



The Commercialization of College Football and the Compensation of Players

By Christopher Cleary

University Honors in Business

Spring 2013

Advisor: Richard Linowes, Kogod School of Business

Abstract

The rising popularity of college football nationwide has led to a revenue explosion and the commercialization of NCAA football. No longer is major college football about the players—universities and the NCAA now work to make the most money off so-called “student athletes” as they can. Despite the student athlete working more hours than a full-time job and making millions of dollars for the university, the athletes receive nothing more than a full scholarship that does not even meet their basic needs. 86% of college football players live below the poverty line; yet they are forced to remain in poverty while waiting for a chance at the NFL. Although the NCAA promotes the idea of the student athlete, if the student fails athletically his scholarship is taken away and he is not given a chance to be a student. Guaranteeing four year scholarships and increasing full scholarships to cover living expenses is a first step which needs to start now. However, in the interest of equity, college football players should get a small portion of the revenue that they help generate. This revenue would be placed in escrow, unable to be withdrawn until a player graduates college. Compensating players in this manner furthers the mission of universities by promoting graduation and fairness. Players are the principle producers of billions of dollars of revenue—it is time that they start to collect their fair share.

College Football Landscape

General Overview

Division 1 Football Bowl Subdivision, formerly known as Division 1A College Football, is the top level of college football in the United States. It consists of eleven different conferences and 120 total member schools. Of the eleven conferences, six of them are known as major

conferences: Big East, Big Ten, SEC, Big 12, Pac 12, and ACC. These major conferences are home to the best college football programs, and therefore recruit the best players and earn the most money. When discussing college football, most people refer mainly to these six conferences, as their revenues and skill levels are vastly different than the other conferences. Therefore, in the subsequent sections, only policies related to the major conferences will be discussed.

NCAA and Amateurism

College football is governed by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in conjunction with the Presidents of each University. The athletes that play in college football are considered amateur athletes, and per NCAA rules cannot receive any benefits besides a scholarship. This scholarship consists solely of tuition, fees, room, board, and books. If any student athlete is caught receiving essentially anything else from anybody, that student athlete is deemed to have violated NCAA rules related to amateurism. If a violation occurs, the school as a whole and the individual player are subject to punishment by the NCAA. Therefore, colleges take great care to ensure that their athletes do not receive any improper benefits (or at least do not get caught doing so) and keep their amateur status.

The NCAA maintains that all players in college sports are “student-athletes.” This means that in the NCAA’s eyes the players are students first, regardless of how often the players are actually participating in school work compared to playing football. This terminology also helps the NCAA and universities with the issue of workers compensation. Because the NCAA does not consider the player’s “workers” they have been able to get away with not compensating players for their injuries. Since every practice is technically “voluntary” the injuries that occur are not

the responsibility of the university. Essentially, if a serious injury occurs, the university has very little liability for compensation because of the idea of the “student-athlete.”¹

NCAA Scandals

College football is regularly engulfed in scandals, big and small, involving top football programs giving improper benefits to athletes. Reggie Bush, star running back and Heisman trophy winner for the USC Trojans, was deemed ineligible after he accepted the improper benefit of a suburban home for his parents and had to return his Heisman trophy. Georgia star receiver A.J. Green was suspended four games for selling a jersey for \$1,000 to an agent. Most innocently, Terrelle Pryor, star quarterback for Ohio State, traded his own championship rings for simple tattoos.²

Although all of these situations involved players and colleges breaking NCAA rules, many of these actions seem justifiable. Reggie Bush, A.J. Green, and Terrelle Pryor were all making millions of dollars for their schools and the NCAA by their incredible performances on the field. However, neither they nor their families were granted access to even a tiny fraction of all that money. Considering these players came from extremely impoverished backgrounds, moderately violating NCAA rules simply gave the players simple luxuries they justifiably deserved.

¹ Bianchi, Greg. "Age Requirement in Professional Sport." The Sport Journal. United States Sports Academy, n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.thesportjournal.org/article/age-requirement-professional-sport>>.

² "USA TODAY." USATODAY.COM. Associated Press, 31 May 2011. Web. 14 Apr. 2013. <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/sports/college/football/2011-05-31-4176652001_x.htm>.

NFL Age Requirement

The National Football League requires that a player must be three years out of high school in order to join the league. During that three year waiting period, the only legitimate way to develop in order to play in the NFL is through college football. Therefore, a common view is that college football is the equivalent of a developmental league for the NFL. If a player wants to turn professional, he has no choice but to go to college for three years. Although a college education is always a good thing for a young person, players trying to make the NFL focus their energy on developing their football skills, not their academics. The NFL age requirement essentially makes a mismatch for top football programs. Elite college football players are called “student athletes” even though all they really want to do is be an athlete. This leads to low academic standards just to keep star players on the field. Meanwhile, these players are not allowed to make any money off themselves. To sum it up, young people with the ability to play in the National Football League are essentially being forced to be an amateur student athlete for three years.

Commercialization

While NCAA rules limit the amount any athlete can earn to zero, there is no such limit on coaches, the universities, or the NCAA. All of these entities make a ton of money from organizing, coaching, and watching student athletes play football. College football has become commercialized, with the simplest example being major college coaches. The average salary for a coach from a major conference is about \$2.3 million, with thirteen coaches making over three million a year (See Exhibit A). Nick Saban, whose Alabama teams have won three out of the last

four national championships, earns \$5.5 million every season.³ Although no one doubts these coaches are very good, the difference between the amount the coaches make and the absence of payment for the players is staggering.

However, college coaches make pennies compared to the major universities. The major source of wealth for college programs is television contracts, and the price of television contracts have been skyrocketing. Television providers are desperate for content that cannot simply be recorded and watched later, as commercials during those programs can be skipped and are therefore worth much less. Therefore, providers are turning to sporting events, and the bidding wars have raised the prices substantially. For instance, ESPN recently agreed to acquire the rights for the new four team college football playoff for \$5.6 billion over 12 years. In total, television has agreed to pay about \$25.5 billion in rights fees for college football programs.⁴ Despite providers paying to see the players play football, none of the over \$25 billion trickles down to the players.

Additionally, there is tremendous evidence of the capitalistic tendencies of the major college football programs in recent years. Many college programs have abandoned geographical regions of their conference in favor of more profitable conferences. For example, West Virginia University now plays in the Deep South based Big 12, while University of Maryland belongs to the Midwest based Big 10. To replace the schools leaving, the Big East chose to bring in Texas schools Southern Methodist University and University of Houston. Traditional rivalries were

³ Brady, Erik. "College Football Coaches Continue to See Salary Explosion." USA Today. Gannett, 20 Nov. 2012. Web. 14 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/ncaaf/2012/11/19/college-football-coaches-contracts-analysis-pay-increase/1715435/>>.

⁴ Bachman, Rachel. "College Football's Big-Money, Big-Risk Business Model." The Wall Street Journal. News Corp, 10 Dec. 2012. Web. 14 Apr. 2013. <<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324024004578169472607407806.html>>.

destroyed; instead, student athletes will be asked to travel thousands of miles away for many games. College football players will now be pulled out of school more often and longer.

However, these moves made the most money for the conferences and schools. Major college football schools have clearly demonstrated that their motives start with money before thinking about the good of the students.

Arguments against Compensation

Scholarships are Payment

The main justification for not compensating college athletes outside of a scholarship is that they are being compensated enough with a scholarship to a university. According to NCAA rules, a full scholarship includes tuition, fees, room, board, and books. This scholarship for four years could be worth somewhere between \$30,000 and \$200,000. And this valuation does not include the other benefits a student athlete receives by attending the university. The athlete gets everything any other student receives while going to a university, such as the fitness facilities, concerts and lectures, and a variety of clubs. Furthermore, an athlete at a prominent school gets the name recognition of the institution and the personnel to help them develop.⁵ Receiving all of these benefits for free is definitely worth something in itself.

In addition, a major college football player receives the perks of being on the football team. Student athletes get to travel all over the country and get fed very well when they are gone.

At their school, college football players are among the most revered students on campus. They

⁵ Johnson, Dennis A., Ed.D. "Point/Counterpoint: Paying College Athletes." The Sport Journal (2013): n. pag. United States Sport Academy. Web. 14 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.thesportjournal.org/article/pointcounterpoint-paying-college-athletes>>.

also receive many forms of merchandise from the school. However, football players are so busy with their other commitments that they barely have time to relax and have a typical college experience. Overall, there are definitely some benefits to playing major college football, but they come with the price of working extremely hard.

Undermines Educational Purpose

Many people also make the argument that compensating student athletes sends a bad message to other students. Paying players could very well undermine the educational purpose of the university by making profit the top priority for players. Most people can agree that the main goal in college should be academics and focusing for life after college. Paying players might devalue the education even further for the athlete. However, the question must be asked how much is academics really emphasized for these student athletes currently.

No Clear Method of Compensation

The most debated part about paying college athletes is figuring out who gets paid and how much. There is not a general consensus on those issues, and this question is central to the debate. Athletic departments cost a lot of money, and sometimes operate at deficits and need to borrow money from the university's general fund⁶ (See Exhibits D and E). If every college athlete receives a very large payment, most universities will go broke very fast. Even if only revenue generating sports pay players, this will mean that the schools that generate the most revenue will have even more of an upper hand. Mid major schools will have even less of a chance to compete to get very good players. It is unfair to demand that schools pay players if

⁶ Bachman, Rachel. "College Football's Big-Money, Big-Risk Business Model." The Wall Street Journal. News Corp, 10 Dec. 2012. Web. 14 Apr. 2013.
<<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324024004578169472607407806.html>>.

they simply do not have enough funds to pay for them. There are a million different ways to pay players, and the hardest part is determining how this payment occurs.

Title IX

An additional defense to not paying revenue-generating sports such as football and men's basketball is that paying only men's sports would violate the famous "Title IX". Some people might see payments only to men's sports as discrimination against women's sports. However, if it was done on a strictly revenue basis, it would be hard for Title IX to take effect. Currently, schools spend a lot more money on men's sports than women's sports. If it is legal to spend more on men's programs, then it might also be legal to pay men's players if they are generating revenue.⁷ However, if payment was based solely on the sport being football, then Title IX might come more into play.

Arguments for Compensation

Scholarships Fall Short

The people who believe that a simple full scholarship is enough to get a person through college forgets that many college athletes come from extremely impoverished backgrounds. In fact, the National College Players Association released a report that determined 86% of student athletes live in poverty.⁸ Many of these poor athletes travel extremely far away from home for a

⁷ Nocera, Joe. "Let's Start Paying College Athletes." The New York Times. N.p., 30 Dec. 2011. Web. 14 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/01/magazine/lets-start-paying-college-athletes.html?pagewanted=all>>.

⁸ Hayes, Matt. "Report Concludes 86 Percent of Student Athletes Live in Poverty." SportingNews. AOL, 16 Jan. 2013. Web. 14 Apr. 2013. <<http://aol.sportingnews.com/ncaa-football/story/2013-01-15/student-athletes-poverty-paid-scholarships-ncpa-texas-duke>>.

chance to play at a very good college football program. Therefore, they have absolutely no support from their families. As it stands currently, athletes need more money to pay for other essentials such as laundry and trips home. Many studies have determined that the actual full cost of attending a college is as much as \$3,000 more than a full scholarship. Where is an impoverished athlete supposed to get that money if he is far away from home? Even former NCAA President Myles Brand favored increasing the scholarship amounts by that much. Exhibit C shows the simple budgeting effect that giving players an extra \$3,000 would have. Players would go from not being able to cover all expenses at college to breaking even.

In addition, scholarships can be revoked at any time to any athlete for any reason. Whether a player gets hurt, has an attitude problem, or simply plays bad, a school can drop his scholarship without recourse. Therefore, if a player has a down year, he might not be able to afford finishing his degree. By using this power, a university clearly shows that it does not care about promoting a student athlete finishing his degree. If universities' mission was really to educate, colleges would allow a student to continue attending regardless of their athletic status.

For some reason, athletes cannot simply revoke their commitment to the university like the university can for athletes. According to NCAA rules, if a player decides for whatever reason that he wants to transfer, that player must sit out a year before playing for his new team. Therefore, players are essentially locked into a contract with the university which the university can cancel at any time. This rule is blatantly one-sided—if a player is committed to a university, the university should have to be committed to him.

College Football vs. Academics

NCAA rules dictate that coaches can only require players to train for twenty hours per week. Despite this restriction, a survey of college football players shows that players spend an average of 43.3 hours on their sport.⁹ This is more than equivalent to a full-time job, and more than the same survey says they spend on academics. In general, college football coaches require that a player puts football ahead of academics. If a player refuses to prioritize accordingly, they get thrust aside: “For instance, Robert Smith, former running back for Minnesota Vikings and pre-med student while at Ohio State, needed two afternoon labs in the same semester. Since the labs conflicted with practice, coaches suggested that he drop them because of the commitment he made to play football. Against the wishes of the coaching staff, Smith took the classes but was forced to sit out the season as red shirt athlete.”¹⁰ Unfortunately, Smith’s decision is extremely rare—almost every football player faced with that same choice chooses the other direction. Academics are simply not valued in college football like the NCAA advertises. Major college football programs treat football as the student athlete’s primary job and academics as a side gig. Since football is treated like their primary focus, it only seems fair that they are compensated accordingly.

Further evidence of universities’ indifference towards football player’s academics exists looking at specific players. For many schools, playing ability completely overrides academic inefficiencies. Universities provide college football players with simple classes, surrogate test

⁹ Wieberg, Steve. "NCAA Survey Delves into Practice Time, Coaches' Trust." USA Today. N.p., 15 Jan. 2011. Web. 29 Apr. 2013. <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/sports/college/2011-01-14-ncaa-survey_N.htm>.

¹⁰ Johnson, Dennis A., Ed.D. "Point/Counterpoint: Paying College Athletes." The Sport Journal (2013): n. pag. United States Sport Academy. Web. 14 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.thesportjournal.org/article/pointcounterpoint-paying-college-athletes>>.

takers, and even doctored transcripts. Although not completely widespread, these practices help players like Dexter Manley go through school without learning anything: “Former NFL player Dexter Manley testified before a Senate Committee that he played four years at Oklahoma State University, only to leave the school illiterate.”¹¹ And Manley is not alone—there are many big-time college football programs that are more than willing to sacrifice academics to put a winning team on the field.

Slavery Analogy

When describing the relationship between college athletes, coaches, and the universities, many bring up the analogy of slavery. Although admittedly overblown, there are certainly merits to this adventurous analogy written in depth by Stanley Eitzen: “The athletes (slaves) are exploited economically, making millions for their masters, but provided only with a subsistence wage of room, board, tuition, and books; they are controlled with restricted freedoms; they are subject to physical and mental abuse by overseers; and the master-slave relationship is accepted by the athletes as legitimate.”¹² More realistically an indentured servant analogy, this statement warrants further consideration about the way the college football system operates.

In this analogy, the players are the servants that are not paid at all yet do the hard work. The coaches are the overseers, making sure everything is running smoothly and everyone is in line. The university is the plantation, which gives the players a place to both live and work. The players must be at the university at all times, and they are forbidden to do certain other activities such as club sports and political protests. The player cannot get out of his commitment to the

¹¹ Johnson, Dennis A., Ed.D. "Point/Counterpoint: Paying College Athletes." *The Sport Journal* (2013): n. pag. United States Sport Academy. Web. 14 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.thesportjournal.org/article/pointcounterpoint-paying-college-athletes>>.

¹² D, Stanley Eitzen. "Slaves of Big-Time College Sports." *USA Today* 2000: 26-30. ProQuest. Web. 18 Apr. 2013.

university without a punishment of sitting out a year. Also, the NFL age limit forces kids with NFL dreams to put up with this indentured servitude.¹³

Though somewhat dramatic, this analogy actually fits very well. Maybe the most important aspect of the analogy is the socioeconomic factors of this analogy. The leaders of the university and the coach are most often rich and white, while the bulk of the players are poor and black. This system of unpaid labor makes it look like the rich white men are taking advantage of the poor black kids. Although not necessarily true, when looked at through this lens, the system looks particularly wrong. Even economist Andrew Zimbalist substantiates this argument: "Big-time intercollegiate athletics is a unique industry. No other industry in the United States manages not to pay its principal producers a wage or a salary."¹⁴ Payment somewhat close to fair value would certainly help nullify this perception of exploitation.

College a Must for the NFL

Ever since the National Football League (NFL) made it mandatory to be three years out of high school before being able to enter into the NFL draft, college football has been a necessary stepping stone for the NFL. If a player has any dreams of going pro, he must go to a college and show off his skills. Even if that player could go to the NFL straight out of high school and get paid millions of dollars, he is instead required to play for free for three years. During those three years, a player could get seriously injured or tragedy could strike. Also, during a player's college career, the university benefits monetarily from a star player while the player gets nothing extra for his skills. A player's prime earning years only benefit the player's

¹³ D, Stanley Eitzen. "Slaves of Big-Time College Sports." USA Today 2000: 26-30. ProQuest. Web. 18 Apr. 2013.

¹⁴ D, Stanley Eitzen. "Slaves of Big-Time College Sports." USA Today 2000: 26-30. ProQuest. Web. 18 Apr. 2013.

university. Exhibit C shows the extreme difference in earnings of a player that is allowed to go to the NFL versus a player that has to stay in college.

Fair Market Value

As has been shown, the business of college football is a definite money raiser for universities. College football players are each worth a lot of money for their play on the field and their endorsements. In fact, the National College Player Association performed a study titled “The Price of Poverty in Big Time College Sports” where they looked at fair market value of college athletes. The study found that, if allowed access to the fair market like the pros, the fair market value of the average college football player would be \$121,000, not including potential endorsement deals. In addition, the study found that the ten highest valued college football players were worth between \$345,000 and \$514,000.¹⁵ Adding in endorsement deals, there could be a number of college football players making \$500,000 a year. Instead, these players are incurring costs attending college while waiting to go professional. There is no reason why players worth that amount of money should be explicitly not allowed to make any money off themselves.

Specific Player Examples

Maurice Clarett was a top five player in college football as a sophomore. He was very poor and virtually guaranteed to be an early first round pick, so he decided to declare for the draft and challenge the draft rule in the courts. Although originally receiving a favorable ruling, the appeals court ruled against his case, and he was not allowed to be drafted. However, since he declared for the NFL draft, he was no longer an “amateur” by NCAA standards and not

¹⁵ Huma, Ramogi. "Study: "The Price of Poverty in Big Time College Sport"" National College Players Association, n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.ncpanow.org/research?id=0024>>.

permitted to play in college either. So he sat out a year and, because he had nowhere to play, lost a lot of his skills and was no longer a top prospect. Clarette had a poor workout and was not drafted at all the next year. This sad development reinforced the notion that college football is a necessary developmental league for the NFL. Players who refuse to give in to the NCAA's amateur system are essentially shut out from any chance at going pro. Basically, Clarette's desire to make money off his brilliant football talents earlier than permitted ultimately led him to never capitalize.

In 2012, Johnny Manziel won the Heisman Trophy and Jadeveon Clowney was arguably the best defensive player in college football. However, because they were both less than three years out of high school, they were ineligible for the NFL draft. This season, they are facing the issue of playing another season without getting injured. They are unable to cash in on their talents even though their jerseys are being sold in record amounts and viewers will tune in every Saturday to see them play. There is so much fear that injury could strike that people are asking whether they should play this year at all. People are justifiably upset that these star players cannot start making money off their superior play immediately.

Benefits of Compensation for Universities

Public Perception

Throughout the history of college football, universities have only shown a desire to look out for their self interest. Therefore, it is reasonable to wonder why the universities and the NCAA would ever start paying players if it would cost them more money. Despite the cost, paying players might dramatically increase public perception of the individual schools and the

NCAA as a whole. Recently, there has been widespread dislike of the direction that the major universities and the NCAA are heading. Countless commentators have denounced the NCAA for being hypocritical, selfish, and idiotic. If public perception continues to trend negatively, college football may lose popularity or major reform might take effect. Either of these possibilities could undermine the universities and the NCAA's profitability. Therefore, paying players might ultimately increase public opinion and allow the NCAA to keep their very profitable business model.

Additionally, the public perception of a poor black athlete is starting to tarnish the NCAA's reputation. As previously mentioned, a staggering 86% of college football players live below the poverty line. The more that statistic comes out, the worse it looks for the universities who pay their coaches millions of dollars. Additionally, individual stories like former USC All-American Daylon McCutchen's make the universities look terrible: "My main thing was that I was in a situation where I could barely put food in my refrigerator, and I couldn't get help from home. Actually, I was able to receive a Pell Grant, but the majority of the time, a lot of my Pell Grant was going home to help my mom and my sister. So, there wasn't any help."¹⁶ This inequity tarnishes college football's reputation, and as more money keeps getting brought into the system, the calls for equity will only increase.

Legal Challenges

In addition, there have been a number of legal challenges to NCAA's rules that players cannot be compensated. These legal battles threaten the NCAA's power and influence on college football. If the courts strike down some of the NCAA's more controversial rules, the NCAA

¹⁶ D, Stanley Eitzen. "Slaves of Big-Time College Sports." USA Today 2000: 26-30. ProQuest. Web. 18 Apr. 2013.

could lose significant power in regulating college football. For example, there is a court case pending that would allow athletes, former and current, access to television rights.¹⁷ A judge ruled in February that college athletes do have the right to pursue some of the money from television contracts. This ruling is an early step to a possible monumental victory for college athletes everywhere. For the first time, the NCAA is legitimately threatened by college athletes having a right to some of its profits.

That is just one example of the number of legal challenges to the NCAA's authority to determine whether college athletes get paid. The NCAA is finding it harder and harder to argue that college athletics, particularly college football, is not commercialized. Therefore, instead of waiting for a possible unfavorable ruling, the NCAA should work on coming up with terms more favorable to itself. The NCAA has a lot of power right now, and instead of fighting the current trend of commercialization, the organization should be proactive. Small, controlled payments to players would virtually eliminate all threats to the NCAA's power. If the NCAA wants to remain relevant and powerful, college football players need to get a cut.

Competitive Advantage

Every college football program looks for any way to gain a competitive advantage. There are so many scandals in college football because schools have decided they will break rules in order to gain a competitive advantage. Being able to legally offer players additional payment would serve the school's interests tremendously—they could attract better talent while staying within the rules. If some schools started giving players additionally compensation, other top schools would have no choice but to follow along or they would lose top talent. Regulating the

¹⁷ Egan, Matt. "Judge: NCAA Athletes in Lawsuit Can Go After Live TV Cash." Fox Business. News Corp, 30 Jan. 2013. Web. 14 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.foxbusiness.com/industries/2013/01/30/judge-ncaa-athletes-in-lawsuit-can-go-after-live-tv-cash/>>.

amount of money that athletes could receive would be a success for all parties. Players would be compensated more equitable while universities would still be able to attract top talent.

Compensation Possibilities

Living Expenses Stipend

As mentioned previously, the full scholarship that an athlete receives does not cover all the costs of attending college. There are additional costs, such as living essentials and trips home, which are not covered under the current scholarship system. All athletic scholarships could be increased to cover those costs—a plan which even former NCAA President Myles Brand endorses: “Ideally, the value of an athletically related scholarship would be increased to cover the full-cost of attendance, calculated at between \$2,000 to \$3,000 more per year than is currently provided. I favor this approach of providing the full cost of attendance”¹⁸ Exhibit F shows the monetary effect of giving all scholarship athletes \$3,000 extra. This is the most basic possibility, and is also the proposal that has the most likelihood of coming true in the near future. In fact, there have been proposals similar to this in the Big Ten and SEC. However, so far these proposals have not been implemented. A living expenses stipend would be the first step to just compensation for players.

Multi-year Scholarships

An additional proposal that is relatively close to implementation is allowing multi-year scholarships. The fact that NCAA laws specifically ban multi-year scholarships is one of the

¹⁸ Parent, Christopher M. "Forward Progress? An Analysis of Whether Student-Athletes Should Be Paid." Virginia Sports and Entertainment Law Journal 3.2 (2004): 238. Web. 14 Apr. 2013.

main points about the NCAA being hypocritical. Under NCAA rules, if a player gets injured or is ineffective, the university can simply take away his scholarship in the following year and make the student suddenly pay his way through college. Considering 86% of college football players are below the poverty line, most players when losing their scholarship can no longer go to school. Essentially, the current NCAA policy promotes the fact that a person must be a good enough football player in order to be able to attend school.

The current NCAA ban on multi-year scholarship could simply be repealed. However, a more pragmatic step would be for the NCAA to require multi-year scholarships. If college football players are truly student-athletes, then just because they fail on the field does not mean that the college should stop them from being students. Requiring colleges to make the commitment to student-athletes with a guaranteed four year scholarship would help truly turn college football players into student athletes.

Olympic Amateur Model

A little-known fact about the concept of amateurism is that there are multiple ways to define an amateur. Although the NCAA currently has a very clearly defined version of an amateur athlete, the Olympics have a different definition. Athletes participating in the Olympics are allowed to go on the commercial open market and make money for themselves. Athletes are free to procure endorsement deals, get paid for signing autographs, and other money-making activities that the current NCAA system does not support. This adaptation of the Olympic amateur model would require the NCAA to put less effort into enforcement of their stringent policies. No longer would the NCAA spend months and months investigating simple rules violations such as a player selling his own merchandise.

An argument against the Olympic model is that without strict enforcement of monetary gains by players, the sport would devolve into a free-for-all with college football players only caring about making as much money as possible. Although that is a compelling argument, one only has to look around at the current climate of college football to realize that this is already occurring. Universities are no longer looking at what schedule of games is best for the students; instead, colleges are looking to join the conference that will make the school the most money. Additionally, there is already an extensive black market where agents and coaches paying players has become commonplace. This is evident by the frequency of scandals across college football. If the Olympics' simplified, less nitpicky version of amateurism was adopted, there would be no more black market for players' services. The dark cloud that currently hangs over college football would be taken away. The NCAA could now focus on servicing the student-athlete rather than regulating their thousands of rules.

Compensation Linked to Games Played

One possible method of compensating players, recently suggested by the coach of the University of South Carolina football team Steve Spurrier, is paying players a small amount per game played. Under his proposal, each player that dresses for a game gets \$300 per game. This small expense could come out of the coach's extravagant pay, Spurrier reasons. This proposal was also backed by six other SEC coaches, who understand more than anyone that their players deserve some sort of compensation: "I just wish there was a way to give our players a piece of the pie. It's so huge right now. As you know, 50 years ago, there wasn't any kind of money and the players got full scholarships. Now, they're still getting full scholarships and the money is in the millions. I don't know how to get it done. Hopefully there's a way to get our guys that play

football a little piece of the pie.”¹⁹ Even the coaches realize that it is time for a change to the traditional NCAA amateur model.

Although many coaches support this proposal, the act of coaches giving each player a little money is not a reasonable outcome. Conferences and the NCAA would never support coaches themselves giving players money from their pocket. However, this proposal reflects the sentiment around college football that these extraordinary athletes deserve to get some compensation. The idea of taking away a little bit of this extravagant coaches pay and putting it towards modest compensation for players makes sense both as equitable and financial. Colleges would not be spending additional money; instead, the money would go around a little more reasonably.

Payment Linked to Revenue

Although paying every college football player the exact same seems fair, the fact is that star quarterbacks are worth a lot more money to the university than backup offensive lineman. A star player makes so much money for his university, yet has no way to cash in on his superior play. Universities sell jerseys of star players for a premium, but the school makes that entire premium as profit. Superior teams make it to the best bowl games and earn millions of dollars for the school, yet the players that played so hard to get there earn none of the earnings. In one proposal, players earn a small percentage of the revenue that the school makes from them. If Texas A&M sells a ton of Johnny Manziel jerseys, Johnny Manziel would receive a portion of the revenue. If the University of Texas makes it to the Orange Bowl and receives \$20 million,

¹⁹ Jones, David. "Steve Spurrier Proposes Paying SEC Football Players \$300 a Game." USA Today. N.p., 1 June 2011. Web. 29 Apr. 2013. <<http://content.usatoday.com/communities/campusrivalry/post/2011/06/steve-spurrier-sec-paying-players-proposal/1>>.

each player on the University of Texas football team would receive a portion of that money. This way, the earnings of players are tied directly to the earnings that they deserve.

This potential solution is completely about equity. If universities are making money off players, those players deserve adequate compensation. Colleges should not be allowed to make an infinite amount of money off football players without giving them anything. Even a modest proposal of revenue sharing, such as 5% of television revenue, merchandise sales, bowl game winnings, and coach's bonuses would do wonders to adequately compensate players for succeeding. This small percentage would change many young people's lives without affecting the university's bottom line in a significant manner. Additionally, players would be less inclined to solicit money from agents and other sources if they were already receiving a cut of their on-field performance. The simple philosophy of rewarding stellar performances should be a factor in compensating college football players.

Payment Held "in escrow"

Despite the need for payment of players, there obviously should be limits imposed on college athlete's earnings. A very intriguing way to limit an athlete's earnings is to put his surplus earnings into an escrow account. Any earnings that are excessive should be put away until that player finishes his student-athlete experience. Earnings over \$5,000 per year would not be able to be accessed by a player until that player graduates. Receiving a degree would be a requirement for receiving the money that a player earns. The money would be held for ten years, so that a student would have plenty of time to finish his degree.

Holding payments in escrow accomplishes two key things, both of which are in the best interest of the player. The player gets access to enough money to live comfortably, yet since they

are still in college and possibly lack money management skills, the money is put away until they finish school. However, maybe more important is the fact that players would now have a gigantic incentive to graduate. Suddenly students will work extremely hard to graduate college in order to have access to the money that they have earned. This will no doubt increase graduation rates among college football players, since they would hate to not receive payment for all their hard work. These results work in synergy with the NCAA's mission of bettering the student-athlete experience. With payments held in escrow, universities would be both promoting graduation and fair treatment for their players.

How Players Should Be Compensated

Initial Step: Basic Living Expenses and Multi-Year Scholarships

College football has become too commercialized for players not to be compensated. The current system of universities and the NCAA exploiting relatively free labor to make millions of dollars has to come to an end. When every entity involved is profiting tremendously besides the people actually earning the money, the system must be reformed. If the NCAA does not step in within the next couple years, it is very likely that the courts will step in to stop this inequity. Therefore, the NCAA should take the initial step immediately of guaranteeing multi-year scholarships and allowing coverage for basic living expenses. These two policies should be required for all major conference college football programs in the next year or two.

If a university's mission is truly to educate, guaranteeing a scholarship for four years should be in their best interests. Student-athletes who do not succeed as an athlete should not be stopped from being a student. With the tremendous amount of college football players from impoverished backgrounds, taking away an athletic scholarship essentially means they cannot

attend as a student anymore. Scholarships should be guaranteed unless a student violates policy, not only renewed only if he achieves athletic success. A player who gets injured or fails to live up to expectations still deserves a shot to graduate college and make something of his life. That is in the best interest of all parties involved.

Additionally, if the real cost of attending college is \$3,000 more than a full scholarship, full scholarships should be increased to cover those living expenses. Universities should not allow their recruited students to live in extreme poverty while attending the university and participating in the full-time job of playing football. With the extreme time commitment, college football programs essentially do not allow for any activities besides schoolwork and football. Getting a part-time job to cover the extra living expenses simply is not feasible in a system that requires players to contribute forty-three hours a week to football. Therefore, the least colleges can do for their hardworking players is to cover their basic expenses.

Second Step: Revenue-Based Compensation and Escrow Accounts

Although the initial step of multi-year scholarships and basic compensation is a step in the right direction, more should be done to equitably compensate college football players. Major college football players contribute a ton of time, energy, and resources to the school in order to succeed athletically. Nevertheless, the players do not benefit when they succeed; rather, the institution and the NCAA profit off the players' achievements. Various influential figures, such as Steve Spurrier and Andrew Zimbalist, point out the obvious flaws in the system that rewards everybody but the people that deserve it the most. When college football was small and not revenue driven, it made sense to promote strict amateurism. However, when college football moved away from amateur athletics and into a profit-driven system, the argument of amateurism

no longer applied. College football programs' purpose is to make money and promote the university, and the main drivers of this purpose are the players. They deserve a cut of the billions of dollars made by the universities and the NCAA.

To satisfy the need for further payment, the NCAA should move towards a revenue-based compensation system. Players would be entitled to a cut of 5% of related revenue. This revenue would include merchandise sales, video game royalties, coaches' bonuses, bowl game bonuses, and television revenue. The merchandise sales would be player-specific, while the other revenue would be pooled and distributed to every player on the team. Although this would hurt colleges' bottom line, universities could easily make up for this expense by spending a little less extravagantly on coaches and football-related expenses. Universities would not be allowed to cut any other sports to cover this expense.

To curb the current earnings of the college students, amounts over \$5,000 per year would be put into escrow accounts. These escrow accounts would be under the student's names but would be inaccessible until the student graduates. If the student does not graduate within ten years, the money accrued in the account would be forfeited. This would limit the current earnings of student-athletes while promoting graduation. Athletes would try much harder to graduate if a monetary reward existed. Graduation rates would skyrocket from the dismal current rates to at least the college-wide average and possibly higher. Money is a great motivator, particularly for underprivileged athletes if they fail to go professional.

Favorable for All Parties

This outlined proposal seems fair for all parties involved. The players who work so hard for the university will finally be compensated for their hard work. If players do well, they do not

just see everybody profiting but them. This compensation system will eliminate the current black market for services, and allow the NCAA to focus less on regulation of their amateur rules and more on furthering their goal of facilitating the student athlete experience. Additionally, the universities and the NCAA keep their general business model with just some relatively small tweaks. Curbing coaches' salaries and lavish expenses while paying players will allow universities to continue to make money off this revenue-generating sport.

Finally the motives of the universities will match the reality of college football. Graduation will be encouraged by the escrow funds put in place. Students will not simply be removed from school because they got hurt playing football. Student athletes will not just remain in poverty while watching everyone around them get rich. This proposal will not only be equitable but sustainable. The exploitation of college football players will come to a close.

Appendix

Exhibit A: Average Coach's Salary by Conference

Conference	Average Coach Salary
ACC	\$ 2,123,396
Big 12	\$ 2,971,603
Big East	\$ 1,615,654
Big 10	\$ 2,119,558
Pac 12	\$ 2,150,850
SEC	\$ 2,746,350
Avg Salary	\$ 2,287,902

Exhibit B: Comparing Amount Under Poverty Line to Football and Basketball Revenues

School	In Poverty? (On Campus)	In Poverty? (Off Campus)	2009-10 FB & BB Combined Revenues
Florida	-\$2,250	-\$2,250	\$78,899,886
Tennessee	-\$3,090	N/A	\$69,895,525
South Carolina	-\$3,126	N/A	\$67,456,953
Oklahoma	-\$3,064	N/A	\$66,922,135
Arkansas	-\$2,848	-\$2,848	\$64,040,074
Michigan State	-\$3,070	-\$3,070	\$60,600,826
Wisconsin	-\$3,455	-\$2,400	\$56,329,282
Nebraska	-\$3,230	-\$3,122	\$55,950,436
Iowa	-\$2,559	-\$2,559	\$54,651,304
Texas A&M	-\$2,882	-\$2,882	\$50,768,753
Minnesota	-\$3,314	-\$3,314	\$46,056,004
Oklahoma State	-\$2,890	N/A	\$44,872,804
West Virginia	-\$3,022	-\$3,573	\$42,774,266
Louisville	-\$4,288	-\$4,288	\$41,427,279
Virginia Tech	-\$3,890	-\$3,890	\$40,408,163
Indiana	-\$2,972	N/A	\$38,353,343
Arizona State	-\$1,184	-\$2,274	\$38,178,657
Clemson	-\$3,856	N/A	\$38,049,194
Kansas	-\$3,820	-\$3,820	\$34,001,678
North Carolina State	-\$2,736	-\$2,736	\$32,372,895
Texas Tech	-\$2,924	-\$8,344	\$31,293,930

Exhibit C: Profit/Loss Under Different Scenarios

	In College	Living Expenses Covered	Modest Profit Sharing	Star Profit Sharing	NFL
Income	\$ -	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 5,000,000.00
Expenses	\$(3,000.00)	\$ (3,000.00)	\$ (3,000.00)	\$ (3,000.00)	\$ (500,000.00)
Profit/Loss	\$(3,000.00)	\$ -	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 47,000.00	\$ 4,500,000.00

Exhibit D

Top 50 Colleges By Total Revenue				
Team	Game Revenue	General Funding	Media & Branding	Total Revenue
Alabama	\$28,415,919	\$33,961,915	\$13,332,020	\$123,769,841
Texas	\$46,841,348	\$35,057,421	\$16,830,861	\$120,288,370
Ohio State	\$42,358,327	\$27,556,385	\$20,815,062	\$115,737,022
Florida	\$23,984,648	\$42,630,821	\$14,091,656	\$106,607,895
Tennessee	\$30,653,335	\$26,405,309	\$10,804,643	\$101,806,196
Michigan	\$40,503,503	\$15,196,817	\$13,112,101	\$99,027,105
Oklahoma State	\$20,219,239	\$57,032,963	\$4,018,005	\$98,874,092
Wisconsin	\$27,266,910	\$22,133,963	\$8,365,573	\$95,118,124
Texas A&M	\$30,450,315	\$31,605,873	\$9,224,632	\$92,476,146
Penn State*				\$91,570,233
Auburn	\$27,293,048	\$34,897,688	\$10,729,271	\$89,311,824
Georgia	\$23,756,807	\$30,542,918	\$12,422,641	\$85,554,395
LSU	\$30,017,694	\$23,252,017	\$9,187,770	\$85,018,205
Notre Dame*				\$83,352,439
Kansas	\$19,672,739	\$39,066,191	\$10,047,227	\$82,976,047
Iowa	\$22,135,051	\$22,204,864	\$6,871,577	\$81,515,865
Michigan State	\$25,887,193	\$19,800,350	\$4,606,752	\$81,390,686
Oklahoma	\$35,849,720	\$13,255,316	\$9,860,497	\$77,098,008
Stanford*				\$76,661,466
USC*				\$76,409,919
Nebraska	\$30,768,065	\$16,410,663	\$12,767,163	\$75,492,884
Florida State	\$22,116,630	\$25,190,569	\$12,575,878	\$73,458,494
Kentucky	\$27,988,669	\$11,980,590	\$13,301,106	\$71,727,243
Minnesota	\$20,586,931	\$9,390,656	\$6,636,620	\$68,951,692
Duke*				\$67,820,335
Illinois	\$18,531,318	\$15,432,077	\$5,865,477	\$67,818,403
South Carolina	\$23,119,658	\$18,039,591	\$3,558,899	\$66,545,953
Arkansas	\$28,665,214	\$14,286,540	\$3,840,843	\$66,174,916
North Carolina	\$25,892,442	\$15,892,163	\$12,847,498	\$66,148,186
UCLA	\$28,636,331	\$8,564,437	\$14,600,447	\$66,088,264
Virginia Tech	\$23,880,798	\$17,712,774	\$4,220,738	\$64,412,343
Virginia	\$27,571,334	\$18,933,467	\$3,561,647	\$64,396,612
California	\$19,786,337	\$19,103,884	\$6,373,873	\$64,326,057
Purdue	\$18,688,667	\$10,411,973	\$5,058,518	\$64,253,784
Boston College*				\$61,203,340
Washington	\$24,166,335	\$14,532,236	\$7,515,090	\$60,729,016
Maryland	\$22,290,541	\$15,311,072	\$5,575,476	\$59,624,100
Clemson	\$24,012,877	\$16,544,405	\$3,706,944	\$59,180,652
Indiana	\$14,570,489	\$9,848,448	\$4,512,149	\$57,155,333
Oregon	\$18,241,172	\$18,347,181	\$3,194,018	\$56,623,901
Louisville	\$20,292,972	\$16,703,766	\$6,089,935	\$56,540,896
Missouri	\$19,196,110	\$15,943,667	\$4,182,704	\$55,566,932
Connecticut	\$20,035,324	\$15,435,762	\$10,444,905	\$55,218,003
Arizona State	\$14,232,519	\$22,755,074	\$4,072,559	\$54,833,194
Georgia Tech	\$16,637,192	\$15,040,059	\$2,472,344	\$54,511,968
West Virginia	\$19,413,508	\$14,725,298	\$5,822,746	\$54,262,716
Oregon State	\$11,702,477	\$18,749,545	\$7,872,437	\$52,875,339
Colorado	\$17,053,202	\$18,732,215	\$4,204,089	\$52,631,896
Texas Tech	\$15,364,635	\$20,096,547	\$5,170,422	\$52,599,785
Rutgers	\$16,067,843	\$22,793,538	\$1,021,608	\$52,012,491
Average	\$24,200,350	\$21,170,659	\$8,076,964	\$74,154,972

Exhibit E

Top 50 Colleges by Expenses								
Team	Tuition	Visitors	Coaches	Recruiting	Travel	Games	Marketing	Total Expenses
Alabama	\$8,824,492	\$2,193,500	\$13,118,559	\$1,029,523	\$3,580,868	\$1,345,797	\$3,460,518	\$123,370,004
Ohio State	\$13,184,957	\$6,248,917	\$14,108,419	\$1,137,016	\$5,225,694	\$10,364,206	\$2,602,886	\$114,264,848
Texas	\$6,993,766	\$2,599,256	\$17,810,365	\$1,291,852	\$6,991,985	\$16,230,167	\$6,867,642	\$110,996,365
Tennessee	\$9,780,350	\$2,250,000	\$16,655,628	\$1,789,301	\$5,611,586	\$2,126,101	\$5,632,325	\$100,507,146
Florida	\$6,482,515	\$2,803,232	\$13,574,263	\$1,468,044	\$6,162,438	\$4,801,014	\$5,941,289	\$98,775,583
Wisconsin	\$8,788,071	\$2,554,562	\$12,805,872	\$754,972	\$8,189,121	\$6,960,819	\$2,569,796	\$93,008,125
Oklahoma State	\$6,609,989	\$938,631	\$9,167,517	\$733,802	\$4,208,548	\$1,788,463	\$1,438,376	\$89,801,118
Michigan	\$13,584,477	\$1,905,538	\$13,561,605	\$1,333,040	\$6,914,132	\$2,524,741	\$2,174,835	\$85,496,004
Michigan State	\$8,901,044	\$5,669,052	\$10,527,226	\$1,067,088	\$4,478,011	\$3,617,147	\$1,110,438	\$83,444,368
LSU	\$7,779,905	\$1,843,292	\$12,810,268	\$1,078,187	\$4,142,660	\$4,039,261	\$846,694	\$81,150,829
Penn State*	\$10,596,768	--	--	\$935,014	--	--	--	\$79,275,354
Texas A&M	\$5,437,790	\$2,791,535	\$11,597,811	\$939,973	\$6,495,033	\$2,079,364	\$137,219	\$77,426,317
Oklahoma	\$7,346,156	\$1,736,664	\$12,951,543	\$1,568,125	\$5,240,672	\$6,720,662	\$1,136,574	\$76,945,882
USC*	\$10,877,442	--	--	\$971,767	--	--	--	\$76,409,919
Stanford*	\$15,825,345	--	--	\$879,583	--	--	--	\$75,127,232
Nebraska	\$8,166,819	\$2,490,197	\$9,413,168	\$1,083,385	\$3,143,311	\$3,096,467	\$424,450	\$74,981,110
Georgia	\$6,665,226	\$1,505,700	\$11,811,911	\$1,302,076	\$3,189,022	\$8,300,790	\$1,529,037	\$71,993,533
Iowa	\$7,579,781	\$1,195,500	\$12,093,032	\$977,795	\$4,232,662	\$2,757,147	\$1,678,560	\$71,602,594
Kentucky	\$8,072,145	\$2,426,671	\$11,349,295	\$1,118,738	\$3,995,639	\$3,764,237	\$2,853,999	\$71,079,982
Auburn	\$7,141,616	\$2,667,720	\$11,324,094	\$1,452,521	\$3,739,973	\$2,648,904	\$5,185,438	\$69,841,200
Duke*	\$13,043,010	--	--	\$1,560,829	--	--	--	\$67,820,334
UCLA	\$8,768,645	\$2,359,444	\$9,768,187	\$696,473	\$5,565,053	\$4,308,300	\$2,955,998	\$66,088,264
North Carolina	\$7,521,420	\$2,425,981	\$11,404,126	\$1,126,532	\$3,090,422	\$3,337,412	\$675,982	\$65,929,532
Virginia	\$9,567,702	\$2,270,958	\$10,558,573	\$1,280,853	\$5,505,386	\$4,224,569	\$1,293,303	\$65,838,543
Kansas	\$7,844,822	\$2,075,519	\$10,940,531	\$986,411	\$8,294,163	\$2,304,710	\$1,651,053	\$65,748,366
Florida State	\$7,794,848	\$2,116,433	\$9,716,062	\$956,182	\$4,761,978	\$1,235,704	\$1,775,425	\$65,583,105
Arkansas	\$6,657,930	\$2,943,556	\$10,467,565	\$1,342,876	\$5,184,214	\$3,982,662	\$1,249,530	\$64,632,499
South Carolina	\$9,040,952	\$1,359,042	\$6,613,638	\$878,556	\$3,467,730	\$3,728,426	\$3,552,139	\$64,516,437
California	\$8,996,598	\$1,832,058	\$13,154,873	\$740,877	\$4,669,065	\$2,356,297	\$2,633,541	\$64,275,307
Minnesota	\$8,977,632	\$1,134,000	\$11,196,912	\$1,212,843	\$4,660,223	\$2,020,015	\$997,889	\$63,968,805
Illinois	\$8,476,778	\$1,169,060	\$8,528,364	\$1,263,219	\$5,224,639	\$2,835,274	\$1,952,887	\$63,458,807
Boston College*	\$13,022,474	--	--	\$719,759	--	--	--	\$61,065,308
Notre Dame*	\$14,527,119	--	--	\$2,287,619	--	--	--	\$60,117,476
Clemson	\$8,749,849	\$2,444,692	\$10,152,366	\$1,081,669	\$3,640,243	\$2,729,216	\$3,558,456	\$60,050,712
Purdue	\$7,231,660	\$4,737,443	\$6,663,779	\$1,110,998	\$4,756,516	\$2,017,038	\$3,081,231	\$59,217,169
Virginia Tech	\$6,877,972	\$2,885,323	\$9,195,310	\$824,296	\$4,001,498	\$2,077,903	\$1,505,800	\$59,157,745
Washington	\$7,704,449	\$3,481,483	\$10,068,076	\$928,348	\$4,226,388	\$3,981,197	\$1,022,054	\$57,330,671
Maryland	\$12,505,552	\$2,214,638	\$11,049,175	\$856,074	\$3,194,534	\$2,612,445	\$1,357,632	\$56,844,987
Oregon	\$6,929,651	\$2,688,783	\$7,635,199	\$1,141,377	\$4,548,407	\$3,742,545	\$2,883,414	\$56,259,942
Louisville	\$7,645,106	\$1,829,600	\$10,440,122	\$813,074	\$3,823,109	\$1,717,498	\$303,050	\$55,145,760
Connecticut	\$8,810,389	\$1,757,250	\$10,484,759	\$1,002,722	\$6,844,960	\$5,176,665	\$3,154,102	\$55,025,374
Georgia Tech	\$7,013,578	\$2,234,657	\$7,926,937	\$1,333,120	\$3,311,329	\$3,143,677	\$1,332,519	\$54,800,099
Arizona State	\$9,310,610	\$3,253,343	\$9,966,053	\$758,146	\$3,229,812	\$3,361,456	\$3,450,753	\$54,296,003
Oregon State	\$7,360,450	\$1,508,771	\$7,710,158	\$720,132	\$3,421,107	\$3,120,189	\$1,253,415	\$52,128,314
Missouri	\$6,517,208	\$2,664,956	\$8,670,420	\$700,565	\$3,724,085	\$1,622,197	\$1,102,438	\$51,779,677
Rutgers	\$7,693,148	\$1,708,226	\$9,914,810	\$697,539	\$4,617,910	\$2,981,994	\$2,562,342	\$51,748,813
Texas Tech	\$5,399,522	\$700,700	\$8,435,635	\$946,452	\$3,947,774	\$2,298,147	\$1,560,519	\$51,275,866
Indiana	\$8,963,255	\$3,395,056	\$9,256,150	\$924,838	\$3,901,468	\$1,965,713	\$1,150,901	\$50,920,826
West Virginia	\$6,663,670	\$1,373,500	\$7,657,024	\$1,567,395	\$6,498,154	\$2,627,954	\$2,969,987	\$49,052,709
Colorado	\$6,351,417	\$905,500	\$7,632,752	\$1,007,121	\$2,926,288	\$3,007,750	\$1,778,907	\$48,368,255
Total	\$434,606,070	\$103,289,939	\$469,888,132	\$54,378,697	\$206,577,810	\$161,682,240	\$98,355,343	\$3,487,943,218

Exhibit F

Profit/Loss and Adjustment for Additional Scholarship Money							
Team	Total Revenue	Total Expenses	Profit/Loss	Scholarships	Adjustment	Addition	Adj P/L
Alabama	\$123,769,841	\$123,370,004	\$399,837	259	\$3,000	\$ 777,000	(\$377,163)
Texas	\$120,288,370	\$110,996,365	\$9,292,005	261	\$3,000	\$ 783,000	\$8,509,005
Ohio State	\$115,737,022	\$114,264,848	\$1,472,174	394	\$3,000	\$ 1,182,000	\$290,174
Florida	\$106,607,895	\$98,775,583	\$7,832,312	251	\$3,000	\$ 753,000	\$7,079,312
Tennessee	\$101,806,196	\$100,507,146	\$1,299,050	244	\$3,000	\$ 732,000	\$567,050
Michigan	\$99,027,105	\$85,496,004	\$13,531,101	337	\$3,000	\$ 1,011,000	\$12,520,101
Oklahoma State	\$98,874,092	\$89,801,118	\$9,072,974	237	\$3,000	\$ 711,000	\$8,361,974
Wisconsin	\$95,118,124	\$93,008,125	\$2,109,999	300	\$3,000	\$ 900,000	\$1,209,999
Texas A&M	\$92,476,146	\$77,426,317	\$15,049,829	244	\$3,000	\$ 732,000	\$14,317,829
Penn State*	\$91,570,233	\$79,275,354	\$12,294,879	316	\$3,000	\$ 948,000	\$11,346,879
Auburn	\$89,311,824	\$69,841,200	\$19,470,624	249	\$3,000	\$ 747,000	\$18,723,624
Georgia	\$85,554,395	\$71,993,533	\$13,560,862	249	\$3,000	\$ 747,000	\$12,813,862
LSU	\$85,018,205	\$81,150,829	\$3,867,376	249	\$3,000	\$ 747,000	\$3,120,376
Notre Dame*	\$83,352,439	\$60,117,476	\$23,234,963	268	\$3,000	\$ 804,000	\$22,430,963
Kansas	\$82,976,047	\$65,748,366	\$17,227,681	243	\$3,000	\$ 729,000	\$16,498,681
Iowa	\$81,515,865	\$71,602,594	\$9,913,271	288	\$3,000	\$ 864,000	\$9,049,271
Michigan State	\$81,390,686	\$83,444,368	(\$2,053,682)	320	\$3,000	\$ 960,000	(\$3,013,682)
Oklahoma	\$77,098,008	\$76,945,882	\$152,126	263	\$3,000	\$ 789,000	(\$636,874)
Stanford*	\$76,661,466	\$75,127,232	\$1,534,234	268	\$3,000	\$ 804,000	\$730,234
USC*	\$76,409,919	\$76,409,919	\$0	268	\$3,000	\$ 804,000	(\$804,000)
Nebraska	\$75,492,884	\$74,981,110	\$511,774	262	\$3,000	\$ 786,000	(\$274,226)
Florida State	\$73,458,494	\$65,583,105	\$7,875,389	230	\$3,000	\$ 690,000	\$7,185,389
Kentucky	\$71,727,243	\$71,079,982	\$647,261	255	\$3,000	\$ 765,000	(\$117,739)
Minnesota	\$68,951,692	\$63,968,805	\$4,982,887	319	\$3,000	\$ 957,000	\$4,025,887
Duke*	\$67,820,335	\$67,820,334	\$1	268	\$3,000	\$ 804,000	(\$803,999)
Illinois	\$67,818,403	\$63,458,807	\$4,359,596	250	\$3,000	\$ 750,000	\$3,609,596
South Carolina	\$66,545,953	\$64,516,437	\$2,029,516	245	\$3,000	\$ 735,000	\$1,294,516
Arkansas	\$66,174,916	\$64,632,499	\$1,542,417	234	\$3,000	\$ 702,000	\$840,417
North Carolina	\$66,148,186	\$65,929,532	\$218,654	312	\$3,000	\$ 936,000	(\$717,346)
UCLA	\$66,088,264	\$66,088,264	\$0	276	\$3,000	\$ 828,000	(\$828,000)
Virginia Tech	\$64,412,343	\$59,157,745	\$5,254,598	264	\$3,000	\$ 792,000	\$4,462,598
Virginia	\$64,396,612	\$65,838,543	(\$1,441,931)	318	\$3,000	\$ 954,000	(\$2,395,931)
California	\$64,326,057	\$64,275,307	\$50,750	279	\$3,000	\$ 837,000	(\$786,250)
Purdue	\$64,253,784	\$59,217,169	\$5,036,615	241	\$3,000	\$ 723,000	\$4,313,615
Boston College*	\$61,203,340	\$61,065,308	\$138,032	268	\$3,000	\$ 804,000	(\$665,968)
Washington	\$60,729,016	\$57,330,671	\$3,398,345	274	\$3,000	\$ 822,000	\$2,576,345
Maryland	\$59,624,100	\$56,844,987	\$2,779,113	329	\$3,000	\$ 987,000	\$1,792,113
Clemson	\$59,180,652	\$60,050,712	(\$870,060)	258	\$3,000	\$ 774,000	(\$1,644,060)
Indiana	\$57,155,333	\$50,920,826	\$6,234,507	290	\$3,000	\$ 870,000	\$5,364,507
Oregon	\$56,623,901	\$56,259,942	\$363,959	281	\$3,000	\$ 843,000	(\$479,041)
Louisville	\$56,540,896	\$55,145,760	\$1,395,136	273	\$3,000	\$ 819,000	\$576,136
Missouri	\$55,566,932	\$51,779,677	\$3,787,255	250	\$3,000	\$ 750,000	\$3,037,255
Connecticut	\$55,218,003	\$55,025,374	\$192,629	254	\$3,000	\$ 762,000	(\$569,371)
Arizona State	\$54,833,194	\$54,296,003	\$537,191	267	\$3,000	\$ 801,000	(\$263,809)
Georgia Tech	\$54,511,968	\$54,800,099	(\$288,131)	202	\$3,000	\$ 606,000	(\$894,131)
West Virginia	\$54,262,716	\$49,052,709	\$5,210,007	239	\$3,000	\$ 717,000	\$4,493,007
Oregon State	\$52,875,339	\$52,128,314	\$747,025	281	\$3,000	\$ 843,000	(\$95,975)
Colorado	\$52,631,896	\$48,368,255	\$4,263,641	162	\$3,000	\$ 486,000	\$3,777,641
Texas Tech	\$52,599,785	\$51,275,866	\$1,323,919	231	\$3,000	\$ 693,000	\$630,919
Rutgers	\$52,012,491	\$51,748,813	\$263,678	273	\$3,000	\$ 819,000	(\$555,322)
Average	\$74,154,972	\$69,758,864	\$4,396,108	268	3,000	803,580	3,592,528