

As the committee marks up the SCORE Act (H.R.4312), we urge your boss to oppose this legislation which would codify the ability of educational institutions to gain billions of dollars in annual profit at the expense of their own undercompensated students.

The SCORE Act would have devastating impacts for college athletes, including:

- **Establishing an unprecedented federal antitrust status and placing severe economic restrictions on current and future athletes that no other students on campus face.**

College students are no different from other working-age young adults in the American economy in that they have a right to be fairly compensated for their labor. Under current law, only two industries have federal antitrust exemptions: Major League Baseball (a limited case designed to prevent any competitor leagues from being established) and railroads. Neither of these exemptions were packaged with provisions that workers in these industries would be barred from federal employment status. The SCORE Act would prevent athletes from gaining legally recognized employment status at the federal level, which is a restriction that isn't placed on any other college students in any context.

- **Failing to acknowledge that college athletics has a spending problem and not a revenue generation problem.**

The SCORE Act is not an attempt to ease concerns for institutions seeking to afford scholarship opportunities in a time of financial turmoil. In 2024 across the Division 1 level, schools [spent](#) over double on coaching and staff compensation (\$5.3 billion) than on *all financial aid* for athletes (\$2.0 billion). The top 20 highest paid college football coaches in 2020 earned a combined [\\$128 million](#) in salaries, enough to provide over 7,110 male athletes the [average](#) athletic scholarship award for that year. This legislation is an attempt to preserve the ability of coaches and administrators to continue personally profiting from athletics by paying athletes as little as legally possible.

- **Specifically limiting the economic earnings potential of Black male students.**

The current college athletics model is based on the unpaid labor of primarily Black men. Football and basketball fund entire athletics programs through their revenue generation, and from that revenue previously not being shared with the Black men who make up [majorities](#) of each sport in Division 1 and [pluralities](#) in Division 2. This tradeoff is already [unequal](#), as Black male athletes are commonly pressured into prioritizing athletic accomplishments over academic achievement by their institutions.

- **Failing to account for schools prioritizing maintenance of athletic eligibility over providing true academic and career support for athletes.**

A notable presence missing from all prior Congressional testimony are the experiences of former athletes who did not complete their degree programs. Athletes, especially those participating in football and basketball, are [commonly](#) unsupported and discarded by their institutions for circumstances like sustaining long-term injuries or simply because of a coach/other staff member being unsatisfied with on-field performance. SCORE, despite

claiming to be for the benefit of all athletes, provides no protections for athletes from being treated as commodities by their own educational institutions. Though the bill mandates access to academic and career counseling along with mental health support for athletes, these services are already [supported](#) by the NCAA.

- **Placing arbitrary time limits on medical benefits which ignores the reality of athletics participation, especially football.**

College football generates the most revenue of any college sport and represents a third of male athletes across the NCAA Division 1 and 2 levels. This sport's danger is evident not just within the professional ranks but in college athletics as well. In 2023, [53%](#) of all NCAA football players reported experiencing an injury that required surgery, hospitalization, or more than a month away from training or competition during college. Every additional year of playing football is associated with a 15% [increase](#) in odds for a CTE diagnosis. The long-term health effects of playing football are well-documented, yet with the SCORE Act the coverage of medical expenses for athletic injuries only lasts for up to 3 years post-enrollment. Though this is a welcome improvement over the [current](#) NCAA policy of two years post-eligibility health insurance coverage, this still falls well short of the health support often needed for former college football athletes.

- **Lacking accounting for the fact that college athletics roster spots are also admissions spots at postsecondary institutions.**

College sports are very much a tool used by schools to bolster their admissions, directly through enrolling more athletes and indirectly by [influencing](#) the college choices of other students. The SCORE Act [mandates](#) that schools have at least 16 different athletics programs to offer for students but does not mandate that funding is equivalent across those programs. In providing no guarantees that schools will have to spend similar amounts on non-revenue sports as they will for football and basketball, the SCORE Act would likely fuel the elimination of admissions spots for other athletes as schools seek to maintain competitive advantage in revenue-generating sports programs.

Best,

Juan Carlos Gomez

Interim Director of Legislative Affairs

CLASP | 1310 L St. NW | Suite 900 | Washington, DC 20005