an intolerable portion of the positions 47 years after the passage of Title IX.

Racial Hiring Grade for Assistant Coaches of All DI Men's Teams

A+ ↑ **30.6%**
People of Color

Gender Hiring Grade for Assistant Coaches of All DI Men's Teams

F ↑ **9.4%**
Women



Racial Hiring Grade for Assistant Coaches of All DI Women's Teams

A- ↓ **27.3%**
People of Color

Gender Hiring Grade for Assistant Coaches of All DI Women's Teams

C+ ↑ **46.8%**
Women

See Tables 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21.
See Appendix II for Division I, II, and III comparisons.

Division I College Athletic Directors

Within Division I athletics in 2018-2019, excluding HB-CUs, whites held 84.5 percent of the athletics director positions, which increased from 84.3 percent in 2017-2018. African-Americans held 8.8 percent of the athletics director positions in 2018-2019, which was a slight increase from 8.7 percent in 2017-2018. Hispanics/Latinos held 2.7 percent of the positions, which decreased from 3.0 percent in 2017-2018. American Indians and Alaskan Natives held zero of the positions in 2018-2019, which remained the same from the year before. Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander athletics directors held 0.3 percent of the positions, which decreased from 0.6 percent from 2017-2018.

While women who are athletics directors in Division I increased from 10.5 percent to 13.6 percent in 2018-2019, they remained seriously underrepresented in the athletics director position this year. White women made up 10.9 percent while Hispanics/Latinas represented 0.6 percent, Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders represented a combined 0.3 percent, and African-Americans represented 1.2 percent of the athletics director positions within Division I. Two or More Races represented 0.6 percent of women athletics di-

rectors, up from 0.3 percent the previous year. There were no female athletics directors reported in 2018-2019 who were American Indian/Alaskan Native or those classified as Other.

Of the 130 athletics directors who oversee FBS football programs, there were 106 (86.2 percent) whites. The number of people of color holding the athletics director positions at the FBS level increased by four, to 24 (18.5 percent) in 2018-2019, from 20 (15.4 percent) in 2017-2018. One athletics director chose to not identify their race. As of March 31, 2020, the athletics directors of color included:

- 14 (10.8 percent) African-Americans
 - **Allen Greene**, Auburn University
 - **Mark Alnutt**, The State University of New York at Buffalo
 - **Bernard Muir**, Stanford University
 - **Terry Tumey**, California State University, Fresno
 - **Carla Williams**, University of Virginia
 - **Damon Evans**, University of Maryland
 - **Derrick Gragg**, University of Tulsa
 - **Eugene Smith**, The Ohio State University
 - **Lynn Swann**, University of Southern California
 - **Martin Jarmond**, Boston College
 - **Ray Anderson**, Arizona State University
 - **Sean T. Frazier**, Northern Illinois University
 - **Warde J. Manuel**, University of Michigan
 - **Malcolm Turner**, Vanderbilt University

- Seven (5.4 percent) Hispanics/Latinos
 - **Barry Alvarez**, University of Wisconsin
 - **Chris Del Conte**, University of Texas at Austin
 - **Lisa Campos**, University of Texas at San Antonio
 - **Daniel G. Guerrero**, University of California - Los Angeles
 - **Eddie Nuñez**, University of New Mexico
 - **Mario Moccia**, New Mexico State University
 - **Pete Garcia**, Florida International University

- One (0.8 percent) Asian
 - **Patrick Chun**, Washington State University

- Two (1.5 percent) Two or More Races
 - **Bob Moosbrugger**, Bowling Green State University
 - **Desiree Reed-Francois**, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

There were nine women (6.9 percent) who oversaw FBS football programs:

- **Beth Goetz**, Ball State University
- **Carla Williams**, University of Virginia
- **Desiree Reed-Francois**, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- **Heather Lyke**, University of Pittsburgh
- **Jennifer Cohen**, University of Washington
- **Kathy Beauregard**, Western Michigan University
- **Lisa Campos**, University of Texas at San Antonio
- **Marie Tuile**, San Jose State University
- **Sandy Barbour**, Penn State University

Christine A. Plonsky at the University of Texas at Austin heads the separate women's department and does not oversee football.

Racial Hiring Grade for All DI Athletic Directors



Gender Hiring Grade for All DI Athletic Directors



See Tables 22, 23, and 24.
See Appendix II for Division I, II, and III comparisons.

Division I College Associate and Assistant Athletic Directors

This senior administrative category includes both the associate and assistant athletics director positions. These positions are thought of as the pipeline to the athletics director position. People in both positions work very closely with the athletics director and they are often training grounds for future athletics directors. In the hierarchy of power, associate athletics directors are above assistant athletics directors. Although these are two separate positions, the demographic make-up of each slot is strikingly similar at the Division I level.

In Division I, the gender breakdown was similar between associate and assistant athletics directors. Associate athletics directors were 67.7 percent male and 32.3 percent female in Division I and assistant athletics directors were 69.0 percent male and 31.0 percent female in Division I in 2018-2019. This compared to 2017-2018 when associate athletics directors were 68.6 percent male and 31.4 percent female in Division I and assistant athletics directors were 68.8 percent male and 31.2 percent female in Division I.

Associate Athletics Directors

There was a slight improvement for people of color in Division I at the associate athletics director position. In 2018-2019, whites held 85.1 percent of the total, down slightly from 85.3 percent in 2017-2018. In 2018-2019, African-Americans held 9.5 percent of the associate athletics director positions in Division I. This number had not previously changed since 2015-2016 when it was 8.6 percent. In 2018-2019, Hispanics/Latinos, Asians/Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, and American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 2.1 percent, 1.1 percent, and zero percent, respectively, of the Division I associate athletics director positions. In 2018-2019 associate athletics director classified as Two or More Races held 0.6 percent, which is a decrease from the percentage mark met in 2017-2018 of 0.8 percent. In 2018-2019, those classified as Other held 1.5 percent, an increase from 1.1 in 2017-2018.

In 2018-2019, women gained representation as associate athletics directors in Division I. Women occupied 32.3 percent of the positions in 2018-2019, which was an increase from 31.4 percent in 2017-2018.

Assistant Athletics Director*

At the assistant athletics director position in 2018-2019, representation for people of color decreased by 0.6 percentage points in Division I. African-Americans held 9.3 percent, an increase from 8.8 percent in 2017-2018. Hispanics/Latinos, Asians/Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, and American Indians/Alaska Natives held 3.0 percent, 2.0 percent, and 0.2 percent of the Division I assistant athletics director positions, respectively, in 2018-2019. This was compared to 2017-2018 when Hispanics/Latinos, Asians/Pacific Islanders, and American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 2.8 percent, 1.9, and 0.1 percent of the Division I assistant athletics director positions, respectively. In 2018-2019 assistant athletics directors classified as Two or More Races held 1.0 percent of the positions, compared to 1.4 percent in 2017-2018. In 2018-2019, assistant athletics directors classified as Other held 2.0 percent of the positions, an increase from the mark met in 2017-2018 of 1.6 percent.

In 2018-2019, Division I saw a slight decrease in the representation of women at the assistant athletics director position. Women occupied 31.0 percent of the assistant athletics directors in Division I, compared to 31.2 percent in 2017-2018.

Racial Hiring Grade for All DI Associate Athletic Directors



Gender Hiring Grade for All DI Associate Athletic Directors



See Table 25.

See Appendix II for Division I, II, and III comparisons.
*This category is not included in the final grade calculation.

Division I Senior Woman Administrators

The senior woman administrator (SWA) is a significant position within an athletic department. The SWA is the highest ranking female in each NCAA athletics department or conference office, helping to promote meaningful representation of women within leadership positions throughout member institutions. Voted on by the membership in 1981, the SWA designation was added at the same time that women's championships were added to ensure adequate gender involvement in such a male dominated industry.

White women continued to dominate the position in 2018-2019 with 80.0 percent in Division I. However, this was a decrease from 2017-2018 when they held 81.3 percent. Even with the improvement, the racial diversity of the SWA position continued to be very low.

In Division I, African-American women held 14.5 percent of the SWA positions, Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander women held 0.9 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held 2.5 percent, and American Indian and Alaskan Native women held 0 percent. Women classified as Two or More Races held 1.2 percent. Others held 0.9 percent and there were no Non-Resident Aliens.

Overall, women of color occupied 20 percent of the SWA positions in 2018-2019 within Division I compared to 2017-2018 when they held 18.7 percent. In 2017-2018 African-American women held 14.0 percent, Asian/Pacific Islander women held 1.2 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held 2.2 percent, and American Indian/Alaskan Native women held 0.3 percent. Women classified as Two or More Races held 0.6 percent, Other held 0.3 percent and Non-Resident Aliens held zero percent.

Racial Hiring Grade for All DI Senior Woman Administrators

B+ ↑ **20.0%**
People of Color

Gender Hiring Grade for All DI Senior Woman Administrators*

A+ **100.0%**
Women

*See Table 26.
See Appendix II for Division I, II, and III comparisons.
Not calculated in final grade

Division I Faculty Athletic Representatives

The FAR is a representative of the university on issues regarding athletics. The FAR is usually appointed by the president and is not only involved with ensuring academic integrity of the athletic programs, but also maintaining the welfare of the student-athlete. The NCAA requires each of its member institutions to appoint a FAR who must be on faculty and administrative staff and may not hold a position within the athletics department in any capacity. This role could include professors and other non-athletic department personnel.

For the FAR positions in 2018-2019, whites held 87.7 percent in Division I. In 2017-2018, the percentage was 87.8 percent. The racial diversity of the FAR position continued to be minimal. In 2018-2019, African-Americans held 7.5 percent in Division I. Hispanics/Latinos held 1.7 percent, Asians held 1.2 percent, Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders held 0.3 percent, and American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 0.3 percent. FARs classified as Two or More Races held 0.6 percent in Division I, while those classified as Other held 0.9 percent. Non-Resident Aliens held 0.3 percent of these positions.

In 2018-2019 women held 33.5 percent of the FAR positions, up from 32.7 percent in 2017-2018. White women held the greatest percentage of these positions with 29.5 percent. In Division I, African-American women held 2.3 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held 0.3 percent, and Asian/Pacific Islander women held 0.3 percent. Women identifying as Two or More Races and Other made up 0.3 percent and 0.6 percent of these positions, respectively.

Among the SIDs who were not white, 3.3 percent were African-American, 1.5 percent were Asian, 1.4 percent were Hispanic/Latino, 1.0 percent were Other, 0.2 percent were Two or More Races, and 0.3 percent were Non-Resident Alien. Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders and American Indians and Alaskan Natives did not hold any of these positions. Women held 12.8 percent of the sports information director positions in 2018-19 the same percentage as last year.

Racial Hiring Grade for All DI Faculty Athletic Representatives



Gender Hiring Grade for All DI Faculty Athletic Representatives



See Table 27.
See Appendix II for Division I, II, and III comparisons.

Racial Hiring Grade for All DI Sports Information Directors



Gender Hiring Grade for All DI Sports Information Directors



See Table 28.
See Appendix II for Division I, II, and III comparisons.


Division I Sports Information Directors

The Sports Information Director (SID) plays a critical role in directing the media's attention to student-athletes, coaches and teams including but not limited to coordinating communications between local/national media and the athletics department, providing updates on player/team information, and composing various stories within each sports program in the athletic department.

The sports information director position was one of the least diverse positions in all of college sport. In 2018-2019, 92.3 percent of the SIDs in Division I were white, which is an increase from 2017-2018's 91.4 percent. This is very important because the sports information director is usually the key decision maker in what and who is publicized among coaches and student-athletes.

Division I Professional Administration

This category includes a wide range of job descriptions. At NCAA member institutions, jobs that fit in this category are academic advisor/counselor, compliance coordinator/officer, sports information director and assistant directors, strength coaches, life skills coordinators, and managers for business, equipment, fundraiser/development, facilities, promotions/marketing and tickets. As in all cases regarding employment in college athletics, the data reported in this section excludes HBCUs. These positions are often starting points from which many people rise to higher level positions within a university or athletic department. All of these roles are vital to the success of athletic departments throughout the NCAA membership, as they provide support to athletic department leadership and provide equitable representation across the college sport decision making platform.



This report shows opportunities for women serving in professional administration positions have decreased in Division I while they increased for people of color.

In 2018-2019 whites continued to dominate the professional administration category by holding 80.2 percent of all professional administration positions in Division I. In 2017-2018 whites held 81.5 percent. In 2018-2019, African-Americans held 10.0 percent, Hispanics/Latinos held 3.6 percent, Asians held 1.4 percent, Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders held 0.1 percent, and American Indian and Alaskan Native representation was 0.2 percent. Those identifying as Two or More Races, Non-Resident Aliens, and Other represented 1.4 percent, 0.2 percent, and 3.0 percent of these positions, respectively.

In 2018-2019 women accounted for 35.3 percent of all professional administration positions compared to 35.4 percent in 2017-18.

Women were especially well represented in the positions of academic advisor/counselor, life skills coordinator, business manager, and compliance coordinator/officer. In the

academic advisor/counselor position, women held 65.2 percent of the positions at Division I institutions. Within the life skills coordinator position, women held 70.5 percent of the positions at Division I institutions. In the business manager position, women held 58.3 percent of the positions at Division I institutions. The compliance coordinator/officer also had a strong representation of women at the Division I level holding 49.8 percent of the positions.

**Racial Hiring Grade for All DI
Professional Administration**

B+  **19.8%**
People of Color

**Gender Hiring Grade for All DI
Professional Administration**

B-  **35.3%**
Women

*See Table 29 and 30.
See Appendix II for Division I, II, and III comparisons.*

NCAA Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives

College Sport continues to be one of the industry leaders with their diversity and inclusion initiatives for leadership, administrators, and student-athletes alike. The Leadership Development department at the NCAA National Office continues to put forward programming that challenges and encourages growth for all individuals involved. All the initiatives put forth by the NCAA National Office can be found in Appendix I.

**Grade for NCAA
Diversity Initiatives**

A+



How Grades Were Calculated

The 2019 College Racial and Gender Report Card data showed that college athletics departments' hiring practices do not nearly reflect the number of student-athletes of color competing on their teams. However, to give it perspective for sports fans, The Institute issues the grades in relation to overall patterns in society. Federal affirmative action policies state the workplace should reflect the percentage of the people in the racial group in the population. When TIDES first published the Racial and Gender Report Card in the late 1980s, approximately 24 percent of the population was comprised of people of color. Thus, an A was achieved if 24 percent of the positions were held by people of color, B if 12 percent of the positions were held by people of color, C if it had 9 percent, a D if it was at least 6 percent and F for anything below 6 percent.

The change in the nation's demographics has been dramatic with the most recent census making all people of color and minorities closer to 35 percent. To be fair in transition to the organizations and sports we examine in the Racial and Gender Report Cards, we decided to increase the standards in two steps. The following chart shows the new scale we are using for race and gender. To get an A for race, the category now needs to have 30 percent people of color and to get an A for gender, 45 percent is needed.

For issues of gender, an A would be earned if 45 percent of the employees were women, B for 38 percent, C for 31 percent, D for 24 percent and F for anything below 24 percent.

However, in the case of women's head and assistant coaches of women's teams, it should be expected as a minimum that women hold at least half of the positions. Thus, in that category, 60 percent earned an A, 52 percent would earn a B, 44 percent earned a C and 40 percent would earn a D.

In the case of women as student-athletes, 50 percent earned an A, 45 percent a B, and 40 percent a C.

The Institute once again acknowledges that even those sports where grades are low generally have better records on race and gender than society.

<u>Race</u>		<u>Gender</u>	
A+	>30	A+	>45
A	28.6-30	A	44.1-45
A-	24.6-28.5	A-	41.6-44
B+	19.6-24.5	B+	39-41.5
B	17-19.5	B	37.6-38.9
B-	16.0-16.9	B-	34.6-37.5
C+	15.0-15.9	C+	32-34.5
C	14.0-14.9	C	30.6-31.9
C-	13.0-13.9	C-	27.6-30.5
D+	12.0-12.9	D+	25-27.5
D	11.0-11.9	D	24-24.9
F	<11	F	<24

Methodology

All data was collected by a research team at The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport at the University of Central Florida's DeVos School of Sport Business Management.

Baseline data was gathered from the NCAA at the 2020 NCAA Convention in Anaheim, California. That data was then transferred to the NCAA Data and Demographics Dashboard located on the "NCAA.org" platform. TIDES representatives sent over spreadsheets with each position broken down by race and gender to personnel within the NCAA Research and Development Department to input data for the 2018-2019 year. The Institute's research team also gathered data from the FBS schools for presidents, athletics directors, football coaches and faculty athletics representatives, as listed from the 2019 NCAA DI FBS report.

It is important to note that the racial categories of Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander were separated into their own categories. The category of Native American has also been updated for this year to reflect American Indian or Alaskan Natives. Additionally, the category of Latino(a) was updated to include the Hispanic category.

ry. These are the official racial designations made by the NCAA in its demographics database.

The findings were compared to data from previous years. After evaluating the data, the report text was drafted and compared changes to statistics from previous years. The report draft was then sent to the NCAA National Office to be reviewed for accuracy. In addition, updates were requested for personnel changes that had occurred during the time frame. The NCAA was very supportive with several changes that helped clarify the materials.

The report covers both the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 academic years depending upon the availability of data for each position. Listings of presidents, athletics directors, conference commissioners, associate commissioners and head coaches in Football Bowl Subdivision were updated as of December 18, 2019.

About the Racial and Gender Report Card

The Racial and Gender Report Card (RGRC) is the definitive assessment of hiring practices of women and people of color in most of the leading professional and amateur sports and sporting organizations in the United States. The report considers the composition – assessed by racial and gender makeup – of players, coaches and front office/athletic department employees in our country's leading sports organizations, including the National Basketball Association (NBA), the National Football League (NFL), Major League Baseball (MLB), Major League Soccer (MLS) and the Women's National Basketball Association (WNBA), as well as in collegiate athletics departments.

The Racial and Gender Report Card is published by The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport, which is part of the College of Business Administration at the University of Central Florida (UCF) in Orlando. Dr. Richard Lapchick has authored all reports, first at Northeastern University and now at UCF. (Until 1998, the report was known as the Racial Report Card.) In addition to Dr. Lapchick, Pedro Ariza, Carter Ellis, Dylan Gladney, Ivan Hudson, Mallika Mali, David Morrin, Nicholas Mutobi, Andre Vasquez, and David Zimmerman contributed

greatly to the completion of this year's College Racial and Gender Report Card.

The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES)

The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport ("TIDES" or the "Institute") serves as a comprehensive resource for issues related to gender and race in amateur, collegiate and professional sport. The Institute researches and publishes a variety of studies, including annual studies of student-athlete graduation rates and racial attitudes in sport as well as the internationally recognized Racial and Gender Report Card, an assessment of hiring practices in professional and college sport. The Institute also monitors some of the critical ethical issues in college and professional sport, including the potential for exploitation of student-athletes, gambling, performance-enhancing drugs and violence in sport.

The Institute's founder and director is Dr. Richard Lapchick, a scholar, author and internationally recognized human rights activist and pioneer for racial equality who is acknowledged as an expert on sports issues. Described as "the racial conscience of sport," Dr. Lapchick is Chair of the DeVos Sport Business Management Program in the College of Business Administration at UCF, where The Institute is located. In addition, Dr. Lapchick serves as President of the Institute for Sport and Social Justice (ISSJ). It was formerly known as the National Consortium for Academics and Sports (NCAS) and focuses on leadership, diversity, conflict resolution and men's violence against women.

DeVos Sport Business Management Program

College of Business Administration, University of Central Florida

The DeVos Sport Business Management Program is a landmark program focusing on business skills necessary for graduates to conduct successful careers in the rapidly changing and dynamic sports industry while also emphasizing diversity, community service and social issues in sport. It offers a dual-degree option, allowing students to earn a Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree in addition to the Master of Sport Business Management (MSBM) degree. The program was funded by a gift from the Richard and Helen DeVos Foundation and RDV Sports, with matching funds from the State of Florida.



Appendix I

NCAA DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION INITIATIVES

The NCAA has a long history of supporting diversity and inclusion policies and initiatives for its member administrators, coaches, faculty and student-athletes. The Association also has committed significant resources to educational programming and grants, the professional development of women and minorities, and postgraduate scholarship support for former student-athletes pursuing careers in athletics.

Under the leadership of President Mark Emmert, the NCAA national office continues to prioritize academics, well-being and fairness in the Association. The NCAA also advocates for the safety, excellence and physical and mental health of student-athletes, and it focuses on respect, integrity, inclusion and responsibility both on and off the field of play.

Inclusive strategies also tie to NCAA principles. Strategies include developing a culture that recognizes and values diversity to organizational excellence and providing outstanding service to the higher education community and student-athletes. Having an inclusive culture is imperative, as it represents a shift from viewing diversity only as a metric to encouraging inclusion as an important value in the leadership and decision-making processes.

The NCAA Executive Committee (which is now called the NCAA Board of Governors) adopted a framework for inclusion in 2010 to guide the Association's efforts. This statement was amended by the Board of Governors in 2017:

"As a core value, the NCAA believes in and is committed to diversity, inclusion and gender equity among its student-athletes, coaches and administrators. We seek to establish and maintain an inclusive culture that fosters equitable participation for student-athletes and career opportunities for coaches and administrators from diverse backgrounds. Diversity and inclusion improve the learning environment for all student-athletes and enhance ex-

cellence within the Association. The office of inclusion will provide or enable programming and education, which sustains foundations of a diverse and inclusive culture across dimensions of diversity including but not limited to age, race, sex, class, national origin, creed, educational background, religion, gender identity, disability, gender expression, geographical location, income, marital status, parental status, sexual orientation and work experiences."

Spearheading efforts on the front lines, the NCAA office of inclusion advances diversity, equity and inclusion in college athletics for over 1,100 member schools and athletics conferences. The office supports student-athletes and individuals who teach and lead about disabilities, international student matters, LGBTQ issues, race/ethnicity and women's issues. The office of inclusion also facilitates programming, provides educational resources, and advocates for diverse, equitable, and inclusive environments that enhance the student-athlete experience and provide opportunities for coaches and administrators.

In addition to the long-standing focus on its commitment to nurturing and encouraging diversity and inclusion through programmatic and educational efforts, the NCAA's inclusion office is supporting, leading and modeling the way for inclusive excellence in the athletics industry guided by the following strategic priorities:

- Perpetuate inclusive excellence.
- Build and enhance a high-performing organization.
- Drive operational excellence.
- Future-proof the industry.
- Execute external engagement.
- Become a national voice in the work.

Below are committees, programs and initiatives that highlight the NCAA's continued commitment to excellence, diversity and inclusion:

NCAA Governance Committees, Task Forces and Working Groups

Board of Governors Committee to Promote Cultural Diversity and Equity

In August 2017, the NCAA Board of Governors unanimously approved the charter and composition for the NCAA Board of Governors Committee to Promote Cultural Diversity and Equity. The committee's charge is to review, en-

dorse and make recommendations regarding diversity and inclusion matters that impact the Association. Specifically, the committee shall review and react to recommendations from the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics and the NCAA Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, receive information and explanations of Association-wide activities, review and react to topics referred to it by the Board of Governors, and provide comment to the Board of Governors on Association-wide matters of interest. In October 2018, the Board of Governors approved the committee's strategic goals, which are being put into action in relation to inclusion in the governance structure, accountability for diversifying athletics leadership, and advancing the Presidential Pledge initiative.

Board of Governors Student-Athlete Engagement Committee

The Student-Athlete Engagement Committee was established by the NCAA Board of Governors in April 2017 to facilitate dialogue within the student-athlete community and to provide student input on Association-wide issues, policies and key initiatives. The committee comprises 11 members: three from each of the divisional Student-Athlete Advisory Committees, one from the Board of Governors and one from the Division I Council or Division II and Division III Management Councils. The committee primarily reviews and reacts to topics referred by the Board of Governors and provides comments to the board on Association-wide areas of interest.

Committee on Women's Athletics

The Committee on Women's Athletics has a mission to provide leadership and assistance to the Association in its efforts to provide equitable opportunities, fair treatment and respect for all women in all aspects of intercollegiate athletics. The committee seeks to expand and promote opportunities for female student-athletes, administrators, coaches and officiating personnel. The committee promotes governance, administration and conduct of intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference and national levels that are inclusive, fair and accessible to women.

Division III LGBTQ Working Group

In 2016, the Division III Management Council endorsed the creation of a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning Working Group. The working group's charge is to examine the current LGBTQ landscape in Division III. Examination and research has led to the creation of

a nondiscrimination policy guide, the OneTeam Program, and the inaugural recognition award program that will honor three recipients of the LGBTQ community and its allies at the 2021 NCAA Convention, as well as increase the engagement and collaboration at the institutional, conference and national levels.

Division III Diversity and Inclusion Working Group

At the 2015 NCAA Convention, the Division III delegates endorsed the creation of a Diversity and Inclusion Working Group. The working group's charge is to assess the current diversity and inclusion landscape within Division III, evaluate current initiatives and propose next steps (for example, resources, new initiatives, policies, etc.) to the membership. To date, this working group has assisted in the development of three new initiatives to diversify the division: Student Immersion; Next Steps and the Senior Woman Administrator Program, as well as creating The Diverse Workforce. This guide is designed to help Division III institutions fulfill their role in recruiting, selecting and retaining a diverse workforce.

Gender Equity Task Force

The NCAA Gender Equity Task Force engages the membership, student-athletes, the governance structure and affiliate organizations in identifying gender equity strategies for goals such as increasing and supporting female student-athlete participation and women in leadership roles in intercollegiate athletics. The task force works closely with NCAA Association-wide membership committees, like the Committee on Women's Athletics, and reports regularly to the NCAA's Board of Governors and the Division I, II and III governance leadership. The NCAA Board of Governors approved the Gender Equity Task Force's recommendations in April 2017. The task force is now partnering with NCAA office of inclusion staff and other membership diversity and inclusion committees to achieve the equity, diversity and inclusion goals outlined in the recommendations.

Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee

The mission of the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee is to champion the causes of ethnic minorities by fostering an inclusive environment, thereby creating a culture that promotes fair and equitable access to opportunities and resources. Formed by the Association in January 1991, the MOIC reviews issues related to the interests and advocacy of student-athletes, coaches and administrators

who are ethnic minorities, are LGBTQ or have disabilities. The committee examines and advocates for NCAA programs and policies that affect and include ethnic minorities, individuals with disabilities and the LGBTQ community.

National Student-Athlete Advisory Committees

The mission of the NCAA Division I, II and III Student-Athlete Advisory Committees is to enhance the total student-athlete experience by promoting opportunity, protecting student-athlete welfare and fostering a positive student-athlete image. The national SAACs are made up of student-athletes from each division, assembled to provide insight on the student-athlete experience. Additionally, the SAACs offer input on the rules, regulations and policies that affect the lives of student-athletes on NCAA member campuses.

NCAA Initiatives

Common Ground

The Common Ground initiative was established in 2014 to provide LGBTQ individuals and individuals of faith at public and private NCAA member institutions, LGBTQ organizations and faith-based organizations an opportunity to discuss commonalities and differences and learn how to work more cohesively within athletics. The main goal of the Common Ground initiative is to foster athletics environments that respect and support the dignity and well-being of student-athletes and those who teach and lead them.

Emerging Sports for Women

The Emerging Sports for Women program was created in 1994 to grow meaningful intercollegiate sport participation opportunities for female student-athletes in sports that have the potential to reach the required number of varsity teams to be considered for NCAA championship status. NCAA legislation allows a National Collegiate Championship or a division championship to be established in an emerging sport if at least 40 NCAA schools sponsor the sport at the varsity level. NCAA schools may use emerging sports to satisfy minimum sports-sponsorship requirements for all divisions and minimal financial aid awards for Divisions I and II. If a school lists an emerging sport on its NCAA sports sponsorship and demographics form, that sport must follow all applicable NCAA rules. Since the Emerging Sports for Women program was established in

1994, five sports have earned NCAA championship status. Currently, there are five emerging sports for women: acrobatics and tumbling (Divisions II and III only), equestrian (Divisions I and II only), rugby, triathlon, and women's wrestling (Divisions II and III only).

Inclusion Forum

The annual NCAA Inclusion Forum brings together intercollegiate athletics leaders, student-athletes and subject matter experts passionate about improving the educational and professional environment for student-athletes, coaches and staff. Sessions engage on a broad range of topics related to research, best practices and policy around disabilities, international student matters, LGBTQ issues, race/ethnicity and women's issues. Programming offers useful knowledge, engaging dialogue and practical takeaways to empower participants' efforts on equity, diversity and inclusion initiatives on their campuses.

NCAA/MOAA Award for Diversity and Inclusion

This annual national award represents a partnership formed by the NCAA and the Minority Opportunities Athletics Association to recognize and celebrate the initiatives, policies and practices of schools and conferences that embrace diversity and inclusion across the intercollegiate athletics community. Nominees are evaluated on their equity, diversity and inclusion efforts in the areas of leadership, infrastructure, evaluation and assessment, education, and collaboration. The award is presented at an Association-wide luncheon at the NCAA Convention. The 2019 winner was the University of Wisconsin-River Falls, and the 2020 winner was the University of Oregon.

Optimizing the Impact of the Senior Woman Administrator

The NCAA office of inclusion is partnering with the Committee on Women's Athletics, the Gender Equity Task Force, and the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee on an initiative to optimize the senior woman administrator designation. The SWA is the highest-ranking female in NCAA athletics departments and conference offices. The purpose of the SWA designation is to promote meaningful representation of women in the leadership and management of college sports. Efforts to optimize the designation are available on ncaa.org and include disseminating the results of a national research study on the SWA, educational resources that provide clarity about the designation and ways to optimize it, video spotlights that feature successful

SWAs, and division-specific best practices guides.

Presidential Pledge and Commitment to Promoting Diversity and Gender Equity in Intercollegiate Athletics

Launched in September 2016, the Presidential Pledge encouraged presidents and chancellors at NCAA member colleges and universities to sign a pledge that commits their schools to achieving ethnic and racial diversity and gender equity in college sports hiring practices. The pledge was developed out of a membership concern for the low representation of racial and ethnic minorities and women in coaching and athletics administration at all levels. To date, close to 78% of all schools and 73% of all conferences (94% of multisport conferences) have pledged their support, including the NCAA Board of Governors, whose 16 presidents and chancellors were among the first signatories. Women Leaders in College Sports also has endorsed the pledge.

Woman of the Year

The NCAA Woman of the Year program was established in 1991 and honors the academic achievements, athletics excellence, community service and leadership of graduating female college athletes from all three divisions. A record 585 female college athletes were nominated by NCAA member schools for the 2019 NCAA Woman of the Year award. Angela Mercurio, a former Nebraska triple jumper who double majored in biochemistry and women's and gender studies, was celebrated as the 2019 NCAA Woman of the Year.

NCAA Professional Development

Basketball Coaches Academy

The NCAA Basketball Coaches Academy provides current, full-time intercollegiate basketball coaches at NCAA member institutions an opportunity to expand their knowledge and insight into the world of intercollegiate basketball coaching. During the academy, selected participants will be trained in a variety of areas that encourage effective coaching at the intercollegiate level, with a focus on the holistic well-being and development of the student-athlete.

Career in Sports Forum

The NCAA Career in Sports Forum is an annual educational forum that brings together more than 200 selected student-athletes for four days to learn and explore potential

careers in sports, with the primary focus on intercollegiate athletics. The forum is designed to assist student-athletes in charting their career paths, to give them the opportunity to network and to learn from current athletics professionals.

Champion Forum

The Champion Forum provides current coaches with a unique and transformative professional development opportunity. Participants gain a realistic view of what it takes to become a head coach at the collegiate level. Throughout the academic year, NCAA leadership development staff execute three iterations of the program: Champion Forum for Football, Champion Forum for Men's Basketball and Champion Forum for Women's Basketball. High-performing, high-potential ethnic minority assistant coaches from these three sports who have been identified as rising stars in the industry will be selected to participate in this immersive educational experience. The Champion Forum will prepare tomorrow's leaders in football and basketball, populating a talented pool of future head coaches primed to influence a vital shift in college athletics.

Dr. Charles Whitcomb Leadership Institute

Dr. Charles Whitcomb Leadership Institute participants, who are ethnic minority men and women, will explore the collegiate athletics community in its entirety as they strategically map and plan their careers. The weeklong institute will provide tailored programming to diversify their network, enhance their professional skills and gain exposure to key stakeholders within college administration.

Emerging Leaders Seminar

The Emerging Leaders Seminar provides transitional educational programming and an overview of the collegiate athletics structure to interns and graduate assistants from NCAA member institutions, conference offices and affiliate organizations. Additionally, this seminar provides individuals with the opportunity to network with industry experts and their peer group.

NCAA and NFL Coaches Academy

The NCAA and NFL Coaches Academy is an opportunity for current, full-time intercollegiate football coaches at NCAA member institutions and former NFL athletes to expand their knowledge and insight into the world of intercollegiate football coaching. During the three-day academy, the NCAA and the NFL educate, and train selected participants in a variety of areas that encourage effective coaching and improve student-athlete well-being at both the inter-

collegiate and professional levels. Topical education and conversation during the academy may include effective communication with campus and community constituents, the importance of building culture focused on the overall success of the student-athletes both on and off the field, budget management of a football program, and coaching strategies and philosophies.

NCAA/Women Leaders in College Sports Women's Leadership Symposium

The NCAA/Women Leaders in College Sports Women's Leadership Symposium is developed for women aspiring to or just beginning a career in intercollegiate athletics. This program aims to enrich participants' skills, expand their professional network and promote the recruitment and retention of women working in intercollegiate athletics administration. This program will ask participants to take an active role in exploring:

- Personal branding.
- Individual strengths and values.
- Resume building.
- Interviewing.
- Goal and vision setting.

NCAA/Women Leaders in College Sports Institute for Administrative Advancement

The Institute for Administrative Advancement is the premier "level one" leadership development program for women in intercollegiate athletics administration. An engaging faculty — including leaders representing all NCAA divisions and pioneers in women's athletics — prepare, empower and inspire participants to become successful administrators and advance within the profession.

NCAA/Women Leaders in College Sports Leadership Enhancement Institute

The Leadership Enhancement Institute is the premier "level two" leadership development program for women in intercollegiate athletics administration. Open to Women Leaders in College Sports members and graduates of the Institute for Administrative Advancement (formerly NACWAA/HERS), LEI provides advanced educational opportunities, professional development and more in-depth training for women athletics administrators.

NCAA/Women Leaders in College Sports Executive Institute

The Executive Institute is an advanced professional development program for women in collegiate athletics administration. Program goals include preparation to become an athletics director or commissioner, connection to search firms and college presidents, and creation of new networks with current athletics directors and commissioners.

NCAA/WeCOACH Women Coaches Academy

The Women Coaches Academy is a four-day educational training available to NCAA coaches of all experience levels. The WCA is designed for women coaches who are ready and willing to increase their individual effectiveness by learning advanced skills and strategies that directly affect their personal and team success. Participants will focus on concepts that are not sport specific in an environment that fosters inclusion across the sports community.

NCAA/WeCOACH Women Coaches Academy 2.0

The Women Coaches Academy 2.0 takes a coach's game to the next level. It builds on the sense of community, the passion and the renewed sense of joy for coaching that participants experienced at the NCAA Women Coaches Academy. The 2.0 version provides a master learning opportunity — in a small class setting — which progresses on the skills, strategies and knowledge gained from the Women Coaches Academy.

Pathway Program

The Pathway Program is designed to elevate those currently in senior-level positions within athletics administration to the next step as a director of athletics or conference commissioner. This program is an intensive, experiential learning opportunity for selected participants equally representing NCAA Divisions I, II and III. This yearlong program provides an opportunity for participants to identify how values fit into their philosophy and execution of leadership within college athletics and higher education. Participants also develop knowledge in areas such as budgeting, strategic planning and fundraising for both their current job responsibilities and for their next role as a director of athletics or conference commissioner. The Pathway Program also looks into the NCAA governance structure, exposes participants to key stakeholders from member institutions and the NCAA, and matches participants with a president and director of athletics who will provide guidance and mentorship.

Postgraduate Internship Program

The NCAA Postgraduate Internship Program provides on-the-job learning experiences annually for 30 college graduates who express an interest in pursuing a career in intercollegiate athletics administration. A yearlong paid program based at the national office in Indianapolis, the NCAA postgraduate internship exposes participants to the inner workings of college sports from the national perspective, one they may eventually share as full-time athletics administrators on campuses and conference offices. Internship positions are offered in the following areas: academic and membership affairs/student-athlete reinstatement, administrative services, championships and alliances, communications, education and community engagement initiatives, the NCAA Eligibility Center, enforcement, governance, inclusion and leadership development.

Student-Athlete Leadership Forum

The NCAA Student-Athlete Leadership Forum provides a diverse and dynamic representation of student-athletes, coaches, and administrators with a transformational opportunity to build a leadership toolkit and develop vital self-awareness that allows them to realize their potential. Participants leave the program with invaluable leadership skills; the experience of exploring the relationship among personal values, core beliefs and behavioral styles; and an understanding of the NCAA, the different divisional perspectives and the valuable role of Student-Athlete Advisory Committees. The Student-Athlete Leadership Forum also creates a close personal support network of like-minded peers to provide continued connection and dialogue after the program concludes.

NCAA Scholarships and Grants**Division II Coaching Enhancement Grant**

This Division II Coaching Enhancement Grant was created to provide financial assistance to the division's member schools that are committed to enhancing ethnic minority and gender representation in newly created assistant coaching positions for any NCAA-sponsored sport. The NCAA grant will fund \$25,000 in the first year, \$15,000 in the second year, and \$8,000 in the third year. Professional development funding of \$1,200 is also provided during the first three years. All applications are reviewed and confirmed by a selection committee of non-NCAA staff.

Division II Ethnic Minorities and Women's Internship Grant Program

The Division II Ethnic Minorities and Women's Internship Grant is designed to provide financial assistance to Division II conferences and member institutions committed to enhancing ethnic minority and gender representation in full-time, entry-level administrative positions. Selected recipients receive one year of grant funds, including \$23,660 to be allocated toward the hired intern's salary and \$3,000 in professional development funding. Recipients also must contribute \$3,700, at minimum, as an in-kind gift to the hired intern as outlined in their proposal.

Division II Strategic Alliance Matching Grant Enhancement Program

The Division II Strategic Alliance Matching Grant Enhancement Program provides funding for the creation of new, or the enhancement of current, full-time, senior-level administrative positions at Division II institutions and conference offices to encourage access, recruitment, selection and long-term success of ethnic minorities and women. The grant will fund 75% of the grant request in the first year, 50% in the second year and 25% in the third year.

Division III Coaching Enhancement Grant

Established in 2019, the Division III Coaching Enhancement Grant was created to provide financial assistance to the division's member schools that are committed to enhancing ethnic minority and gender representation in newly created assistant coaching positions for any NCAA-sponsored sport during a two-year commitment. The grant provides a \$7,500 annual salary and \$1,500 professional development funding. The next grant cycle for the Division III Coaching Enhancement Grant will open in fall of 2020. All applications are reviewed and confirmed by a selection committee of non-NCAA staff.

Division III Ethnic Minorities and Women's Internship Grant Program

The Division III Ethnic Minorities and Women's Internship Grant Program was founded to assist in enhancing diversity and inclusion within Division III athletics administrative staffs. The internship grant is a \$23,660 grant designated for a Division III institution to hire a 10-month full-time individual, give that person the opportunity for learning in administration and coaching, with NCAA member institutions or conference offices providing administrative supervision and mentorship throughout the

program. Assistant coaching responsibilities are allowed, including strength and conditioning, but the percentage of time focused on assistant coaching should be realistic but be no more than 50% of the outlined job responsibilities.

Division III Strategic Alliance Matching Grant

The Division III Strategic Alliance Matching Grant is a five-year grant program that provides funding for mid- to senior-level administrative positions at Division III institutions and conference offices to encourage access, recruitment, selection and the long-term success of ethnic minorities and women. The grant will fund 75% of the grant request in the first year, 50% in the second year and 25% in the third year. Assistant coaching responsibilities are allowed but should be limited in nature. No head coaching responsibilities are allowed for positions funded by the grant.

Ethnic Minority and Women's Enhancement Graduate Scholarship

The Ethnic Minority and Women's Enhancement Graduate Scholarship was developed by the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics and the NCAA Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee to increase the pool of and opportunities for qualified minority and female candidates in intercollegiate athletics through graduate scholarships. The NCAA awards \$10,000 to 13 ethnic minorities and 13 female college graduates who will be entering their initial year of graduate studies. The applicant must be seeking admission or have been accepted into a sports administration program or other graduate program that will help the applicant obtain a career in intercollegiate athletics, such as athletics administrator, coach, athletic trainer or a career that provides a direct service to intercollegiate athletics.

Jim McKay Graduate Scholarship

The NCAA established the Jim McKay Graduate Scholarship to recognize the immense contributions and legacy of pioneer sports journalist Jim McKay. Annually, one male and one female student or student-athlete will be awarded a one-time \$10,000 Jim McKay scholarship in recognition of outstanding academic achievement and their potential to make a major contribution to the sports communication industry or public relations. McKay scholars will be recognized as having a unique aptitude and commitment to the communications field while displaying the highest level of professional integrity, including the principles of truthfulness, accuracy, objectivity, impartiality, fairness

and public accountability, with the element of compassion that so infused McKay's long and storied career. While McKay scholars do not need a major in communications or journalism, they should demonstrate achievement in sport communication or public relations or at least show an interest in contributing to the field.

Postgraduate Scholarship

The NCAA awards up to 126 Postgraduate Scholarships annually. The scholarships are awarded to student-athletes who excel academically and athletically and who have completed or are at least in their final year of intercollegiate athletics competition. The one-time nonrenewable scholarships of \$10,000 are awarded three times a year corresponding to each sport season (fall, winter and spring). Each sports season there are 21 scholarships available for men and 21 scholarships available for women for use in an accredited graduate program. All former student-athletes who earned an undergraduate degree from an NCAA member school are eligible to be nominated by that school for an NCAA graduate degree scholarship, regardless of when they received their undergraduate degree.

Walter Byers Graduate Scholarship

The NCAA established the Walter Byers Graduate Scholarship as a means of recognizing the contributions of the former NCAA executive director through encouraging excellence in academic performance by student-athletes. Annually, one male and one female student-athlete are awarded the \$24,000 scholarship in recognition of outstanding academic achievement and potential for success in graduate study. It is intended that an individual named a Byers Scholar will be recognized as one who has combined the best elements of mind and body to achieve national distinction and who promises to be a future leader in the individual's chosen field of career service.

Appendix II

NCAA DIVISION I, II, AND III COMPARATIVES

Not all of the below grades are used in the calculation of the final grades. These are provided for comparative analysis only. The only sections that are included in the final grade are the measures of Division II and III Student-Athletes. As in all cases regarding employment in college athletics, the data reported on associate and assistant athletics directors, senior woman administrators and faculty athletics representatives excludes HBCUs.

Student Athletes

According to the NCAA, 44.2 percent of all NCAA Division I, II, and III student-athletes combined are female and 55.8 percent are male.

Total White Male Student Athletes

The percentage of white male student-athletes participating at the Divisions I, II, and III levels combined, decreased from 62.7 percent in 2017-2018 to 62.0 percent in 2018-2019.

In the 2018-2019 year, white male student-athletes comprised 54.5, 56.7, and 71.2 percent of all male student-athletes, in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

In the 2017-2018 year, white male student-athletes comprised 55.6, 57.7 and 71.4 percent of all male student-athletes in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

Total Male Student Athletes of Color

In the 2018-2019 year, the percentage of African-American male student-athletes was 18.1 percent; 6.1 percent were Hispanics/Latinos, 1.6 percent were Asian, 0.4 percent were Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 0.4 percent were American Indian or Alaskan Native, 4.2 percent were males of Two or More Races, 4.1 percent were Non-Resident Aliens, and 3.2 percent identified as Other.

In the 2017-2018 year, the percentage of African-American male student-athletes was 18.0 percent; 6.0 percent

were Hispanics/Latinos, 0.4 percent were American Indian or Alaskan Native, 3.9 percent were males of Two or More Races, 3.9 percent were Non-Resident Aliens, and 3.2 percent identified as Other.

During the 2018-2019 year, African-American male student-athletes comprised 23.4, 20.2 percent and 12.7 percent of all male student-athletes in Divisions I, II and III, respectively. Hispanics/Latinos were 5.1 percent, 7.3 percent and 6.2 percent, respectively. Asians were 1.4 percent, 0.9 percent and 2.1 percent, respectively. American Indian and Alaskan Natives were 0.3 percent, 0.6 percent and 0.2 percent, respectively. Hawaiian or Pacific Islanders were 0.6 percent, 0.4 percent and 0.2 percent, respectively. Male student-athletes of Two or More Races were 5.1 percent, 4.4 percent and 3.3 percent, respectively. Non-Resident Aliens were 5.9 percent, 6.4 percent and 1.3 percent of all male student-athletes, respectively. Those identifying as other were 3.7 percent, 3.2 percent, and 2.8 percent, respectively.

Total White Female Student Athletes

The percentage of white female student-athletes participating at the Divisions I, II, and III levels combined decreased from 70.9 percent in 2017-2018 to 70.2 percent in 2018-2019.

In the 2018-2019 year, white female student-athletes comprised 63.3, 67.8 and 78.5 percent of all female student-athletes in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

In the 2017-2018 year, white female student-athletes comprised 64.1, 68.8 and 79.1 percent of all female student-athletes in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

Total Female Student Athletes of Color

In the 2018-2019 year, the percentage of African-American female student-athletes in all three divisions combined was 9.3 percent; 5.8 percent were Hispanic/Latina, 2.2 percent were Asian, 0.3 percent were Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 0.4 percent were American Indian or Alaskan Native, 4.4 percent were females of Two or More Races, 4.3 percent were Non-Resident Aliens, and 3.1 percent identified as Other.

In the 2017-2018 year, the percentage of African-American female student-athletes in all three divisions combined was 9.4 percent; 5.5 percent were Hispanic/Latina, 2.6 percent were Asian/Pacific Islander, 0.4 percent were American In-

dian or Alaskan Native, 4.1 percent were females of Two or More Races, 4.1 percent were Non-Resident Aliens, and 3.1 percent were Other.

During the 2018-2019 year, African-American female student-athletes comprised 12.2 percent, 10.0 percent and 5.9 percent of all female student-athletes in Divisions I, II and III, respectively. Hispanics/Latinas were 5.4 percent, 7.3 percent and 5.5 percent. Asians comprised 2.1 percent, 1.4 percent and 2.9 percent. Hawaiian or Pacific Islanders were 0.4 percent, 0.5 percent and 0.1 percent, respectively. American Indians or Alaskan Natives were 0.4 percent, 0.6 percent and 0.3 percent. Female student-athletes of Two or More Races were 5.4 percent, 4.3 percent and 3.4 percent. Non-Resident Aliens were 7.2 percent, 5.1 percent and 0.8 percent. Finally, those identifying as Other were 3.6, 3.0, and 2.6 of all female student-athletes, respectively.

Head Coaches*

Men's Teams (Race)

In 2018-2019, whites still dominate the head coaching positions, holding 85.0 percent, 86.9 percent, and 91.1 percent of the positions within men's sports in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Opportunities for African-Americans as head coaches continued to be poor in 2018-2019. African-Americans held 9.1 percent, 5.7 percent, and 5.0 percent of the men's head coaching positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Comparing those figures to 2017-2018, African-Americans coaching men's teams increased by 1.0 percentage point in Division I, increased by 1.1 percentage point in Division II and increased by 0.8 percentage point in Division III. Hispanics/Latinos held 1.9 percent, 3.0 percent, and 1.8 percent of head coaching positions for men's teams in the respective divisions during 2018-2019. Comparing those figures to 2017-2018, Hispanics/Latinos coaching men's teams stayed the same in Division I, increased by 0.1 percentage point in Division II, and increased by 0.1 percentage point in Division III. Asians held 0.6 percent, 0.9 percent, and 0.5 percent of the head coaching positions for men's teams in the respective divisions. American Indian and Alaskan Native representation was again minimal. These figures accounted for male and female head coaches of men's teams.

Men's Teams (Gender)

The percentage of female head coaches of men's teams was 4.0, 4.1 and 6.9 percent in the respective divisions. While there was an increase in Divisions II and III, compared to the 2017-2018 dataset, the increases were minimal.

Women's Teams (Gender)

In 2018-2019, women held 40.6 percent of head coaching positions at the Division I level for women's sports, while they only held 4.0 percent of the head coaching positions at the Division I level for men's sports. In Division II, women comprised 36.3 percent of the head coaches of women's teams and only 4.1 percent of the head coaching positions for men's teams. At the Division III level, women made up 44.5 percent of all head coaches for women's teams and only 6.9 percent of the head coaching positions for men's teams. Overall, women held 41.2 percent of the head coaching positions for women's sports for all three divisions combined. All these percentages either match or set the highest recorded marks in the report's history. However, they are all reflective of how far women have to go to achieve equality under Title IX 47 years after its adoption.

Women's Teams (Race)

Whites also dominated the head coaching positions in women's sports in Division I overall, holding 83.2 percent of head coaching positions, 85.5 percent in Division II, and 91.2 percent in Division III. Compared to 2017-2018, there was a 1.8 percentage point decrease in representation for Division I, a 0.1 percentage point decrease in Division II, and an increase of 0.3 percentage points in Division III.

In 2018-2019, African-Americans held 8.3 percent, 6.2 percent, and 4.6 percent of the women's head coaching positions in the three NCAA divisions, respectively (7.3 percent, 5.5 percent, and 4.9 percent in 2017-2018). Hispanics/Latinas held 2.4 percent, 3.2 percent, and 1.9 percent of head coaching positions for women's teams in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively (2.13 percent, 2.9 percent, and 1.9 percent in 2017-2018). Asians held 1.5, 1.1, and 0.9 percent of head coaching positions for women's teams in the respective divisions. Hawaiians or Pacific Islanders held 0.5 percent, 0.2 percent and 0.2 percent, respectively. American Indian and Alaskan Native representation was again minimal with 0.3 percent in Division I, 0.1 percent in Division II, and 0.1 percent in Division III. These figures accounted for male and female head coaches of women's teams.

** It is important to note the NCAA data represents demographics by position, not in sum. There is potential for double counting race or people of color in some instances.*

See Tables 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Assistant Coaches*

Men's Teams (Race)

In 2018-2019, whites held 69.4 percent, 71.5 percent, and 83.0 percent of the assistant coach positions on men's teams in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. This compared to 2017-2018 when whites held 70.3 percent, 72.3 percent, and 85.1 percent. African-American assistant coaches for men's teams across the three divisions held 21.0 percent, 15.2 percent, and 10.2 percent of the positions, respectively. This compared to 2017-2018 when African-Americans held 17.9 percent, 12.7 percent, and 8.6 percent. Hispanic/Latino assistant coaches for men's teams across the three divisions held 2.0 percent, 4.6 percent, and 2.7 percent of the positions, respectively, compared to 2017-2018 when they held 1.9 percent, 4.2 percent, and 2.7 percent. In 2018-2019, Asians held 0.8 percent, 0.8 percent, and 1.2 percent of the total assistant coaching positions, respectively. Hawaiian or Pacific Islanders held 0.5 percent, 0.2 percent and 0.1 percent, respectively. American Indian or Alaskan Natives held 0.1 percent, 0.0 percent, and 0.1 percent, respectively.

Men's Teams (Gender)

Among the men's teams in 2018-2019, women held 9.4 percent, 9.9 percent, and 11.6 percent of the assistant coach positions, respectively, in Divisions I, II, and III. In 2017-2018, women held 8.6 percent, 10.6 percent, and 12.2 percent. There was a slight increase in Division I and a decrease in Divisions II and III.

Women's Teams (Race)

Among the women's teams during 2018-2019, whites held 72.6 percent, 73.2 percent, and 85.8 percent of the assistant coach positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively, compared to 72.5 percent, 74.0 percent, and 85.7 percent in 2017-2018. African-Americans held 14.8 percent, 11.3 percent, and 7.5 percent of the women's assistant coach positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Hispanics/Latinas held 2.7 percent, 4.9 percent, and 2.4 percent of the assistant coach positions within women's sports in Di-

visions I, II, and III, respectively. Asians held 1.6 percent, 1.2 percent, and 1.5 percent, respectively. In 2018-2019, American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 0.1 percent, 0.2 percent, and 0.2 percent of assistant coach positions within women's sports in the three divisions, respectively. Hawaiian or Pacific Islanders held 0.3 percent, 0.5 percent and 0.1 percent, respectively.

Women's Teams (Gender)

The percentage of women assistant coaches in women's sports increased in Division I and II, but decreased in Division III. In Divisions I and II, it increased from 46.1 percent and 49.5 percent in 2017-2018, to 46.8 percent and 49.8 percent in 2018-2019. In Division III, it decreased from 52.4 percent to 52.1 percent.

** It is important to note the NCAA data represents demographics by position, not in sum. There is potential for double counting race or people of color in some instances.*

Athletics Directors, Associate Athletics Directors* and Assistant Athletics Directors*

Athletics Directors (Race)

In Division I in 2018-2019, excluding HBCUs, whites held 84.5 percent of the athletics director positions, which increased slightly from the 84.3 percent in 2017-2018. African-Americans held 8.8 percent of the athletics director positions in 2018-2019, which was also a slight increase from the 8.7 percent in 2017-2018. Hispanics/Latinos held 2.7 percent of the positions, which decreased from 3.0 percent in 2017-2018. Asians held 0.3 percent of the athletic director positions in Division I. American Indians or Alaskan Natives and Hawaiian or Pacific Islanders held none of the positions in 2018-2019.

In Division II, excluding HBCUs, whites held 89.8 percent of the athletics director jobs in 2018-2019, which was a slight decrease from the 90.0 percent that was reported in 2017-2018. The percentage of white males was 74.0 percent in 2018-2019, which was an increase from 73.4 percent in 2017-2018. African-Americans increased from 4.1 percent in 2017-2018 to 5.3 percent in 2018-2019. Hispanics/Latinos held 2.5 percent of the athletics director positions, a decrease from 3.1 percent in 2017-2018.

Division III had the worst record for racial diversity in the

position of athletics director. African-Americans held 4.9 percent of the athletics director positions, Hispanics/Latinos held 1.5 percent, while less than one percent were held by Asians, American Indians or Alaskan Native, and those classified as Two or More Races.

Athletics Directors (Gender)

While the percent of women athletics directors in Division I increased from 10.5 percent to 13.6 percent in 2018-2019, women remained seriously underrepresented in the athletics director position this year.

White women made up 10.9 percent, while Hispanics/Latinas represented 0.6 percent, Asians represented 0.3 percent, and African-Americans represented 1.2 percent of the athletics director positions within Division I. Those of Two or More Races represented 0.6 percent of women athletics directors, up from 0.3 percent the previous year. There were no women athletics directors reported in 2018-2019 who were American Indian or Alaskan Native or those classified as Other.

Women held 17.5 percent of the Division II athletics director positions, which was a decrease from 18.3 percent in 2017-2018. White women held 15.8 percent of these positions, which was a decrease from 16.6 percent. There was an increase in African-American women from 0.7 percent to 1.1 percent. There were no Hispanic/Latina, Asian, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and American Indian or Alaskan Native women serving in Division II athletics director positions in 2018-2019. Those identifying as Non-Resident Alien and Two or More Races together held less than 1 percent of women of athletic director positions in 2018-19 in Division II.

Division III offers women the greatest opportunity at the athletics director level. Women held 31.7 percent of the athletics director positions, an increase of 0.6 percentage points from 2017-2018. Among the female athletics directors, white women held 29.4 percent, while African-American women held 1.8 percent and Hispanics/Latinas held 0.4 percent.

Associate Athletics Director (Race)

There was a slight improvement for people of color in Divisions I, II, and III at the associate athletics director position. In 2018-2019, African-Americans held 9.5 percent, 5.8 percent, and 4.9 percent of the associate athletics director positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

This compared to last year's 9.5 percent, 6.5 percent, and 4.7 percent, respectively. Hispanics/Latinos held 2.1 percent, 2.5 percent, and 0.5 percent of the associate athletics director positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively which compared to last year's 1.9 percent, 1.1 percent and 1.1 percent, respectively. Asians held 0.9 percent, 0.8 percent, and 0.3 percent in Divisions I, II, and III in 2018-2019.

In 2018-2019 American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 0.9 percent in Division I, 0.6 percent in Division II and had 0.5 percent of these positions in Division III. In 2018-2019, associate athletics directors classified as Two or More Races held 0.6 percent, 1.4 percent and 1.1 percent of the positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. This compared to 2017-2018 when they held 0.8 percent, 1.8 percent and 1.1 percent, respectively. In 2018-2019, those identifying as Other held 1.5 percent in Division I, 0.3 percent in Division II, and 0.3 percent in Division III which compared to 2017-2018 when they held 1.1 for Division I, 0.5 percent for Division II and 0.3 percent for Division III.

Associate Athletics Director (Gender)

In 2018-2019, women gained representation as associate athletics directors in Divisions I. In Division I, women occupied 32.3 percent of the positions in 2018-2019, which was an increase from 31.4 percent in 2017-2018. In Division II, women saw a slight decrease as they held 39.8 percent of the associate athletics director positions in 2018-2019 compared to 40.9 percent in 2017-2018. There was a decrease in Division III where women occupied 50.5 percent of the associate athletics director positions in 2018-2019 compared to 51.3 percent in 2017-2018.

Assistant Athletics Director (Race)

At the assistant athletics director position in 2018-2019, representation increased or stayed the same for people of color in all three divisions. African-Americans held 9.3 percent, 5.4 percent and 5.1 percent of the assistant athletics director positions in 2018-2019 for Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. This was compared to 2017-2018 when African-Americans held 8.8 percent of the assistant athletics director positions in Division I, 5.4 percent in Division II, and 4.9 percent in Division III. Hispanics/Latinos held 3.0 percent, 3.2 percent, and 1.0 percent of the assistant athletics director positions in 2018-2019 for Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. This was compared to 2017-2018 when they held 2.8 percent of the assistant athletics director positions in Division I, 3.1 percent in Division II, and 1.6 percent in Division III. In 2018-2019 Asians held 1.5 percent,

1.6 percent, 0.5 percent of the positions at each level. In 2018-2019, American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 0.2 percent, 0.4 percent and 0.2 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. In 2018-2019 assistant athletics directors classified as Two or More Races held 1.0 percent, 1.8 percent, and 0.5 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. This was compared to the statistics from 2017-2018 when assistant athletics directors classified as Two or More Races held 1.4 percent in Division I, 1.6 percent in Division II, and 0.7 percent in Division III. In 2018-2019, those identifying as Other held 2.0 percent, 1.0 percent, and 0.7 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. This compared to 2017-2018 when they held 1.6 percent of assistant athletics director positions in Division I, 1.2 percent in Division II, and 0.2 percent in Division III.

Assistant Athletics Director (Gender)

In 2018-2019, there was an increase in Division II and III in the representation of women at the assistant athletics director position, while there was a slight decrease in Division I. Women occupied 31.0 percent of the assistant athletics directors in Division I, 37.1 percent in Division II, and 40.4 percent in Division III. This compared to 2017-2018 when women occupied 31.2 percent in Division I, 36.3 percent in Division II, and 39.0 percent in Division III.

Associate and Assistant Athletics Director (Gender)

In Division I, the gender breakdown was similar between associate and assistant athletics directors. Associate athletics directors were 67.7 percent male and 32.3 percent female in Division I and assistant athletics directors were 69.0 percent male and 31.0 percent female in Division I in 2018-2019. This compared to 2017-2018 when associate athletics directors were 68.6 percent male and 31.4 percent female in Division I and assistant athletics directors were 68.8 percent male and 31.2 percent female in Division I.

In Division II, associate athletics directors were 59.2 percent male and 39.8 percent female and assistant athletics directors were 62.9 percent male and 37.1 percent female in 2018-2019. This compared to 2017-2018 when associate athletics directors were 59.1 percent male and 40.9 percent female and assistant athletics directors were 63.7 percent male and 36.3 percent female in Division II.

At the Division III level in the associate athletics director position, men held 49.5 percent and females held 50.5 percent of the positions. For the assistant athletics director po-

sition, males held 59.6 percent and females held 40.4 percent in 2018-2019. This is comparable to 2017-2018 when the associate athletics director position was comprised of 48.7 percent males and 51.3 percent females and assistant athletics directors were 61.0 percent male and 39.0 percent female in Division III.

Senior Woman Administrators?

The senior woman administrator (SWA) is a significant position within an athletic department. White women continued to dominate the position in 2018-2019 with 80.0 percent, 86.9 percent, and 91.1 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. However, this was a decrease in Division I from 2017-2018 when they held 81.3 percent, 86.8 percent, and 90.8 percent respectively. Even with the improvement, the racial diversity of the SWA position continued to be very low.

In Division I, African-American women held 14.5 percent of the SWA positions, Asian women held 0.9 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held 2.5 percent, and women classified as Two or More Races women held 1.2 percent. Women classified as Other held 0.3 percent of these positions. Overall, women of color occupied 20.0 percent of the SWA positions in 2018-2019 within Division I. This compared to 2017-2018 when African-American women held 14.0 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held 2.2 percent, and American Indian and Alaskan Native women held 0.3 percent. Women classified as Two or More Races held 0.6 percent while those identifying as Other held 0.3 percent and Non-Resident Aliens held zero percent.

The senior woman administrator position was even less diverse at the Division II level. African-American women held 7.1 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held 2.1 percent, and Asian accounted for 0.7 percent of these positions. Hawaiian or Pacific Islander women held 0.4 percent, and American Indian and Alaska Native held 0.4 percent. Women classified as Two or More Races held 1.8 percent, Other held 0.4 percent, and Non-Resident Alien held 0.4 percent. Women of color overall occupied 13.1 percent of the SWA positions in 2018-2019 within Division II. This compared to 2017-2018 when African-American women held 7.1 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held 1.7 percent, women classified as Two or More Races held 1.4 percent, those identifying as Other held 0.7 percent, and Non-Resident Aliens held 0.3 percent.

In Division III, the senior woman administrator position was the least diverse of all three divisions. African-American

women held 4.6 percent, Hispanic/Latina women held 1.6 percent, Asian women held 0.7 percent, American Indian and Alaskan Natives held 0.9 percent, women classified as Two or More Races held 0.9 percent, and women classified as Other held 0.5 percent. Females of color occupied an overall 8.9 percent of the SWA positions in 2018-2019 within Division III. This compared to 2017-2018 when African-American women held 4.8 percent, Hispanic/Latina women held 2.1 percent, women classified as Two or More Races held 0.9 percent, and women classified as Other held 0.7 percent. American Indian and Alaskan Native women held 0.2 percent, respectively.

Faculty Athletics Representatives

For the FAR positions in 2018-2019, whites held 87.7 percent, 91.6 percent, and 93.4 percent at Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. In 2017-2018, the percentages were 87.8 percent, 92.0 percent, and 93.4 percent. The racial diversity of the FAR position continued to be minimal. In 2018-2019, African-Americans held 7.5 percent, 3.5 percent, and 2.6 percent of the FAR positions at Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. For the 2017-2018 report, African-Americans represented 8.1 percent, 3.1 percent, and 3.4 percent for Divisions I, II, and III. Hispanics/Latinos held 1.7 percent, 1.8 percent, and 0.8 percent of the FAR positions at Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Asians held 0.9 percent, 1.1 percent, and 1.2 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. American Indians and Alaskan Natives held 0.3 percent in Division I, zero percent in Division II, and 0.4 percent in Division III. FARs classified as Two or More Races held 0.6 percent in Division I, 0.7 percent in Division II, and zero percent in Division III. Those classified as Other held 0.9 percent, 1.1 percent, and 1.4 percent in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

In 2018-2019 women held 33.5 percent, 29.3 percent, and 38.4 percent of the FAR positions. This compared to 2017-2018 when women held 34.2 percent of the FAR positions in Division I, 30.0 percent in Division II, and 37.9 percent in Division III. White women held the greatest percentage of these positions with 29.5 percent, 27.6 percent, and 36.2 percent in Division I, II, and III, respectively.

In Division I, African-American women held 2.3 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held 0.3 percent, Asian women held 0.3 percent, American Indian and Alaskan Natives held 0.3 percent, and women identifying as Two or More Races held 0.3 percent of FAR positions. Women identifying as

Other held 0.6 percent.

In Division II, African-American women held 0.7 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held zero percent, Asian women held 0.7 percent, while American Indian and Alaskan Native women, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander women, and those classified as Two or More Races had no representation. Those classified as Other held 0.4 percent of positions.

In Division III, African-American women held 0.8 percent, Hispanics/Latinas held zero percent, Asian women held 0.6 percent, those who were classified as Other held 0.6 percent, Non-Resident Aliens held zero percent, and American Indian and Alaskan Native women held 0.2 percent of FAR positions.

Sports Information Directors

Not all the below grades are used in the calculation of the final grades. These are provided for comparative analysis only.

The Sports Information Director plays a critical role in directing the media's attention to student-athletes, coaches and teams.

The sports information director position was one of the least diverse positions in all of college sport. In 2018-2019 it was 92.3, 90.3, and 95.8 percent white in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. This did not change much from 2017-2018 when it was 91.4, 90.6, and 95.8 percent white in Division I, II, and III. This is very important because the sports information director is usually the key decision maker in what and who is publicized among coaches and student-athletes.

The sports information director position in Division I athletics was 92.3 percent white, 3.3 percent African-American, 1.5 percent Asian, 1.4 percent Hispanic/Latino, 0.2 percent Two or More Races, 0.3 Non-Resident Alien, and 1.0 percent Other.

Division II consisted of 90.3 percent whites, 1.9 percent African-Americans, 1.6 percent Asians 1.6 percent Hispanics/Latinos, 1.3 percent American Indian and Alaskan Natives, 1.2 percent Two or More Races, 1.3 percent Non-Resident Aliens, and 0.6 percent Other.

Division III was 95.8 percent white, 2.0 percent Afri-

can-American, zero percent American Indian and Alaskan Native, 0.2 percent Asian, 0.8 percent Hispanic/Latino, 0.7 percent Two or More Races, 0.4 percent Other, and Non-Resident Aliens were not represented.

Women held 15.0, 7.6, and 12.8 percent of the sports information director positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively.

Professional Administrators

Not all the below grades are used in the calculation of the final grades. These are provided for comparative analysis only.

This category includes a wide range of job descriptions. At NCAA member institutions, jobs that fit in this category are academic advisor/counselor, compliance coordinator/officer, sports information director and assistant directors, strength coaches, life skills coordinators, and managers for business, equipment, fundraiser/development, facilities, promotions/marketing and tickets. As in all cases regarding employment in college athletics, the data reported in this section excludes HBCUs. These positions are often starting points from which many people rise to higher level positions within a university or athletic department.

This report shows opportunities for women serving in professional administration positions have decreased across all three divisions. In 2018-2019 women accounted for 35.3 percent, 34.0 percent, and 35.9 percent of all professional administration positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. The percentage of people of color filling these positions increased in Divisions I and III, but decreased in Division II.

In 2018-2019 whites continued to dominate the professional administration category by holding 80.2 percent, 84.6 percent, and 91.0 percent of all professional administration positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. In 2018-2019 whites held 81.5 percent, 84.3 percent, and 91.4 percent of the professional administration in Divisions I, II, III, respectively.

African-Americans held 10.0 percent, 6.5 percent, and 4.9 percent of all professional administration positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. Hispanics/Latinos held 2.5 percent, 3.4 percent, and 1.6 percent of positions for all professional administration positions in Divisions I, II,

and III, respectively. Asians held 1.4 percent, 1.3 percent, and 0.7 percent of all professional administration positions in Divisions I, II, and III, respectively. American Indian and Alaskan Native representation was minimal, with 0.2 percent, 0.7 percent and 0.1 percent in each division, respectively.

Women were especially well represented in the positions of academic advisor/counselor, life skills coordinator, business manager, and compliance coordinator/officer. In the academic advisor/counselor position, women held 65.2 percent of the positions at Division I institutions. Within the life skills coordinator position, women held 70.5 percent of the positions at Division I institutions. In the business manager position, women held 58.3 percent of the positions at Division I institutions. The compliance coordinator/officer also had a strong representation of women at the Division I level holding 49.8 percent of the positions.

Appendix III

NCAA DATA TABLES

NCAA Executive/Senior/Vice Presidents									
	%	#		%	#		%	#	
2018	White	64.4%	13	White	70.0%	12	Black or African American	31.6%	6
	Hispanic or Latino	0.0%	0		African American	29.4%	6		Latino
	Asian	0.0%	0		Latino	0.0%	0		Asian
	Hispanic or Pac. Islander	0.0%	0		Asian	0.0%	0		Hispanic or Pac. Islander
	Am. Indian or Alaska Nativ.	0.0%	0		Other	0.0%	0		Am. Indian or Alaska Nativ.
	Two or More Races	0.0%	0		Women	17.6%	3		Two or More Races
	Other	0.0%	0		Total	17.6%	3		Other
	Total	64.4%	13		Total	64.4%	13		Total
2017	White	59.6%	12	White	63.7%	13	Black or African American	29.4%	6
	African American	24.4%	5		African American	18.7%	3		Latino
	Latino	0.0%	0		Latino	0.0%	0		Asian
	Asian	0.0%	0		Asian	0.0%	0		Hispanic or Pac. Islander
	Other	0.0%	0		Other	0.0%	0		Am. Indian or Alaska Nativ.
	Women	22.2%	4		Women	22.2%	4		Two or More Races
	Total	59.6%	12		Total	59.6%	12		Other
2016	White	75.0%	12	White	81.3%	13	Black or African American	21.0%	4
	African American	21.0%	4		African American	18.7%	3		Latino
	Latino	0.0%	0		Latino	0.0%	0		Asian
	Asian	0.0%	0		Asian	0.0%	0		Hispanic or Pac. Islander
	Other	0.0%	0		Other	0.0%	0		Am. Indian or Alaska Nativ.
	Women	21.3%	4		Women	21.3%	4		Two or More Races
	Total	75.0%	12		Total	75.0%	12		Other
2015	White	75.0%	12	White	81.4%	14	Black or African American	21.0%	4
	African American	21.0%	4		African American	18.8%	3		Latino
	Latino	0.0%	0		Latino	0.0%	0		Asian
	Asian	0.0%	0		Asian	0.0%	0		Hispanic or Pac. Islander
	Other	0.0%	0		Other	0.0%	0		Am. Indian or Alaska Nativ.
	Women	21.3%	4		Women	21.3%	4		Two or More Races
	Total	75.0%	12		Total	75.0%	12		Other
2014	White	76.9%	13	White	81.7%	13	Black or African American	21.0%	4
	African American	21.0%	4		African American	18.8%	3		Latino
	Latino	0.0%	0		Latino	0.0%	0		Asian
	Asian	0.0%	0		Asian	0.0%	0		Hispanic or Pac. Islander
	Other	0.0%	0		Other	0.0%	0		Am. Indian or Alaska Nativ.
	Women	21.3%	4		Women	21.3%	4		Two or More Races
	Total	76.9%	13		Total	76.9%	13		Other
2013	White	77.8%	14	White	81.0%	13	Black or African American	22.2%	4
	African American	22.2%	4		African American	19.0%	3		Latino
	Latino	0.0%	0		Latino	0.0%	0		Asian
	Asian	0.0%	0		Asian	0.0%	0		Hispanic or Pac. Islander
	Other	0.0%	0		Other	0.0%	0		Am. Indian or Alaska Nativ.
	Women	22.2%	4		Women	22.2%	4		Two or More Races
	Total	77.8%	14		Total	77.8%	14		Other
2012	White	71.7%	14	White	80.7%	14	Black or African American	26.3%	5
	African American	26.3%	5		African American	18.7%	3		Latino
	Latino	0.0%	0		Latino	0.0%	0		Asian
	Asian	0.0%	0		Asian	0.0%	0		Hispanic or Pac. Islander
	Other	0.0%	0		Other	0.0%	0		Am. Indian or Alaska Nativ.
	Women	21.3%	4		Women	21.3%	4		Two or More Races
	Total	71.7%	14		Total	71.7%	14		Other
2011	White	76.3%	13	White	81.2%	13	Black or African American	23.0%	4
	African American	23.0%	4		African American	18.8%	3		Latino
	Latino	0.0%	0		Latino	0.0%	0		Asian
	Asian	0.0%	0		Asian	0.0%	0		Hispanic or Pac. Islander
	Other	0.0%	0		Other	0.0%	0		Am. Indian or Alaska Nativ.
	Women	21.3%	4		Women	21.3%	4		Two or More Races
	Total	76.3%	13		Total	76.3%	13		Other

*1999, 2001, 2003, 2005 data not recorded
 **% Data provided by the NCAA

TABLE 1

NCAA Managing Directors/Directors					
	%	#		%	#
2019			2018		
White	77.8%	81	White	75.1%	58
Black or African American	18.3%	19	African American	15.7%	12
Hispanic or Latino	3.0%	3	Latino	2.8%	2
Asian	2.8%	3	Asian	2.8%	2
Native or Pac. Islander	0.0%	0	Other	1.4%	1
Am. Indian or Alaska Native	0.0%	0	Women	54.4%	32
Two or More Races	0.0%	0	Total	x	72
Other	0.0%	0			
Total	x	104			
White	80.0%	87			
2017			2016		
White	80.7%	71	White	75.1%	52
African American	15.9%	14	African American	17.1%	12
Latino	1.1%	1	Latino	4.3%	3
Asian	2.3%	2	Asian	4.6%	3
Other	0.0%	0	Other	1.4%	1
Women	41.7%	43	Women	41.4%	32
Total	x	88	Total	x	70
2015			2014		
White	80.7%	71	White	76.5%	52
African American	15.9%	14	African American	16.2%	11
Latino	1.1%	1	Latino	2.9%	2
Asian	2.3%	2	Asian	4.0%	3
Other	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0
Women	41.7%	43	Women	41.1%	28
Total	x	88	Total	x	69
2013			2012		
White	81.1%	79	White	77.4%	68
African American	14.6%	13	African American	14.6%	9
Latino	1.1%	1	Latino	1.8%	1
Asian	1.1%	1	Asian	4.8%	3
Other	0.0%	0	Other	0.8%	1
Women	48.1%	41	Women	41.5%	28
Total	x	95	Total	x	84
2011			2010		
White	81.2%	89	White	75.9%	64
African American	16.8%	14	African American	19.0%	11
Latino	1.2%	1	Latino	1.7%	1
Asian	1.2%	1	Asian	3.4%	2
Other	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0
Women	44.7%	39	Women	41.4%	24
Total	x	93	Total	x	64
2009			2008		
White	81.9%	88	White	81.5%	59
African American	15.7%	13	African American	12.5%	5
Latino	1.2%	1	Latino	2.0%	1
Asian	1.2%	1	Asian	4.0%	2
Other	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0
Women	44.6%	37	Women	48.0%	20
Total	x	93	Total	x	41
2007			2006		
White	82.8%	85	White	79.0%	x
African American	15.9%	15	African American	14.0%	x
Latino	0.0%	0	Latino	0.0%	x
Asian	1.2%	1	Asian	2.0%	x
Other	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	x
Women	41.0%	34	Women	35.0%	x
Total	x	95	Total	x	x
2005			2004		
White	79.6%	58	White	82.5%	54
African American	18.4%	12	African American	9.7%	4
Latino	2.7%	2	Latino	2.4%	1
Asian	1.4%	1	Asian	4.8%	2
Other	0.0%	0	Women	30.2%	18
Women	42.0%	31	Total	x	41
Total	x	73			
2003			2002		
White	77.9%	53	White	86.1%	56
African American	17.6%	12	African American	7.1%	3
Latino	2.9%	2	Latino	2.4%	1
Asian	1.0%	1	Asian	0.3%	0
Other	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0
Women	42.0%	25	Total	x	41
Total	x	73			

*1999, 2001, 2003, 2005 data not recorded
 Note: Data provided by the NCAA

TABLE 2

NCAA Administrators						
	%	#		%	#	
2015						
White	75.0%	340	White	73.2%	188	
Black or African American	15.4%	69	African American	21.2%	30	
Hispanic or Latino	2.9%	13	Latino	1.9%	2	
Asian	2.9%	13	Asian	2.9%	5	
Hawaiian or Pac. Islander	0.9%	4	Other	0.9%	0	
Am. Indian or Alaska Native	0.0%	0	Women	53.2%	100	
Two or More Races	0.9%	4	Total		202	
Other	0.0%	0				
Total		442				
Women	58.6%	265				
Total		452				
2016						
White	77.0%	351	White	76.0%	190	
African American	16.2%	74	African American	19.0%	37	
Latino	2.2%	10	Latino	2.0%	4	
Asian	2.2%	10	Asian	2.0%	4	
Other	1.8%	8	Other	0.0%	0	
Women	58.7%	265	Women	53.2%	109	
Total		452	Total		202	
2017						
White	80.0%	354	White	76.0%	190	
African American	13.1%	41	African American	19.0%	37	
Latino	1.9%	6	Latino	2.1%	4	
Asian	2.2%	7	Asian	2.1%	4	
Other	1.8%	6	Other	0.0%	0	
Women	50.6%	189	Women	54.9%	107	
Total		442	Total		196	
2018						
White	80.1%	355	White	76.4%	192	
African American	13.8%	43	African American	18.4%	34	
Latino	1.8%	5	Latino	2.2%	4	
Asian	2.6%	8	Asian	1.1%	2	
Other	1.3%	4	Other	0.0%	0	
Women	51.1%	189	Women	55.1%	102	
Total		442	Total		198	
2019						
White	80.0%	344	White	76.0%	190	
African American	14.2%	43	African American	19.7%	34	
Latino	1.0%	3	Latino	1.1%	2	
Asian	3.0%	9	Asian	1.6%	3	
Other	1.0%	3	Other	1.1%	2	
Women	53.3%	181	Women	55.2%	34	
Total		430	Total		196	
2020						
White	79.8%	333	White	76.7%	174	
African American	15.8%	46	African American	22.2%	37	
Latino	2.7%	6	Latino	0.0%	0	
Asian	1.4%	4	Asian	1.2%	2	
Other	0.3%	1	Other	0.0%	0	
Women	53.1%	185	Women	54.3%	88	
Total		420	Total		193	
2021						
White	79.8%	323	White	77.2%	190	
African American	15.8%	45	African American	22.2%	34	
Latino	1.8%	5	Latino	0.0%	0	
Asian	2.6%	8	Asian	1.7%	3	
Other	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	
Women	56.6%	181	Women	54.5%	34	
Total		406	Total		197	
2022						
White	82.4%	316	White	76.6%	158	
African American	14.8%	37	African American	21.9%	30	
Latino	0.8%	2	Latino	1.7%	1	
Asian	2.4%	6	Asian	1.7%	1	
Other	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	
Women	55.5%	141	Women	55.6%	88	
Total		383	Total		137	
2023						
White	79.1%	301	White	75.1%	98	
African American	16.2%	33	African American	19.1%	22	
Latino	1.0%	2	Latino	2.6%	3	
Asian	2.9%	5	Other	0.0%	0	
Other	0.8%	1	Women	55.2%	30	
Women	54.0%	110	Total		119	
Total		382				

1999, 2001, 2003, 2005 data not reported
 Note: Data provided by the NCAA
TABLE 3

Total Full-Time NCAA Staff					
	%	#		%	#
2018			2018		
White	76.8%	434	White	81.1%	365
Black or African American	16.5%	93	African-American	16.0%	72
Hispanic or Latino	2.5%	14	Latino	0.9%	4
Asian	2.8%	16	Asian	2.0%	9
Hawaiian or Pac. Islander	0.7%	4	Other	0.0%	0
Am. Indian or Alaska Native	0.0%	0	Women	59.6%	268
Two or More Races	0.7%	4	Total	x	450
Other	0.0%	0			
Total	x	565			
Women	56.6%	309			
2018			2011		
White	77.9%	434	White	79.6%	312
African-American	16.5%	92	African-American	16.8%	66
Latino	2.0%	11	Latino	1.3%	5
Asian	2.2%	12	Asian	2.0%	8
Other	1.4%	8	Other	0.3%	1
Women	56.2%	313	Women	61.5%	241
Total	x	562	Total	x	392
2017			2010		
White	79.9%	417	White	79.0%	324
African-American	14.9%	78	African-American	17.3%	71
Latino	1.5%	8	Latino	1.2%	5
Asian	2.1%	11	Asian	2.2%	9
Other	1.5%	8	Other	0.2%	1
Women	54.2%	283	Women	63.7%	261
Total	x	522	Total	x	410
2016			2009		
White	80.5%	401	White	78.7%	326
African-American	15.1%	75	African-American	17.4%	72
Latino	1.4%	7	Latino	1.9%	8
Asian	2.0%	10	Asian	1.7%	7
Other	1.0%	5	Other	0.2%	1
Women	56.2%	285	Women	62.1%	257
Total	x	498	Total	x	414
2016			2008		
White	79.9%	394	White	78.1%	307
African-American	15.8%	78	African-American	17.6%	69
Latino	0.8%	4	Latino	0.0%	0
Asian	2.4%	12	Asian	2.3%	9
Other	1.0%	5	Other	0.5%	2
Women	57.4%	283	Women	62.3%	245
Total	x	493	Total	x	393
2014			2007		
White	79.6%	386	White	76.1%	299
African-American	16.7%	81	African-American	16.5%	65
Latino	1.0%	5	Latino	1.5%	6
Asian	2.5%	12	Asian	1.8%	7
Other	0.2%	1	Other	0.5%	2
Women	57.9%	281	Women	63.1%	239
Total	x	485	Total	x	379
2013					
White	80.0%	385			
African-American	16.6%	80			
Latino	1.0%	5			
Asian	2.3%	11			
Other	0.0%	0			
Women	59.9%	288			
Total	x	485			

Note: Data provided by the NCAA

TABLE 4

Conference Commissioners																
Division	Division I (A)				Division I (B)				Division II (A)				Division II (B)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
001010	African American	81%	2	0	20%	2	0	96%	24	6	100%	11	0	0		
001010	Black or African American	81%	2	0	20%	2	0	96%	24	6	100%	11	0	0		
001010	Hispanic or Latino	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	0		
001010	Asian	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001010	Native American	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001010	Non-Hispanic Asian	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001010	Other	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001010	Total	100%	4	0	100%	4	0	100%	33	7	100%	11	0	0		
001011	African American	55%	21	2	100%	0	1	96%	24	5	100%	11	0	0		
001011	African American	55%	21	2	100%	0	1	96%	24	5	100%	11	0	0		
001011	Hispanic or Latino	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	0		
001011	Asian	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001011	Native American	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001011	Non-Hispanic Asian	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001011	Other	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001011	Total	100%	41	2	100%	0	1	100%	39	6	100%	11	0	0		
001012	African American	60%	20	4	100%	0	0	96%	28	3	100%	11	0	0		
001012	African American	60%	20	4	100%	0	0	96%	28	3	100%	11	0	0		
001012	Hispanic or Latino	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001012	Asian	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001012	Native American	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001012	Non-Hispanic Asian	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001012	Other	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001012	Total	100%	40	4	100%	0	0	100%	31	3	100%	11	0	0		
001013	African American	60%	20	4	100%	0	0	96%	28	3	100%	11	0	0		
001013	African American	60%	20	4	100%	0	0	96%	28	3	100%	11	0	0		
001013	Hispanic or Latino	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001013	Asian	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001013	Native American	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001013	Non-Hispanic Asian	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001013	Other	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001013	Total	100%	40	4	100%	0	0	100%	31	3	100%	11	0	0		
001014	African American	60%	20	4	100%	0	0	96%	28	3	100%	11	0	0		
001014	African American	60%	20	4	100%	0	0	96%	28	3	100%	11	0	0		
001014	Hispanic or Latino	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001014	Asian	3%	0	1	0%	0	0	3%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001014	Native American	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001014	Non-Hispanic Asian	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001014	Other	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001014	Total	100%	40	4	100%	0	0	100%	31	3	100%	11	0	0		
001015	African American	100%	32	2	100%	10	1	92%	27	3	100%	11	0	0		
001015	African American	100%	32	2	100%	10	1	92%	27	3	100%	11	0	0		
001015	Hispanic or Latino	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001015	Asian	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001015	Native American	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001015	Non-Hispanic Asian	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001015	Other	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001015	Total	100%	32	2	100%	10	1	100%	30	3	100%	11	0	0		
001016	African American	96%	28	3	100%	11	0	92%	27	3	100%	11	0	0		
001016	African American	96%	28	3	100%	11	0	92%	27	3	100%	11	0	0		
001016	Hispanic or Latino	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001016	Asian	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001016	Native American	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001016	Non-Hispanic Asian	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001016	Other	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0		
001016	Total	100%	28	3	100%	11	0	100%	27	3	100%	11	0	0		

Note: Data provided by the NCAA

TABLE 5

Main Student-Athletes: Division I					
	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Overall	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division I	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division II	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division III	26.2%	25.5%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division IV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	81.7%
Division V	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division VI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division VII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division VIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division IX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division X	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division XI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division XII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division XIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division XIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division XV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division XVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division XVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division XVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division XIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division XX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division XXI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division XXII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division XXIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division XXIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division XXV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division XXVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division XXVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division XXVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division XXIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division XXX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division XXXI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division XXXII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division XXXIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division XXXIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division XXXV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division XXXVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division XXXVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division XXXVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division XXXIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division XL	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division XLI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division XLII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division XLIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division XLIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division XLV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division XLVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division XLVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division XLVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division XLIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division L	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division LI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division LII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division LIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division LIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division LV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division LVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division LVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division LVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division LIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division LX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division LXI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division LXII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division LXIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division LXIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division LXV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division LXVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division LXVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division LXVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division LXIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division LXX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division LXXI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division LXXII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division LXXIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division LXXIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division LXXV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division LXXVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division LXXVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division LXXVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division LXXIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division LXXX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division LXXXIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division LXXXIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division LXXXVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division LXXXVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division LXXXIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division LXXXX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXXI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXXII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division LXXXXIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division LXXXXIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXXV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division LXXXXVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division LXXXXVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXXVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division LXXXXIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division LXXXXX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXXXI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXXXII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division LXXXXXIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division LXXXXXIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXXXV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division LXXXXXVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division LXXXXXVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXXXVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division LXXXXXIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division LXXXXXX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXXXXI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXXXXII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division LXXXXXXIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division LXXXXXXIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXXXXV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division LXXXXXXVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division LXXXXXXVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXXXXVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division LXXXXXXIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division LXXXXXXX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXXXXXI	30.7%	30.1%	9.7%	9.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXXXXXII	28.7%	28.1%	7.7%	7.7%	80.2%
Division LXXXXXXXIII	31.2%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	81.2%
Division LXXXXXXXIV	29.7%	29.1%	8.7%	8.7%	80.7%
Division LXXXXXXXV	32.2%	31.6%	11.2%	11.2%	82.2%
Division LXXXXXXXVI	27.7%	27.1%	6.7%	6.7%	78.7%
Division LXXXXXXXVII	30.2%	29.6%	9.2%	9.2%	80.2%
Division LXXXXXXXVIII	28.2%	27.6%	7.2%	7.2%	79.2%
Division LXXXXXXXIX	31.7%	31.1%	10.7%	10.7%	81.7%
Division LXXXXXXX	29.2%	28.6%	8.2%	8.2%	80.2%

TABLE 6

Female Student-Athletes: Division I													
Division	2018-19			2019-20			Division	2018-19			2019-20		
	Number	White	Black	Number	White	Black		Number	White	Black	Number	White	Black
011	36	83%	17%	41	85%	15%	41	85%	15%	42	83%	17%	
021	43	42%	58%	43	42%	58%	43	42%	58%	43	42%	58%	
031	2	100%	0%	2	100%	0%	2	100%	0%	2	100%	0%	
041	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
051	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
061	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
071	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
081	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
091	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
101	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
111	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
121	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
131	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
141	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
151	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
161	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
171	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
181	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
191	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
201	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
211	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
221	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
231	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
241	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
251	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
261	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
271	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
281	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
291	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
301	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
311	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
321	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
331	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
341	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
351	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
361	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
371	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
381	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
391	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
401	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
411	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
421	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
431	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
441	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
451	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
461	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
471	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
481	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
491	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	
501	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	

NOTE: Percentages may not equal 100 percent due to rounding. TABLE 7

College Head Coaches: Men's Tennis																														
Division	Institution	2018-19 Season										2017-18 Season										2016-17 Season								
		W	L	T	OT	WC	WC	WC	WC	WC	WC	W	L	T	OT	WC	WC	WC	WC	WC	WC	W	L	T	OT	WC	WC	WC	WC	
Division I	Alabama																													
	Alabama State																													
Division II	Alaska Pacific																													
	Alaska State																													
Division III	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													
Division I	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													
Division II	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													
Division III	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													
Division I	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													
Division II	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													
Division III	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													
Division I	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													
Division II	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													
Division III	Albany State																													
	Albany State																													

TABLE 9

Women Head Coaches					
	Men's Sports		Women's Sports		
	%	#	%	#	
2018-19					
Division I	4.0%	114	40.6%	1,444	
Division II	4.1%	98	38.3%	916	
Division III	6.9%	277	44.5%	1,817	
2017-18					
Division I	4.0%	116	40.1%	1,444	
Division II	4.0%	86	35.8%	916	
Division III	6.8%	272	44.3%	1,938	
2016-17					
Division I	3.7%	106	39.8%	1,411	
Division II	3.9%	84	35.3%	909	
Division III	6.2%	244	44.4%	1,922	
2015-16					
Division I	3.5%	100	38.8%	1,359	
Division II	4.1%	90	35.3%	896	
Division III	5.8%	227	43.9%	1,888	
2014-15					
Division I	3.4%	86	38.9%	1,352	
Division II	4.0%	85	35.4%	895	
Division III	5.2%	201	43.8%	1,964	
2013-14					
Division I	3.4%	97	38.2%	1,330	
Division II	4.0%	83	34.8%	840	
Division III	5.1%	196	43.9%	1,959	
2012-13					
Division I	3.2%	91	38.7%	1,341	
Division II	3.9%	77	34.9%	819	
Division III	5.3%	190	43.0%	1,789	
2011-12					
Division I	3.0%	84	38.6%	1,305	
Division II	4.1%	81	34.2%	791	
Division III	5.0%	184	42.9%	1,744	
2010-11					
Division I	3.0%	85	39.5%	1,317	
Division II	4.4%	84	33.7%	744	
Division III	4.7%	174	42.4%	1,714	
2009-10					
Division I	2.8%	77	39.8%	1,308	
Division II	3.3%	60	32.6%	699	
Division III	4.7%	171	42.5%	1,715	
2008-09					
Division I	2.8%	78	40.1%	1,311	
Division II	3.5%	62	32.8%	672	
Division III	4.7%	172	42.7%	1,697	
2007-08					
Division I	2.7%	74	40.0%	1,287	
Division II	3.7%	67	32.8%	671	
Division III	5.0%	177	43.0%	1,687	

Notes:
 1) Data provided by the NCAA. Historically Black institutions excluded.
 2) Percentages may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

TABLE 10

College Head Coaches												
	Region I		Region II		Region III		Region IV		Region V		Region VI	
	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Minority
Black or African American	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%
Hispanic or Latino	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%
Asian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
White	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%	80.0%	83.2%
African American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hispanic or Latino	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%
Asian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%

TABLE 11

College Head Coaches: Division I														
Division	Sport	Men's Record				Women's Record				Total Record	Winning Streak			
		W	L	T	P	W	L	T	P		W	L	T	P
Baseball	All-American	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	0
	Atlantic	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Midwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Northwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Southwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
Baseball	All-American	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Atlantic	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Midwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Northwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Southwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
Baseball	All-American	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Atlantic	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Midwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Northwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Southwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
Baseball	All-American	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Atlantic	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Midwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Northwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Southwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
Baseball	All-American	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Atlantic	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Midwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Northwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Southwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
Baseball	All-American	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Atlantic	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Midwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Northwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Southwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
Baseball	All-American	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Atlantic	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Midwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Northwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Southwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
Baseball	All-American	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Atlantic	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Midwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Northwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Southwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
Baseball	All-American	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Atlantic	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Midwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Northwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	
	Southwest	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	

College Head Coaches: Division III																								
Division	Men's Soccer						Women's Soccer						Men's Basketball						Women's Basketball					
	W	L	T	Pct.	W	L	T	Pct.	W	L	T	Pct.	W	L	T	Pct.	W	L	T	Pct.	W	L	T	Pct.
MIAA	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
MIAA	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
MIAA	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889
	Black & Ashmun	100	0	0	1.000	100	0	1.000	17	3	0	.882	19	1	0	.947	16	2	0	.889	16	2	0	.889

College Sport (Gender/Division) Women's Teams																						
Sport	Division	Team	2018-19					2017-18					2016-17					2015-16				
			W	L	OT	PTS	PTS/G	W	L	OT	PTS	PTS/G	W	L	OT	PTS	PTS/G	W	L	OT	PTS	PTS/G
Basketball	Division I	Alabama	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Arizona	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Arizona State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Arkansas	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Auburn	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Baylor	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Brigham Young	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Butler	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Clemson	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Connecticut	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
Basketball	Division II	Alabama State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Alcorn State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Alfred Russ	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Alma	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Alcorn State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Alfred Russ	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Alma	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
Basketball	Division III	Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8
		Albany State	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8	23	11	1	25.8	25.8

TABLE 15

College Assistant Coaches: Division I													
Division	Men's Soccer					Men's Tennis					Women's Soccer		
	F	S	P	W	T	F	S	P	W	T	F	S	
2019	Block in Athletic Department	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
	Head of Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Assistant	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Head of Athletic Department	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Other	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2018	Block in Athletic Department	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
	Head of Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Assistant	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Head of Athletic Department	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Other	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2017	Block in Athletic Department	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
	Head of Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Assistant	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Head of Athletic Department	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Other	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2016	Block in Athletic Department	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
	Head of Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Assistant	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Head of Athletic Department	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Other	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2015	Block in Athletic Department	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
	Head of Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Assistant	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Head of Athletic Department	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Other	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

College Assistant Coaches: Division II																
Division	N	Men's Soccer					Men's Soccer					Women's Soccer				
		S	F	W	L	T	S	F	W	L	T	S	F	W	L	T
Black in African American	14	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
Hispanic or Latino	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Asian American	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Native Hawaiian	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Total	21	4	0	4	4	0	4	0	4	4	0	4	0	4	4	
White	14	10	0	10	10	0	10	0	10	10	0	10	0	10	10	
Hispanic or Latino	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Asian American	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Native Hawaiian	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Total	21	13	0	13	13	0	13	0	13	13	0	13	0	13	13	
Black in African American	14	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Hispanic or Latino	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Asian American	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Native Hawaiian	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Total	21	4	0	4	4	0	4	0	4	4	0	4	0	4	4	
White	14	10	0	10	10	0	10	0	10	10	0	10	0	10	10	
Hispanic or Latino	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Asian American	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Native Hawaiian	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	
Total	21	13	0	13	13	0	13	0	13	13	0	13	0	13	13	

College Assistant Coaches - Division III																				
Division	Institution	Men's Soccer					Men's Basketball					Women's Soccer								
		F	S	%	F	S	%	F	S	%	F	S	%	F	S	%				
III	Black of African American	11	100	1.00	100	45%	100	45%	100	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Hispanic or Latino	2	100	1.00	2	4%	100	2%	20	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Asian	4	100	1.00	4	16%	100	16%	16	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Native American	1	100	1.00	1	4%	100	4%	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	White	10	100	1.00	10	40%	100	40%	40	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Two or More Races	1	100	1.00	1	4%	100	4%	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	19	100	1.00	19	76%	100	76%	76	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
III	Black of African American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Hispanic or Latino	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Asian	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Native American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	White	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Two or More Races	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	6	100	1.00	6	24%	100	24%	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
III	Black of African American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Hispanic or Latino	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Asian	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Native American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	White	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Two or More Races	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	6	100	1.00	6	24%	100	24%	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
III	Black of African American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Hispanic or Latino	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Asian	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Native American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	White	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Two or More Races	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	6	100	1.00	6	24%	100	24%	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
III	Black of African American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Hispanic or Latino	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Asian	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Native American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	White	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Two or More Races	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	6	100	1.00	6	24%	100	24%	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
III	Black of African American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Hispanic or Latino	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Asian	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Native American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	White	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Two or More Races	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	6	100	1.00	6	24%	100	24%	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
III	Black of African American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Hispanic or Latino	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Asian	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Native American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	White	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Two or More Races	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	6	100	1.00	6	24%	100	24%	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
III	Black of African American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Hispanic or Latino	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Asian	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Native American	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	White	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Two or More Races	1	100	1.00	1	1%	100	1%	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	6	100	1.00	6	24%	100	24%	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

TABLE 18

College Assessment Committee Division I/II/III Teams																		
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035
Alabama	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Arizona	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Arkansas	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
California	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Colorado	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Connecticut	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Delaware	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Florida	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Georgia	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Illinois	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Indiana	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Iowa	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Kansas	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Kentucky	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Louisiana	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maine	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Marion	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Massachusetts	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Michigan	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Minnesota	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Mississippi	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Missouri	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Montana	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Nebraska	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Nevada	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
New Hampshire	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
New Jersey	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
New Mexico	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
New York	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
North Carolina	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
North Dakota	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ohio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Oklahoma	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Oregon	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Pennsylvania	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Rhode Island	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
South Carolina	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
South Dakota	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Tennessee	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Texas	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Utah	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Vermont	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Virginia	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Washington	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
West Virginia	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Wisconsin	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Wyoming	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

TABLE 19

College Assistant Coaches: Men's Teams Divisions I, II, and III

Division	Year	Number of Coaches	Number of Assistant Coaches	Number of Assistant Coaches (by gender)	Number of Assistant Coaches (by ethnicity)	Number of Assistant Coaches (by education)	Number of Assistant Coaches (by experience)	Number of Assistant Coaches (by degree)	Number of Assistant Coaches (by certification)	Number of Assistant Coaches (by other)
Division I	2018	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124
	2019	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124
Division II	2018	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124
	2019	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124
Division III	2018	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124
	2019	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124	1,124

As reported by the NCAA. Reported data includes assistant coaches who are currently employed by a college or university. Data is based on the 2018-2019 season.

TABLE 20

College Athletics Directors: Division I												
	2018-19				2019-20				2020-21			
	%	F	M	W	%	F	M	W	%	F	M	W
2018-19	White	73.6%	243	10.9%	36	White	62.7%	203	7.2%	10		
	Black or African American	7.6%	25	1.2%	4	African American	5.7%	19	0.9%	1		
	Hispanic or Latino	2.1%	7	0.3%	1	Asian	0.9%	3	0.0%	0		
	Asian	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Latino	2.5%	8	0.3%	1		
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.1%	1	0.0%	0		
	Two or More Races	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		
	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	62.0%	202	0.2%	26		
	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	62.0%	202	0.2%	26		
	Total	86.4%	285	11.4%	40							
2019-20	White	71.5%	226	8.4%	28	White	62.0%	200	7.0%	31		
	African American	7.8%	26	0.9%	3	African American	6.9%	19	0.4%	2		
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.3%	1	0.0%	1	Asian	0.9%	3	0.0%	0		
	Latino	2.4%	8	0.8%	2	Latino	1.9%	6	0.3%	1		
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.9%	3	0.3%	1		
	Two or More Races	2.1%	7	0.3%	1	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		
	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	62.0%	200	0.2%	26		
	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	62.0%	200	0.2%	26		
	Total	86.4%	282	10.3%	38							
2020-21	White	77.3%	250	8.8%	29	White	61.7%	200	7.5%	32		
	African American	6.2%	21	1.2%	4	African American	6.1%	21	0.8%	2		
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.6%	2	0.3%	1	Asian	0.9%	3	0.0%	0		
	Latino	1.2%	4	0.8%	3	Latino	1.9%	6	0.3%	1		
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.6%	2	0.3%	1		
	Two or More Races	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		
	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	61.0%	198	0.3%	26		
	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	61.0%	198	0.3%	26		
	Total	83.5%	280	11.2%	37							
2018-19	White	78.8%	257	0.3%	27	White	63.7%	200	6.2%	19		
	African American	6.0%	20	0.6%	2	African American	6.2%	19	1.0%	3		
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.3%	1	0.3%	3	Asian	0.9%	3	0.0%	0		
	Latino	1.6%	5	0.0%	0	Latino	1.6%	5	0.0%	0		
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.3%	1	0.3%	1		
	Two or More Races	0.6%	2	0.0%	0	Other	0.3%	1	0.0%	0		
	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	60.4%	200	2.3%	24		
	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	60.4%	200	2.3%	24		
	Total	89.3%	282	0.9%	30							
2019-20	White	79.5%	261	7.6%	26	White	60.3%	x	7.9%	x		
	African American	6.3%	21	0.9%	1	African American	5.9%	x	0.9%	x		
	Asian	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Asian	0.9%	x	0.0%	x		
	Latino	1.6%	5	0.6%	2	Latino	0.9%	x	0.0%	x		
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.9%	x	0.0%	x		
	Two or More Races	0.3%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	x	0.0%	x		
	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	60.3%	x	0.0%	x		
	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	60.3%	x	0.0%	x		
	Total	86.4%	282	8.2%	28							
2020-21	White	79.3%	257	6.3%	27	White	60.0%	200	6.5%	17		
	African American	7.1%	25	1.3%	1	African American	5.9%	19	0.0%	0		
	Asian	0.6%	2	0.3%	1	Asian	0.9%	3	0.4%	1		
	Latino	2.3%	7	0.8%	2	Latino	1.2%	3	0.0%	0		
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	0	0.4%	1		
	Two or More Races	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		
	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	60.0%	200	7.3%	19		
	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	60.0%	200	7.3%	19		
	Total	86.4%	280	8.6%	31							
2018-19	White	79.8%	260	7.4%	24	White	68.4%	x	6.9%	x		
	African American	7.7%	25	0.0%	0	African American	7.0%	x	0.0%	x		
	Asian	0.6%	2	0.3%	3	Asian	0.4%	x	0.0%	x		
	Latino	2.1%	7	0.0%	0	Latino	1.3%	x	0.0%	x		
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	x	0.4%	x		
	Two or More Races	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	x	0.0%	x		
	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	60.0%	x	2.3%	x		
	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	60.0%	x	2.3%	x		
	Total	87.4%	282	8.4%	28							
2019-20	White	82.1%	262	4.6%	12	White	60.0%	x	0.0%	x		
	African American	6.3%	20	0.0%	0	African American	2.4%	x	0.0%	x		
	Asian	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Other	1.5%	x	0.0%	x		
	Latino	2.2%	7	0.6%	2	Total	64.0%	x	0.0%	x		
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	64.0%	x	0.0%	x		
	Two or More Races	0.0%	0	0.0%	0							
	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0							
	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0							
	Total	84.4%	282	5.2%	12							

Notes:
 1. Data provided by the NCAA. Individually Black institutions excluded.
 2. Percentages may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.
 3. NCAA's 2020-21 data not yet released.
 4. X - data not reported.

TABLE 22

College Athletics Directors: Division II									
Division	WABA	Total		WABA	WABA	WABA	WABA	Total	
		N	%					N	%
2018-19	75.7%	211	15.9%	45	75.7%	211	14.9%	40	
	Black or African American	4.2%	12	1.1%	3	African-American	3.2%	9	0.7%
	Hispanic or Latino	2.9%	7	0.6%	2	Asian	2.5%	7	0.4%
	Asian	0.5%	0	0.0%	0	Latino	1.0%	3	0.0%
	Native or Pac. Islander	0.4%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Two or More Races	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Non-Resident Alien	0.7%	2	0.4%	1	Total	12.3%	33	10.0%
	Other	0.4%	1	0.0%	0				
	Total	20.0%	55	17.0%	45				
2019-20	72.4%	210	16.6%	48	72.0%	207	13.1%	30	
	African-American	3.8%	10	0.7%	2	African-American	2.7%	7	0.6%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.7%	2	0.0%	0	Asian	0.4%	1	0.4%
	Latino	2.6%	8	0.3%	1	Latino	3.9%	10	0.0%
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Two or More Races	0.7%	2	0.3%	1	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Non-Resident Alien	0.3%	1	0.3%	1	Total	7.0%	20	14.0%
	Other	0.3%	1	0.0%	0				
	Total	17.1%	47	15.0%	40				
2020-21	73.7%	210	14.5%	42	72.0%	204	13.0%	30	
	African-American	4.4%	10	0.7%	2	African-American	2.7%	6	0.6%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1.0%	3	0.3%	1	Asian	0.4%	1	0.6%
	Latino	3.4%	10	0.7%	1	Latino	3.7%	10	0.0%
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Two or More Races	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Non-Resident Alien	0.3%	1	0.3%	1	Total	6.8%	20	14.4%
	Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0				
	Total	10.1%	26	10.0%	42				
2021-22	71.9%	222	13.9%	41	70.9%	209	13.8%	30	
	African-American	4.4%	10	1.0%	3	African-American	3.2%	8	0.6%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.3%	1	0.0%	0	Asian	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Latino	3.0%	8	0.0%	0	Latino	3.1%	8	0.0%
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Two or More Races	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Non-Resident Alien	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	Total	6.3%	20	15.3%
	Other	0.3%	1	0.0%	0				
	Total	10.0%	26	11.0%	41				
2022-23	74.2%	210	17.3%	36	74.7%	208	17.8%	31	
	African-American	3.7%	9	1.9%	3	African-American	3.0%	8	0.9%
	Asian	0.5%	1	0.2%	1	Asian	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Latino	3.1%	9	0.0%	0	Latino	2.7%	8	0.0%
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Two or More Races	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Non-Resident Alien	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	Total	5.7%	16	13.0%
	Other	0.7%	2	0.0%	0				
	Total	6.4%	18	11.0%	36				
2023-24	75.2%	221	16.3%	48	73.0%	197	14.0%	34	
	African-American	2.4%	7	1.0%	3	African-American	1.9%	5	0.9%
	Asian	0.7%	2	0.3%	1	Asian	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Latino	3.7%	11	0.0%	0	Latino	2.6%	8	0.0%
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.4%	1	0.0%
	Two or More Races	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Non-Resident Alien	0.3%	1	0.0%	0	Total	4.9%	14	16.2%
	Other	0.6%	2	0.0%	0				
	Total	8.2%	24	17.3%	48				
2024-25	70.7%	220	13.0%	43	72.4%	218	12.0%	31	
	African-American	2.4%	7	1.0%	3	African-American	1.9%	5	0.9%
	Asian	0.5%	1	0.7%	2	Asian	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Latino	3.1%	9	0.0%	0	Latino	3.0%	8	0.0%
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Two or More Races	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Non-Resident Alien	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	Total	4.9%	13	14.4%
	Other	0.3%	1	0.0%	0				
	Total	7.3%	20	17.0%	43				
2025-26	75.3%	224	16.9%	46	74.0%	218	13.1%	31	
	African-American	3.9%	11	1.1%	3	African-American	1.6%	4	1.2%
	Asian	0.4%	1	0.4%	1	Asian	3.0%	8	0.4%
	Latino	3.2%	9	0.4%	1	Latino	1.1%	3	0.0%
	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	Total	5.7%	15	15.5%
	Total	8.2%	21	15.0%	45				

TABLE 23
 Notes:
 1. Data provided by the NCAA. Nationally Black institutions excluded.
 2. Institutions that are not required to report to the NCAA are excluded.
 3. 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20 not yet reported.

College Athletics Directors: Division III																	
NACAC	Men				Women				NACAC	Men				Women			
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#		%	#	%	#	%	#		
White	63.1%	281	29.4%	131	White	47.3%	201	28.5%	126	White	47.3%	201	28.5%	126			
Black or African American	3.1%	14	1.8%	8	African American	2.0%	9	0.9%	4	African American	2.0%	9	0.9%	4			
Hispanic or Latinx	1.3%	6	0.6%	3	Hispanic	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Hispanic	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			
Two or More Races	0.4%	2	0.0%	0	Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	73.8%	331	26.1%	130	Total	73.8%	331	26.1%	130			
Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0													
Total	68.3%	304	31.2%	141													
White	61.8%	287	28.9%	130	White	48.0%	204	27.9%	122	White	48.0%	204	27.9%	122			
African American	3.1%	14	1.8%	8	African American	2.0%	9	0.9%	4	African American	2.0%	9	0.9%	4			
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Latino	0.9%	4	0.2%	1	Latino	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Latino	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Two or More Races	0.4%	2	0.0%	0	Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	62.8%	283	26.2%	127	Total	62.8%	283	26.2%	127			
Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0													
Total	66.3%	312	31.9%	141													
White	64.3%	294	28.9%	132	White	49.3%	212	28.2%	117	White	49.3%	212	28.2%	117			
African American	3.2%	15	1.7%	8	African American	2.0%	9	0.9%	4	African American	2.0%	9	0.9%	4			
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	Asian	0.2%	1	0.4%	2	Asian	0.2%	1	0.4%	2			
Latino	0.9%	4	0.4%	2	Latino	0.4%	2	0.0%	0	Latino	0.4%	2	0.0%	0			
Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Two or More Races	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	Other	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	Other	0.0%	0	0.2%	1			
Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	57.7%	260	27.0%	122	Total	57.7%	260	27.0%	122			
Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0													
Total	69.3%	315	30.9%	144													
White	66.2%	302	27.4%	125	White	50.7%	221	28.1%	115	White	50.7%	221	28.1%	115			
African American	2.9%	13	0.9%	4	African American	1.9%	8	0.9%	4	African American	1.9%	8	0.9%	4			
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Latino	0.9%	4	0.2%	1	Latino	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Latino	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Two or More Races	0.2%	1	0.4%	2	Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	53.0%	239	25.0%	119	Total	53.0%	239	25.0%	119			
Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0													
Total	70.3%	323	30.2%	133													
White	67.0%	307	27.9%	125	White	50.3%	220	28.6%	111	White	50.3%	220	28.6%	111			
African American	2.8%	13	1.3%	6	African American	1.9%	8	0.9%	4	African American	1.9%	8	0.9%	4			
Asian	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Latino	0.4%	2	0.0%	0	Latino	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Latino	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Two or More Races	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			
Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	52.2%	239	25.0%	119	Total	52.2%	239	25.0%	119			
Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0													
Total	71.0%	325	30.2%	133													
White	67.0%	308	27.4%	125	White	48.0%	208	28.9%	127	White	48.0%	208	28.9%	127			
African American	2.9%	13	0.9%	4	African American	2.0%	9	0.9%	4	African American	2.0%	9	0.9%	4			
Asian	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Latino	0.9%	4	0.4%	2	Latino	0.4%	2	0.0%	0	Latino	0.4%	2	0.0%	0			
Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Two or More Races	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			
Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	52.2%	239	27.1%	122	Total	52.2%	239	27.1%	122			
Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0													
Total	70.2%	322	29.4%	133													
White	66.5%	303	27.0%	119	White	51.3%	226	28.9%	118	White	51.3%	226	28.9%	118			
African American	2.9%	13	0.9%	4	African American	3.0%	14	0.9%	4	African American	3.0%	14	0.9%	4			
Asian	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Asian	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Latino	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Latino	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Latino	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Native American	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	Native American	0.2%	1	0.0%	0			
Two or More Races	0.4%	2	0.2%	1	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			
Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Total	54.7%	244	26.2%	119	Total	54.7%	244	26.2%	119			
Other	0.2%	1	0.0%	0													
Total	71.0%	323	29.2%	133													

TABLE 24
 1. Data provided by the NCAA. Minority data excluded.
 2. Percentages may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.
 3. NCAA data reported.

College Sport Athletic Administrators: Associate Athletic Director

College	College 1										College 2									
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Alabama	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Arkansas	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
California	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Colorado	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Connecticut	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Delaware	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Florida	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Georgia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Idaho	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Illinois	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Indiana	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Iowa	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Kansas	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Kentucky	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Louisiana	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maine	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maryland	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Massachusetts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Michigan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Minnesota	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mississippi	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Missouri	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Montana	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Nebraska	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Nevada	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
New Hampshire	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
New Jersey	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
New Mexico	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
New York	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
North Carolina	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
North Dakota	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ohio	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Oklahoma	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Oregon	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Pennsylvania	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Rhode Island	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
South Carolina	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
South Dakota	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Tennessee	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Texas	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Utah	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Vermont	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Virginia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Washington	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
West Virginia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wisconsin	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wyoming	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

TABLE 25A

Senior Woman Administrators																	
Institution	2018				2019				Institution	2018				2019			
	W	AWA	AWA%	W%	W	AWA	AWA%	W%		W	AWA	AWA%	W%	W	AWA	AWA%	W%
Alabama	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Alabama State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Alaska	0	0	0%	0%	0	0	0%	0%	Alaska State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Arizona	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Arizona State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Arkansas	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Arkansas State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
California	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	California State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Colorado	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Colorado State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Connecticut	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Connecticut State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Delaware	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Delaware State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Florida	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Florida State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Georgia	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Georgia State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Idaho	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Idaho State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Illinois	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Illinois State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Indiana	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Indiana State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Iowa	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Iowa State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Kansas	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Kansas State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Kentucky	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Kentucky State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Louisiana	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Louisiana State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Maine	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Maine State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Maryland	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Maryland State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Massachusetts	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Massachusetts State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Michigan	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Michigan State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Minnesota	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Minnesota State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Mississippi	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Mississippi State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Missouri	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Missouri State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Montana	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Montana State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Nebraska	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Nebraska State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Nevada	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Nevada State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
New Hampshire	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	New Hampshire State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
New Jersey	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	New Jersey State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
New Mexico	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	New Mexico State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
New York	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	New York State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
North Carolina	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	North Carolina State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
North Dakota	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	North Dakota State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Ohio	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Ohio State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Oklahoma	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Oklahoma State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Oregon	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Oregon State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Pennsylvania	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Pennsylvania State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Rhode Island	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Rhode Island State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
South Carolina	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	South Carolina State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
South Dakota	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	South Dakota State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Tennessee	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Tennessee State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Texas	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Texas State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Utah	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Utah State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Vermont	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Vermont State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Virginia	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Virginia State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Washington	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Washington State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
West Virginia	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	West Virginia State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Wisconsin	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Wisconsin State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%
Wyoming	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%	Wyoming State	1	1	100%	100%	1	1	100%	100%

TABLE 26

Faculty Athletics Representatives																										
		2018-19										2019-20										Total				
		2018	2019	2018-19								2019	2020	2019-20								2019	2020	Total		
		2018	2019	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040
Atlantic Coast Conference
Big East Conference
Big Ten Conference
Big West Conference
Colonial Athletic Association
Conference USA
Mid-American Conference
Midwest Conference
Mountain West Conference
North America Soccer Conference
Ohio Valley Conference
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference
South Atlantic Conference
Summit League
Western Athletic Conference

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN APPROVED THIS CONTRACT UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE REGULATION OF GAMES AND RECREATION CONTRACTS ACT.

TABLE 27

Sports Information Director													
Division	2018-19				2017-18				Division	2018-19			
	White	Black	Latino	Other	White	Black	Latino	Other		White	Black	Latino	Other
2018-19	White 79.3%	12.6%	86.2%	6.1%	64.3%	11.0%	2018-19	White 83.0%	11.4%	80.7%	6.9%	64.2%	12.0%
Black or African American	2.2%	1.1%	1.2%	0.4%	1.7%	0.9%	African American	1.0%	0.2%	0.4%	1.1%	1.4%	0.3%
Hispanic or Latino	1.1%	0.3%	1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.3%	0.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Asian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Latino	1.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%
Native of Pac. Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Am Indian or Alaska Native	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	0.0%	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%							
2017-18	White 80.0%	10.8%	83.4%	7.2%	63.1%	12.3%	2017-18	White 84.1%	10.8%	80.7%	5.8%	69.3%	11.1%
African American	2.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	African American	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.2%	0.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.7%	0.8%	2.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	Asian	0.6%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Latino	0.6%	0.4%	1.7%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	Latino	1.5%	0.2%	2.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.2%
Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	1.0%	0.4%	0.0%	Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Resident Alien	0.2%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2016-17	White 81.0%	12.4%	83.9%	6.9%	64.3%	12.1%	2016-17	White 80.0%	11.7%	84.4%	6.7%	63.0%	10.4%
African American	0.9%	1.1%	0.3%	1.0%	1.3%	0.2%	African American	1.0%	1.2%	1.0%	0.7%	1.4%	0.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.3%	0.9%	1.7%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	Asian	1.0%	0.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Latino	0.3%	0.7%	1.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	Latino	1.2%	0.2%	1.4%	0.4%	0.9%	0.2%
Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Resident Alien	0.3%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	Other	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2015-16	White 82.0%	12.1%	86.4%	5.9%	64.0%	12.6%	2015-16	White 82.2%	12.0%	86.9%	6.8%	63.9%	12.6%
African American	0.5%	0.9%	0.7%	1.0%	0.9%	0.2%	African American	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	0.8%	1.4%	0.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.9%	0.2%	2.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	Asian	1.0%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%
Latino	0.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	Latino	1.6%	0.3%	1.9%	0.4%	1.1%	0.2%
Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Resident Alien	0.2%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
2014-15	White 84.0%	10.5%	85.4%	6.6%	66.5%	12.0%	2014-15	White 85.0%	9.4%	85.4%	6.1%	62.4%	10.1%
African American	1.2%	0.7%	1.0%	1.4%	0.9%	0.2%	African American	1.1%	0.3%	1.2%	0.8%	0.8%	0.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.2%	0.4%	2.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	Asian	1.0%	0.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
Latino	1.2%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	Latino	1.6%	0.3%	1.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%
Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Resident Alien	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2013-14	White 81.0%	11.1%	82.9%	6.2%	63.8%	12.4%	2013-14	White 84.0%	9.2%	84.0%	6.2%	61.3%	10.8%
African American	0.9%	0.7%	1.0%	0.7%	1.1%	0.4%	African American	0.9%	0.0%	2.0%	0.8%	1.9%	0.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.7%	0.2%	2.4%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	Asian	1.7%	0.3%	1.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Latino	1.4%	0.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	Latino	1.6%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	Two or More Races	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Resident Alien	0.2%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Non-Resident Alien	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Notes:
 1) Data provided by the NCAA. Historically Black institutions excluded.
 2) Percentages may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.
 3) - or - data not received.

TABLE 28

College Professional Administration by Division													
Division	Region I				Region II				Region III				All Regions
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2018	2019	2020	2021	2018	2019	2020	2021	
Male	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	
Black or African American	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	
Hispanic or Latino	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	
Asian	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	
White or Non-Hispanic	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	
Two or More Races	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	
Not Reported	1.7%	1.7%	1.8%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	
Female	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	
Black or African American	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	
Hispanic or Latino	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	
Asian	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	
White or Non-Hispanic	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	
Two or More Races	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	
Not Reported	1.7%	1.7%	1.8%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	

Madness, Inc.

How everyone is getting rich off college sports - except the players.



CHRIS
MURPHY
U.S. SENATOR FOR CONNECTICUT

Zion, a Shoe, and “Madness”

February 20th. Cameron Indoor Stadium. Home to the Duke University basketball team and the site of the showdown between Duke and the University of North Carolina, arguably the most heated rivalry in college sports. Any given year, it is a marquee matchup. But this year is different. Because an 18-year-old phenom, who is already known by his first name alone, will be suiting up for the Blue Devils.


Zion Williamson, a kid from the Piedmont of North Carolina and the upcoming first pick in the NBA draft, has turned this game into a must-see event. 4.3 million people will tune in, making it the most-viewed weeknight college basketball game in ESPN history.ⁱ On game day, tickets run at \$4,000 each, easily beating the get-in price for the Super Bowl that occurred just weeks before. Spike Lee is in attendance. President Barack Obama sits courtside.

Thirty-four seconds into the game, and the attraction is gone. Williamson plants his left foot to separate from a defender, rips open his shoe, and tumbles onto the floor clutching his knee. Disappointment and anger sweep through Cameron and across the internet. The sneakers are deemed a public health hazard. Its maker, Nike, finishes the next day’s trading down 1.1 percent – the rough equivalent of a \$1.1 billion loss.ⁱⁱ In less than a minute, a teenager moves an industry.

Williamson has since gone on to headline this past month’s NCAA Basketball Championship, commonly known as “March Madness,” which has become an American institution. Annually, it captivates millions across the country as teams compete over three action-packed weekends full of unforgettable moments. To no surprise, it is one of the most viewed sporting events in the world, with more than 100 million viewers glued to their screens this year.ⁱⁱⁱ With those viewers is the opportunity to make money – lots and lots of money. The NCAA Tournament earns more than \$1 billion annually in media revenue, which is nearly as much as the entire NFL Playoffs, Super Bowl included.^{iv}

Advertisers rightfully fall over themselves to get a piece of the action. The NCAA’s published corporate “champions” and “partners” range from Coca-Cola to Google and Geico, with 97 total corporate sponsors committed to this year’s edition of March Madness. In turn, these companies gain exclusive rights to the NCAA brand in advertising that exists everywhere throughout the month-long tournament.^v Those rights pay dividends, as each commercial or logo embedded

in the programming reaches millions, and justifies the \$1 million price tag on a 30-second commercial spot.³¹ Everything that can be branded has been. That iconic moment where athletes climb a ladder as they cut down the nets to celebrate a berth in the Final Four or the championship? Even the ladder is sponsored.



Williamson's shoe is a symbol of what college sports has become, and what March Madness embodies. Big-time college sports is a business. Everything the student-athletes do affects the bottom lines for institutions and corporations alike. Everything they wear brings profit to companies that have paid to turn student-athletes into human billboards. For the brief time they are on college campuses, they are a valuable resource for the adults around them.

The ever-growing commercialism of college sports has made a lot of money for a lot of people. Yet, as the athletes provide the product that has fueled this industry, they see a fraction of the revenue they generate, while continuing to face severe penalties for failing to abide by a labyrinth of rules that restrict any meaningful participation in that industry. Meanwhile, tax-exempt non-profit institutions of higher education condone and endorse broadcasting and apparel contracts that surpass \$250 million, coaches' salaries that beat their professional equivalents, and lavish spending on facilities that amount to amusement parks aimed at seducing the nation's top teenagers in their sport.

This report seeks to shine a light on the size, scope, and nature of the college sports industrial complex as well as examine the ways participating institutions move money around the student-athletes who provide the labor and their bodies for other people's profits.

The College Sports Industrial Complex

Money swirls all around college sports. Whether from corporate sponsorships, ticket sales, television contracts, apparel deals, merchandise sales, and increasing student fees, the revenue streams for college athletics programs are varied and robust. Last year, the Department of Education reported \$14 billion in total revenue collected by college sports programs, up from \$4 billion in 2003.^{vii} That haul beats every professional sports league in the world, except for the NFL.^{viii} Add the revenue that broadcasters, corporate sponsors, and apparel companies earn, and it is clear that college sports is awash with money. Meanwhile, a fraction of that money goes to the student-athletes. So how did we get here? And where does all the money go?




**Total revenue
collected by
college sports
programs**

How Did We Get Here?

College sports has been a fixture of American culture for more than a century, for good reason. Saturday game days across college campuses are special. The cadence of marching bands in autumn afternoons and the congregations of color-coordinated fans – a mix of students, alumni, and lifelong fans – is hard not to enjoy. So much of college sports has become a way to connect with each other, especially in sharing pride for a college we attended or more often the state it represents. That's a good thing.

While our collective support for college sports has remained a constant, the nature and size of the industry have dramatically changed in recent decades. That change is thanks to the relationship between the college sports we love so much and the opportunity for people to make money off that devotion. Commercialism has always been embedded in college athletics, and the tension

between the business-side and the amateurism of the industry is largely why the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) formed in the early 1900s, mainly to preserve “amateurism” and prevent athletes from receiving compensation.^{ix} That tension has been a consistent feature of college sports ever since, and has grown with the revenues that college sports programs take in annually, which have rapidly increased in the past 15 years.




College sports has become a money-making – and spending – machine. Total revenues have more than tripled since 2003. That growth has been fueled by a select group of sports and programs which have collectively cashed in on a seemingly insatiable demand, driven by broadcasting deals that bring college sports to nearly every screen.

College football, and to a lesser extent basketball, dominates the industry. The average FBS (Football Bowl Subdivision) school, which is any Division I school

Just 3 percent of schools competing in the NCAA bring in 54 percent of all the money. They do that primarily by plowing money into their massive football programs.

with a football team, makes more revenue from football, \$31.9 million each year, than it does on the next 35 sports combined, \$31.7 million.^x Within football and basketball, an exclusive group of colleges bring in most of the money. The Power Five conferences (ACC, SEC, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-12) include 65 of the most successful schools in college sports, both athletically and financially. Those programs brought in more than \$7.6 billion in revenue last year. Out of the 2,078 institutions that have athletic programs, those 65 schools generated 54 percent of all college sports revenue. Essentially, 3 percent of all college programs bring in more than half of all the money, and they do that primarily by plowing money into their massive football programs.^{xi}

NCAA AVERAGE REVENUE BY SPORT



SOURCE: Department of Education based on average revenue from 127 FBS schools


Even within those Power Five conferences, a few reign supreme in their ability to rake in money. Last year, 36 programs reported more than \$100 million in revenues, with 11 reporting more than \$150 million and two clearing \$200 million (The University of Texas at Austin and The Ohio State University).^{xii} Not surprisingly, the list of largest athletic budgets annually maps almost directly onto that year's final college football rankings. Big money programs not only have a stranglehold on the industry's profitability, but the accolades and attention that industry brings. That success, in turn, fuels the desire for aspiring

programs to go into debt for the small chance to earn status within this increasingly exclusive group. In fact, as few as 12 athletic departments make a profit, with many more requiring their institutions or the students themselves to subsidize their losses.

As revenues have poured into college programs, athletic departments have spent them within their programs, often on staff salaries and facilities. The constant and urgent need to compete, either between big-time programs in the Power Five conferences or smaller programs hoping to make the jump onto the national stage, fuels an “arms race” that inflates staff salaries and rationalizes lavish facilities, among other spending meant to get the most out of their student-athletes rather than supporting their futures. The result is an industry with more money than it knows what to do with, and the need to grow revenues at all costs, regardless of what is in the best interests of the student-athletes who make college sports worth watching.

How Institutions Spend Around Student-Athletes

How much of all that money eventually gets to the student-athletes versus the adults and institutions around them?



Let's start with student aid. Scholarships provide the entirety of direct compensation student-athletes currently receive for their effort. According to the NCAA, Divisions I and II schools, which are the only programs that award scholarships, provide approximately \$2.9 billion athletics scholarships annually to more than 150,000 student-athletes.^{xiii} Along with the direct benefit of a college scholarship, student-athletes often receive educational grants that help them pay for the non-tuition costs of college, on top of tutoring and other academic support services. In total, these benefits are substantial and have the potential to dramatically improve a student-athlete's life well beyond their time competing.

However, student aid alone does not provide a clear picture of the considerable imbalance between the revenue student-athletes generate and how that money swirls around them.

Consider the budgets of the top revenue-producing programs in the country. Among the 65 Power Five conference programs, only 12 percent of all revenue goes toward student-athlete scholarships, across all sports. By comparison, 16 percent goes toward coaches' salaries.^{xiv} Effectively, that means the 4,400 head and assistant coaches collectively receive more of the revenue than the nearly 45,000 student-athletes who generate that revenue. In other words, it would take a dozen student-athletes pooling together all of their scholarship money to equal the average salary of just one of their coaches.

If a budget is a reflection of an institution's values, these programs simply believe that coaches and even edifices are far more valuable than the student-athletes who provide all the labor.

Now consider the budgets of the top programs within those Power Five conferences. According to a USA Today analysis of the schools with the 10 largest athletic department budgets, those programs spent 3.5 times as much on coaches' salaries than on scholarships.^{xv} Big programs often invest many times more on facilities, building athletic palaces and amusement park amenities that clear \$50 million in construction costs. If a budget is a reflection of an

institution's values, these programs simply believe that coaches and even edifices are far more valuable than the student-athletes who provide all the labor.

Professionally Paid Coaches

For those in positions of power over student-athletes, the college sports industry has become increasingly lucrative. The median salary for an athletic director at a Division I institution is over \$500,000 a year. More than 100 coaches at Division I schools earn over \$1 million per year, with the top 25 football coaches earning an average of \$5.2 million annually and the top 25 basketball coaches earning \$3.2 million annually.^{xvi} In fact, the highest paid public employees in 41 out of 50 states are football or basketball coaches.

At the extremes, the adults that hold the most power over student-athletes earn well beyond the collective value of their players' scholarships. In 2017, Nick Saban, the head football coach at the University of Alabama, made \$11 million, more than nearly every coach in American sports. Similarly, John Calipari, the head basketball coach at the University of Kentucky, made more than \$9 million.^{xvii} These salaries only represent one form of compensation for coaches. On top of extravagant salaries, coaches receive bonuses, endorsements, country club memberships, the occasional private plane, and in some cases a negotiated percentage of ticket receipts.^{xviii}

“

The highest paid public employees in 41 out of 50 states are coaches.

To an extent, these salaries make sense. College coaches have significant influence over the success of a program. They drive which recruits sign with their schools and the team's performance on the field. The best coaches can build entire programs and elevate those that are already elite.

However, the shocking size of coaches' salaries has more to do with the growth of the industry than it does with winning. Since 1984, the average compensation

for head football coaches at public universities has grown 750 percent (adjusted for inflation).^{xix} That growth has nothing to do with wins. Consider the final salary of Paul Bear Bryant, the legendary head coach of the University of Alabama from 1958-82, who equaled current coach Saban's record of 6 national championships. In 1982, Bryant made \$450,000 (\$1.1 million, adjusted for inflation). For equal achievement, his successor earns exactly ten times as much.^{xx} Meanwhile, the players who made that winning possible have seen little change in the benefits they receive.

Lavish Facilities

When programs aren't spending on their coaches, they often invest in facilities that beat even the most impressive professional counterparts. For instance, Clemson recently built an exclusive \$55 million complex for its football team that amounts to a player's theme park, with a miniature golf course, sand volleyball courts, laser tag, bowling lanes, and a movie theater – and it's not alone. Down the road, the University of South Carolina includes TV and video game areas, a 15-seat movie theater with reclining seats and surround sound, a video arcade room, and a sound studio for athletes to record music. Notably, during the University of Tennessee's dedication for their own extravagant facilities, its athletic director proudly announced to wealthy donors that professional football scouts "have told me this is the best facility, college or professional, that they've ever seen."^{xxi}



Between 2004 and 2014, Power Five conferences nearly doubled facilities spending, even after adjusting for inflation. What has amounted to shrine-building aimed at seducing teenagers will continue to escalate, with several programs slated for projects that exceed \$200 million over the next decade.^{xxii}

The escalating “arms race” of personnel, facilities, and other amenities has pushed most athletic departments into spending far more than they should or can. An athletic program designed to sell tickets and media rights for public entertainment must invest more than one designed simply to allow their students to compete with other teams for the love of the game. An athletic program fielding a football team must invest more than one that only funds a basketball team. And a program striving to enter one of the Power Five conferences is driven to hire huge coaching staffs with multi-million-dollar salaries and build lavish, state-of-the-art athletic competition, training and support facilities to recruit and retain elite players, and fly athletes around the country to compete in conference tournaments.

From the top down, programs are incentivized to pour more and more money into programs regardless of how they increasingly conflict with the missions of their affiliated universities, or whether that money truly helps provide a real future for the student-athletes that earn it.

The ability to pour revenue into extraordinary salaries or facilities comes at the expense of student-athletes. Programs will spend as much as they can to compete. When they do not have to share revenue in a fair way with the athletes, it frees them up to dump that money into everything else.

College Sports: A Corporate Cash Cow

The money all around college sports has particularly profited the corporate interests that find every way imaginable to market student-athletes. Those same corporations have directly fueled the massive growth of the industry, while making sure their margins expand off the backs of “amateurs.”

Again, Zion Williamson offers a perfect example, in this case how corporations exploit the unique and immoral amateurism of college sports. The phenomenon of this 18-year-old is arguably as much about his ability as the way corporations have sought to profit off him. Before Williamson ever played a college game, he was a sensation. A whole cottage industry of media sprung up, tracking every high school dunk and highlight. He headlined All-American games sponsored by McDonald’s and Jordan Brand. ESPN televised his decision to sign with Duke. Drake even sported his high school jersey.

After joining Duke, already one of the most valuable programs in college sports, corporations jumped even further onto the Zion Williamson cash train. Beyond

his notorious effect on Nike's stock price, ESPN covered his sensation on a nightly basis. Even while he was out following his injury against North Carolina, ESPN decided to keep a camera on him throughout Duke games, largely showing him sitting on the bench clapping for his teammates. Meanwhile, CBS and Turner, who have broadcasting rights to the NCAA tournament, have marketed their product by heavily featuring Williamson.

While Williamson is by definition unique, he exemplifies the many ways companies, particularly broadcasting and apparel companies, profit off student-athletes. He also represents the nature of risk and benefit associated with college sports. Had Williamson suffered a severe injury when his shoe malfunctioned, the companies all around him would have kept the millions they already made, while his career could have been gone without earning a single paycheck.

Regardless of benefit to the student-athletes, broadcast companies have squeezed profits out of them. Following a landmark 1984 Supreme Court decision that gave colleges the ability to sell broadcasting rights to the highest bidder, networks doubled down on college sports, football in particular. The biggest companies often negotiate directly with the Power Five conferences to secure substantial broadcast deals. In 2016, the Big Ten conference signed a six-year broadcast rights deal with Fox, ESPN, and CBS worth \$2.64 billion.^{xxiii} That contract mirrored similar deals that the other Power Five conferences have made with broadcasters, mainly ESPN, to launch their own channels. In some cases, even individual programs have started exclusive channels. In 2011, the University of Texas signed a deal with ESPN worth \$300 million over 20 years that created the Longhorn Network, which delivers 24-hour content of all things Texas sports.^{xxiv}

Broadcasting companies know they will make their money back and then some. For instance, while CBS and Turner paid the NCAA more than \$1 billion for the rights to March Madness, advertising revenues netted them nearly \$250 million in profit. Every broadcast deal, whether with the NCAA, conferences or individual programs, is expected to net broadcasters like ESPN substantial profits over the life of the contracts. With most of these contracts extending for 20 or even 30 years, the constant flow of broadcasting money will only grow moving forward, ensuring more money for everyone except the athletes.

With so many cameras pointed at student-athletes, apparel companies have found profits in simply outfitting them. For instance, when 100 million people tune into March Madness, every Nike swoosh or Adidas trefoil emblazoned on

the jersey means direct and efficient advertising. It is no wonder why either Nike, Adidas, or Under Armour have exclusive rights to outfit 97 percent of all football and basketball programs.^{xxv} In the business, schools have become defined by which apparel company suits them. Michigan is a Nike school, having signed a \$173.8 million contract in 2016. The University of California at Los Angeles? It is a very happy Under Armour school, having signed a record-setting deal worth \$280 million. Right behind them, The Ohio State University signed a 15-year, \$252 million deal with Nike that included a \$20 million cash signing bonus.^{xxvi}

Perhaps the most shocking apparel contract so far, though, was the University of Louisville's deal with Adidas. After negotiating a new deal worth \$160 million in 2017, news came out that the previous contract with the apparel company paid out 98 percent of all cash involved to one person: the men's basketball coach, Rick Pitino. The athletic director had lied, promising the money would go to student-athletes. By October of that year, both Pitino and the athletic director would lose their jobs. They had been implicated in a scheme to illegally pay high school recruits so they would choose to play for Louisville. The men who helped them do it? Adidas executives.^{xxvii}

Whether it is giant broadcast companies or multi-national apparel corporations, the private sector has efficiently found ways to milk profits out of student-athletes. From what they wear, to where you can watch them and what advertisements come across your screen, student-athletes not only serve the financial interests of their colleges, but by virtue of massive contracts, they also serve the corporations that see them entirely as a product. As always in the current system, the student-athletes end up lining other people's pockets.

Conclusion

The NCAA and collegiate sports more broadly no longer primarily benefit the players. The current system does more to advance the financial interests of broadcasters, apparel companies, and athletic departments than it does for the student-athletes who provide the product from which everyone else profits. The NCAA must start putting the players first—that starts with finding a way to fairly compensate them for their labor.

Without change, the exploitation inherent in our current system will only get worse. The industry will continue to grow. Big-time athletic programs will

continue to find ways to squeeze more money out of their product. They will continue spending that money around the players instead of meaningfully on them. The arms race will continue. The extravagant coaching contracts and facilities aimed at enticing teenagers will continue. The world's largest companies will continue to profit of student-athletes' names and bodies.

College sports is an American tradition because of the student-athletes. We collectively tune in to see them compete. We fill out brackets and fill up stadiums because the effort and devotion student athletes put into their sport is special. But, these student athletes deserve more than our fanhood. They deserve to receive fair compensation for their work. They deserve a system that guarantees a meaningful education as well as financial security. They deserve a system that shows real concern for their health and well-being, both during and well after their time on the field. Simply, they deserve a system that respects their contribution and dedication. That means a new system. That means different rules. That means change. It won't come easy and the solutions won't be simple. But, if the NCAA can create a complex system that largely drives money into adults' pockets, we can create a system that does better – for the student-athletes today and all those to come after. It's about time.

Preview of Future Reports

This is the first in a series of reports that will consider a range of problems with college athletics. Subsequent reports will examine the nature of amateurism, how programs fail to provide a full education to their student-athletes, the long-term health consequences that student-athletes face and the lack of comprehensive health care afforded to them, and a look forward at how we can address the litany of issues within this industry.

¹ Lawrence, Andrew. The Atlantic. (Mar 18, 2019). Why Zion Williamson Is Poised to Change the Course of NCAA History. <https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2019/03/how-zion-williamson-could-change-ncaa/585163/>

² Id.

³ NCAA Press Release. (Apr 13, 2018). 2018 NCAA tournament viewership, attendance numbers.

<https://www.ncaa.com/news/basketball-men/article/2018-04-13/2018-ncaa-tournament-and-final-four-viewership-attendance>

⁴ USA Today. (Mar 17, 2013). March Madness ad haul spirals higher than any sport.

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2013/03/17/march-madness-ad-revenue-super-bowl-advertisers/1991379/>

⁵ NCAA Press Release. (Mar 17, 2019). Corporate Champions and Partners. <https://www.ncaa.com/news/ncaa/article/2011-02-25/corporate-champions-and-partners>

⁶ Reuters. (Mar 13, 2017). Advertisers bet big on March Madness as live sports ratings wane.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-ncaa-basketball-advertising/advertisers-bet-big-on-march-madness-as-live-sports-ratings-wane-idUSK8N16K2G9>

⁷ U.S. Department of Education. Equity in Athletics Data Analysis.

- ¹⁰⁸ MarketWatch. (Jul 2, 2016). NFL took in \$13 billion in revenue last season – see how it stacks up against other pro sports leagues. <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/the-nfl-made-13-billion-last-season-see-how-it-stacks-up-against-other-leagues-2016-07-01>
- ¹⁰⁹ Lopiano, Donna; Gurney, Gerald & Zimbalist, Andrew. (Feb 7, 2017). Unwinding Madness: What Went Wrong with College Sports and How to Fix It. Brookings Institution Press. <https://www.brookings.edu/book/unwinding-madness/>
- ¹¹⁰ Business Insider. (Oct 5, 2017). The average college football team makes more money than the next 35 college sports combined. <https://www.businessinsider.com/college-sports-football-revenue-2017-10>
- ¹¹¹ U.S. Department of Education. Equity in Athletics Data Analysis.
- ¹¹² Id.
- ¹¹³ NCAA. Scholarship. <http://www.ncaa.org/student-athletes/future/scholarships>
- ¹¹⁴ U.S. Department of Education. Equity in Athletics Data Analysis.
- ¹¹⁵ Business Insider. (Sept 24, 2014). Chart Shows How Little of College Sports Revenues Goes to The Athletes. <https://www.businessinsider.com/college-sports-revenue-athlete-scholarships-2014-9>
- ¹¹⁶ ESPN. (Aug 16, 2017). The perks of being a college football coach: Cars, planes, and... good behavior bonuses? http://www.espn.com/college-football/story/_/id/20176937/college-football-coaches-perks-sweeten-deals-nick-saban-dabo-swinney-jim-harbaugh-urban-meyer-jimbo-fisher-mike-leach
- ¹¹⁷ USA Today. 2017-18 Salaries. <http://sports.usatoday.com/ncaa/salaries/mens-basketball/coach/>
- ¹¹⁸ Branch, Taylor. The Atlantic. (October 2011). The Shame of College Sports. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2011/10/the-shame-of-college-sports/308643/>
- ¹¹⁹ Id.
- ¹²⁰ SBNation. (Oct 4, 2018). A history of skyrocketing college football coach salaries, from Walter Camp to Nick Saban. <https://www.sbnation.com/college-football/2018/6/4/17390394/college-football-coach-salaries-history-highest>
- ¹²¹ Chicago Tribune. (Dec 23, 2015). College spend fortunes on lavish athletic facilities. <https://www.chicagotribune.com/sports/college/ct-athletic-facilities-expenses-20151222-story.html>
- ¹²² Id.
- ¹²³ IndyStar. (June 20, 2016). Report: Big Ten getting \$2.64 billion in new TV deal. <https://www.indystar.com/story/sports/college/2016/06/20/report-espn-pay-more-than-1-billion-big-ten-football-games/86133418/>
- ¹²⁴ SBNation. (Jan 19, 2011). The Longhorn Network and ESPN Sign Texas-Sized Deal. <https://www.sbnation.com/ncaa-football/2011/1/19/1941110/texas-longhorn-network-espn-sign-deal>
- ¹²⁵ Football Scoop. (May 21, 2018). Nike, Adidas or Under Armour? Who wears what in FBS – 2018 edition. <http://footballscoop.com/news/nike-adidas-armour-wears-fbs-2018-edition/>
- ¹²⁶ ESPN. (Sept 27, 2017). Breaking down college shoe and apparel deals. http://www.espn.com/mens-college-basketball/story/_/id/20837463/a-look-colleges-apparel-shoe-deals
- ¹²⁷ Courier-Journal. (Oct 5, 2017). Rick Pitino raked in 98% of the cash from University of Louisville's current Adidas deal. <https://www.courier-journal.com/story/sports/college/louisville/2017/10/05/university-louisville-college-basketball-adidas-tom-jurich-rick-pitino-money/30771001/>

At a time when Congress is knee-deep in more urgent issues, two Federal bills have been proposed to limit the right of college athletes to monetize their names, images and likenesses (“NIL”). A bill from Senator Marco Rubio is simple, while one sponsored by the “Power Five” Conferences is complex, but neither should be taken up this year. This is a great time for Congress to follow the political equivalent of the Hippocratic Oath—first, do no harm. These issues are not suited to a quick fix by a Congress focused on bigger things, and may not need congressional intervention at all.

For background, all citizens have the right under state laws, to profit from, and to stop others from profiting from, their talents and fame. But college athletes cannot exercise this right because the NCAA demands that they be “amateurs”—athletes who don’t get paid. Of course, a college athlete with a Nike shoe contract or a profitable Instagram account is not being paid by his or her university, but the NCAA still says no. You may recall that similar amateurism concepts once controlled the Olympics, international tennis and golf, all of which jettisoned amateurism decades ago, but the NCAA clings to it, keeping the athletes as amateurs, the leading coaches as multi-millionaires, and the top teams earning many millions from football and basketball.

NCAA NIL prohibitions have been long criticized, but public debate heated up when state legislatures took up the issue last year for athletes in their states. California overwhelmingly passed a groundbreaking bill requiring its colleges to allow athletes to profit from NIL.

[Full disclosure: I testified in support of that bill and consulted with its sponsors.] Colorado and Florida followed suit, and two dozen other states have bills pending. The support is bipartisan, as Democrats led the charge in California and Republicans in Florida. To be clear, none of the bills authorized salaries for college athletes, just NIL rights.

The NCAA was initially quite hostile to this state activity, opposing each bill, then threatening to sue the states, but ultimately it blinked, appointing a prestigious Working Group to address the issues. In April the Working Group recommended substantial reforms, which are scheduled to be acted upon by the three NCAA Divisions (larger, medium-sized and smaller athletic programs) at a January Convention. Opinion is split, with some college athletic officials supporting major changes, others urging moderation, and others opposing any change. With the Convention in January and the Florida bill becoming effective in July 2021, many believe that significant reform is around the corner. They may be right—unless Congress screws it up.

This brings us to the two bills. The one from Sen. Rubio audaciously proposes that Congress should instruct the NCAA to do something about this soon, and wipes out all state laws, passed or pending, while blocking any Federal or state court from addressing the issue. Of course, if you tell the NCAA no one can touch them, they are far less likely to do anything constructive. But Sen. Rubio would make them the King who, by definition, can do no wrong. It is hard to imagine a worse plan, or a worse time to try to sneak it through Congress.

The bill sponsored the Power Five—75 of the 1,100 colleges in the NCAA, but the ones with the largest and most revenue-generating sports programs—includes some specific NIL rules that Congress would adopt. The details would apparently be filled in by the schools, or possibly the Federal Trade Commission, a Federal agency with no experience in this area. Like Rubio’s bill, the Power Five bill would preempt all state laws and all litigation on the subject.

The problems with this bill are too numerous to address here, but the biggest one is that—even if Congress were the right entity to govern NIL, it cannot possibly hear from interested constituencies and make good decisions before it adjourns. Jill Bodensteiner, Athletic Director at St. Joseph’s and a member of the NCAA Working Group, said that NIL was the most complex issue she’d ever worked on, “hands down,” including her legal work on billion dollar corporate mergers. But the Power Five want Congress to resolve it right now.

Leaving aside the complexity, the bill seems wrong in several places. It would prohibit a Yale rower from getting a sponsorship contract with a rowing club if the rowing club had made a contribution to the Yale Athletic department in the last 5 years. Why? It would prohibit any athlete at Duke from entering into any NIL contract arrangement with Nike, because Duke has an endorsement contract with Nike, but also prohibit him or her from contracting with an competitor of Nike. So you can have NIL, but not from the places most likely to give it to you. This bill is a mess, and it would take months for Congress to learn the subject matter and find the solution. I have attached an Appendix which identifies some of the problems with the bill as written.

Finally, this bill is an attack on state sovereignty, and Congress has no business telling states how to run their universities. Many NCAA schools are state universities, which are run lock, stock and barrel by the states. But these bills would tell the State of Florida that it can’t tell the University of Florida how to treat its students. By what right? Couldn’t Florida pass a law requiring rigorous concussion protocols for athletes at those universities? How is this different? (Admittedly the Florida bill also covers private universities, but nearly the same question is presented—why can’t Florida tell the University of Miami that it must respect the NIL rights of its athletes?)

Congress should stand down, and focus on other pressing issues. Let the NCAA have its January Convention and let’s see if this works itself out. If not, a new Congress can consider whether it wishes to dictate to the states on this issue next year.

APPENDIX TO COMMENTS OF PROFESSOR LEN SIMON

Primary Concerns with Power Five Bill [These views are personal and do not necessarily reflect the views of Ramogi Huma or the National College Players Association]

1. Prohibition on NIL contracts with persons or entities who have contributed any money to the University’s athletic department in the last 5 years is grossly overbroad. It would, for example, prohibit a modest contract for a Div. III athlete with a local business that contributes \$250 per year to the college. That is exactly the

kind of NIL contract that a (non-scholarship) athlete is likely to get, and need. Section 3(b)(iii).

2. Permission to obtain payment for legitimate hourly work should be expanded to include earnings from legitimate non-hourly work, such as profits from creating a summer camp for young athletes. Section 2(e)(vi)

3. The prohibition of NIL contracts in the first semester should be modified to permit NIL contracts to be negotiated once the athlete registers for and attends class. Recruiting is over by then, and some students need the extra assistance to get by. Section 3(b)(ii)

4. The prohibition on NIL contracts with businesses that have endorsement contracts with the university is unduly harsh, and should prohibit only those contracts that directly conflict with the university's contract, as provided in the California bill (in language proposed by the NCAA). If Duke had a Nike contract, this bill would prohibit a Duke cross-country runner (possibly non-scholarship or partial scholarship) from having a small apparel deal with Nike. Why? It doesn't make much sense even when applied to a basketball player with a full scholarship, since he gets nothing out of the university contract except some equipment, but it sweeps so broadly that it is obviously wrong. Section 3(b)(iv)

5. Similarly, the potential prohibition (at the option of the university) on contracts with businesses competing with those that have contracts with the university is indefensible and anticompetitive. Now our cross-country runner at Duke can't have a small apparel deal with Adidas or UnderArmor. Why? She gets even less out of the Nike deal with the university. Section 3(c).

6. The role of the FTC under the bill is puzzling and likely to frustrate all concerned. The agency has no experience with NIL, nor should we expect its Commissioner or Staff to have any interest or expertise in the area. Asking the FTC to, among other things, develop and administer a test for certification as an agent, or to advise college athletes on entering NIL contracts, is unfortunate to say the least. Further, Federal agencies can at times be entirely stymied by the politics of nominations and lack a quorum or a working majority. NIL rules should come from the NCAA, the conferences, the universities, the states, or if absolutely necessary, from Congress itself. Section 5.

7. Neither antitrust immunity nor state law preemption should be considered for NCAA NIL provisions unless and until rules are in places that are fair and reasonable. Section 6.

8. Section 6(b), by prohibiting states from regulating NIL at universities in their state violates the sovereignty of those states, and their plenary authority to govern state-sponsored universities. Thus, for example, under this bill Florida could not instruct the University of Florida, Florida State and other state universities to allow their students broader NIL rights than the NCAA permits, even if they withdraw from the NCAA and form their own conference with like-minded states. That is an unprecedented overreach in our Federal system. Section 6(b).

[Whereupon, at 12:21 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

