

NCPA-Drexel University Department of Sport Management Study  
“The \$6 Billion Heist: Robbing College Athletes Under the Guise of Amateurism”

**MAJOR FINDINGS**

## Major Findings

1. College athletes on full scholarship do not receive a “free ride.” For the 2011-2012 academic year, the average annual scholarship shortfall (out of pocket expenses) for each Football Bowl Series (FBS) “full” scholarship athlete was \$3,285.
2. The percentage of FBS schools whose “full” athletic scholarships leave their players in poverty is 82% for those athletes who live on campus; 90% for athletes who live off campus.
4. If allowed to access the fair market like the NFL and NBA players, the average FBS football and basketball player would be worth approximately \$137,357 and \$289,031 during the 2011-12 school year, respectively (not counting individual commercial endorsement deals).
5. After accounting for a \$23,204 value of a full athletic scholarship, the average FBS football and basketball player is denied approximately \$114,153 and \$265,827 of their fair market value, respectively. Over a four year career, the lost value for the average football and basketball player is \$456,612 and \$1,063,307, respectively.
6. From 2011-2015, FBS football and men’s basketball players will be forced to forfeit over \$6.2 billion.
7. Football players with the top 10 highest estimated fair market values were each worth between \$351,000-\$568,000 in 2011-2012 but lived below the federal poverty line by an average of \$1,571. After accounting for the value that they received from their athletic scholarships, each player was denied an average of \$395k that he would have otherwise received in a fair market in 2011; and will be denied an average of almost \$1.6 million between 2011-2015. Texas football players held the top spot and will each be denied almost \$2.2 million over four years (See Table 1).

Table 1. Rank	School	Fair Market Value Football Player (2011-12)	Value of Athletic Scholarship (2011-12)	Fair Market Value Denied (2011-12)	Fair Market Value Denied Over 4 Years (2011-15)	In Poverty? (On-Campus 2011-12)	Scholarship Shortfall (On-Campus 2011-12)
1	Texas	\$567,922	\$21,090	\$546,832	\$2,187,328	-\$748	-\$3,624
2	Michigan	\$466,145	\$23,150	\$442,995	\$1,771,980	-\$1,702	-\$2,054
3	Alabama	\$448,554	\$20,481	\$428,073	\$1,712,292	-\$389	-\$3,458
4	Auburn	\$422,167	\$19,790	\$402,377	\$1,609,508	-\$1,178	-\$2,562
5	Georgia	\$410,236	\$19,258	\$390,978	\$1,563,912	-\$2,462	-\$1,562
6	Florida	\$405,466	\$15,527	\$389,939	\$1,559,756	-\$2,370	-\$3,730
7	Notre Dame	\$377,398	\$53,757	\$323,641	\$1,294,564	\$220	-\$1,500
8	LSU	\$376,400	\$16,524	\$359,876	\$1,439,504	-\$2,500	-\$2,890
9	Penn St	\$362,210	\$26,952	\$335,258	\$1,341,032	-\$1,738	-\$4,050
10	Arkansas	\$351,178	\$16,718	\$334,460	\$1,337,840	-\$2,840	-\$3,746
	Average:	\$418,768	\$23,325	\$395,443	\$1,581,772	-\$1,571	-\$2,918

(Continued on next page)

8. Basketball players with the top 10 highest estimated fair market values were each worth between \$690,000-\$1.6 million in 2011-2012 but lived below the federal poverty line by an average of \$1,320. After accounting for the value that they received from their athletic scholarships, each player was denied an average of \$875,000 million that he would have otherwise received in a fair market in 2011-12; and will be denied an average of almost \$3.5 million between 2011-15. Louisville basketball players held the top spot and will each be denied almost \$6.5 million over four years (See Table 2).

Table 2. Rank	School	Fair Market Value Basketball Player (2011-12)	Value of Athletic Scholarship (2011-12)	Fair Market Value Denied (2011-12)	Fair Market Value Denied Over 4 Years (2011-15)	In Poverty? (On-Campus 2011-12)	Scholarship Shortfall (On-Campus 2011-12)
1	Louisville	\$1,632,103	\$17,370	\$1,614,733	\$6,458,932	-\$3,730	-\$4,356
2	Syracuse	\$995,722	\$52,244	\$943,478	\$3,773,912	\$2,084	-\$1,546
3	Duke	\$987,144	\$55,245	\$931,899	\$3,727,596	\$797	-\$2,080
4	UNC	\$923,510	\$17,629	\$905,881	\$3,623,524	-\$1,700	-\$3,686
5	Kentucky	\$830,718	\$19,928	\$810,790	\$3,243,160	-\$1,170	-\$2,240
6	Arizona	\$782,301	\$18,826	\$763,475	\$3,053,900	-\$2,630	-\$3,540
7	Michigan St	\$739,543	\$21,402	\$718,141	\$2,872,564	-\$2,966	-\$1,800
8	Ohio State	\$725,862	\$22,119	\$703,743	\$2,814,972	-\$388	-\$4,752
9	Texas	\$710,710	\$21,090	\$689,620	\$2,758,480	-\$748	-\$3,624
10	Indiana	\$690,016	\$18,767	\$671,249	\$2,684,996	-\$2,751	-\$3,282
	<b>Average</b>	<b>\$901,763</b>	<b>\$26,462</b>	<b>\$875,301</b>	<b>\$3,501,204</b>	<b>-\$1,320</b>	<b>-\$3,091</b>

9. Despite record revenues, salaries and capital expenditures and prohibitions on countless sources of income for athletes, the NCAA explicitly allows tax payers to fund food stamps and welfare benefits for college athletes.

10. FBS schools could provide more equitable financial terms for their revenue-producing athletes without eliminating any non-revenue generating sports or reducing scholarships for athletes from non-revenue generating sports. The second attachment points to lavish spending in by FBS schools in non-revenue sports.<sup>1</sup> We've compared non-revenue sports expenditures between FBS schools and Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) schools because all of their non-revenue sports compete against each other in Division I. We focused on this to find out what it costs to run a competitive Division I non-revenue generating team which is demonstrated by the FCS numbers. The FBS non-revenue team expenses show that these schools spend far more than what's necessary to field these teams. In 2011-12, FBS schools spent an average of about \$200 million more on non-revenue teams when compared to FCS schools. Division I schools average 17 non-revenue generating teams per campus, which means the average FBS schools spent almost \$2 million in 2011-12 more than the average FCS school on non-revenue generating sports.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See attached tables.

<sup>2</sup> Erin Irick, *NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report 1981-1982 – 2010-2011* (2011); <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/PR2012.pdf>. Data for the 2010-2011 year cited above can be found on page 178 of that report.