

## We negate

Observation One: We define ought as a moral obligation, according to Merriam Webster.

Observation Two: Our framework is consequentialism- the judge should weigh this round on what consequences come out of both sides. If the neg can prove that we have the consequences with the least harms, we win the round.

# Sole Contention: Students Suffering the Cost

To fully understand the consequences of passing the resolution, first take a look at the status quo.

## Subpoint A: Cost, college sports don't have the money

Contrary to popular belief, most college sports programs can not fund themselves

**Dr. Phillip L. Yeagle**. 06/04/2015 [Dr. Yeagle: Former Interim Chancellor and Dean, Rutgers]. Huffington Post. "The High Cost of College Athletics and College Tuition". [@BD](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-philip-l-yeagle/may-you-get-what-you-pay-_b_7503068.html)

You are an educated student or parent; also be an educated shopper. Be aware that part of the cost of attending college today may be paying for the athletics teams. To complain about high college tuition is both relevant and popular. College tuition has risen faster than inflation for a generation. For many students and their families, the rise in tuition rates may put access to quality higher education in jeopardy. College tuition is therefore both a public policy issue for the country and a personal issue for students. The rise in tuition at public universities is a result of many factors. As I discussed earlier, the main factor contributing to increases in tuition at public universities is the reduction in support of state universities by state governments. This reduction has been creating financial stress on public universities for a couple of decades or more. However, the prospective student would do well to look a little deeper into the subject to see how to shop smartly for her/his educational choice. Since there are many factors that contribute in both large and small ways to the tuition rate, it would be at least of interest to determine how colleges and universities make major decisions that have significant impact on institutional finances. The recent report from USA Today shines a spotlight on one such set of decisions: how colleges and universities fund athletics. In particular, how do colleges and universities make up the difference between the expenses of athletics and the revenues that athletics programs independently generate? Raising this question may elicit surprise from students and parents. After all, **the popular understanding is that college sports generate high revenue and therefore they must be self-supporting.** While the former can be true, **the latter is certainly not [true] for the majority of colleges and universities.** The recent report (one of a series over the last several years) that **all but** a handful (this report about **two dozen**, but over past several years the number was often smaller) of **athletics departments in 300 colleges and universities with major sports programs fail to raise enough revenue to operate their sports programs. The vast majority require a subsidy** from the institution. The high **athletics costs come from a number of sources**, which is beyond the purpose of this writing to explore. However it is interesting to note that **over 70 coaches are paid salaries are in excess of \$1 million annually. In most states, coaches at state universities are the highest paid public employees in the state.**

The expenses athletics currently incur are incredible. A statistic report by the NCAA breaks them down: On average, funding from the school accounted for 20% of Division I schools with football and 70% of Division I schools without football, and that QUOTE “all revenue generated by Division II athletics... accounted for less than 9 percent” To do the math for you, 91% of Division II athletics are funded by institutional subsidies. The question is where exactly does most of this budget come from?

**Dr. Yeagle 15**

**The next question is how do most athletics departments fill the gap between revenues and expenses?**

**Students pay the athletics budget directly through special student fees (separate from tuition).**

**Students also pay** indirectly **through higher tuition.** Why? Some form of transfer must occur at most of these institutions from tuition revenues to athletics departments to fund those deficits in the athletics departments. Those particular tuition revenues cannot then be used to hire teachers or support student services or fix classrooms. Or other revenues are used that might otherwise support student services and educational expenses, and thus students end up paying indirectly again. In either case, students support part of the costs of the athletics department budget through their tuition and fees. **The greater the deficits of those athletics departments, the higher the tuition and fees must rise.** Many who give to universities would complain that alumni giving support much of the cost of athletics. While this is partially true in some institutions, most departments are still in deficit. It is also true that the needs of the athletics budgets often drive the development offices of major public colleges and universities. What that means in practice is that athletics often gets the first opportunity to ask donors for money (other causes such as student scholarships then come as a lower priority). And when a winning team stimulates greater giving to the institution, the bulk of that giving goes to athletics (and yet athletics budget are still largely in deficit!), not to programs that directly support students like academic scholarships. Therefore, the effect of alumni giving to athletics is not what is commonly perceived. **Athletics still presents a financial burden to the remainder of the institution.** For many students and alumni, the athletics teams of the college or university are a large part of their continuing interest in the institution. There is certainly nothing amiss with such enthusiasm. It is a rare person who does not like to root for their team. However, be an educated shopper. Be aware that part of the cost of attending college is paying for the teams. For some institutions the burden is much less than others. Therefore the pressure of athletics on the tuition you will pay is less at some institutions than at others. If the teams are important to you and you are willing to pay for them (in addition to paying for your education), then may you get what you pay for!

**If universities must fork out more money to pay salaries to all their Student-Athletes, every dollar increase leans on the students. The impacts to forcing every student pay the way for these college players are clear.**

## Subpoint B: is a decrease in access to education

### In order to cover salaries, student costs would increase drastically

Matt **Krupnik** (Matt Krupnick is a Brooklyn, N.Y., reporter and editor committing daily acts of journalism. Coverage areas include higher education, sports and travel) from Time Magazine writes: (November 28, 2015)

**Changes to how student-athletes are paid could lead some schools, stuck with nowhere else to turn, to raise other students' fees.** Universities and colleges could also scale back their athletics programs to cut costs. That "would be the rational approach," Kirwan said. "But **when it comes to college athletics, rationality doesn't often prevail,**" he said. "**There are so many societal pressures.**" Research shows that some **students don't even know their fees are already paying for athletics.** At Ohio University, for instance, **41% of revenue from the general fee** of \$531 per quarter for full-time students in 2010 **went to intercollegiate athletics, but 54% of students didn't know it, according to a survey by the nonprofit Center for College Affordability and Productivity, a Washington, D.C. think tank.**

## Subpoint C: is an increase in Student Debt.

According to Christine **Mulhern** of Education Policy Research at Harvard in 2015, Mulhern, Christine, et al. [From Center for Education Policy Research at Harvard] "The Effects of Rising Student Costs in Higher Education: Evidence from Public Institutions in Virginia." Ithaca S+R. Ithaca S+R. 4 March 2015. Web. 13 November 2017. [https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.221021//\\*Eriife\\*](https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.221021//*Eriife*)

**The risk is most evident in the ever-increasing tuition our colleges and universities charge.** Regardless of the reasons, **higher prices mean fewer families can gain the education and training they need to grow and prosper in their communities.** Traditionally-underserved students, as well as families from deeper into the middle class, find it difficult to afford a college education. **State and federal financial aid is not meeting the growing need, and more students face higher debt levels.** While enrollment in higher education is leveling off, if not declining, **demand for completers of postsecondary credentials has never been higher. We ignore these divergences at our peril.**

This is an inevitable link chain undoubtedly harmful.

### Hurting students more, debt's impact is multiplied as students age.

**Holland**, Kelly. 9 December 2015. CNBC. "The Long-Term Benefits of Student Loans". <https://www.cnbc.com/2015/12/08/the-long-term-consequences-of-student-loans.html>

You have heard the message for years: A college education will give you vastly expanded career opportunities and dramatically higher income for the rest of your life. Easy as pie, right? Not if you have to take out student loans. New data from LIMRA, an association providing research and consulting to insurers, shows that **just \$30,000 in student debt can cut as much as \$325,000 from your 401(k) balance by the time you retire.** That is hardly an outlandish amount to borrow. **As of 2014, the average student graduating with debt had borrowed \$28,950, up from \$18,550 a decade earlier,** according to The Institute for College Access and Success. And **some 69 percent of the class of 2014 borrowed for college.** If millennials had access to defined benefit retirement plans, where employers made contributions on their behalf, their retirement would be more secure. But only 10 percent of workers under age 30 have access to a defined benefit plan, according to LIMRA's Secure Retirement Institute. That means the onus for retirement saving is almost entirely on them, and **those paying down debt are at a clear disadvantage.** "With Gen Y being in defined contribution plans, the time for them to really get ahead is in their 20s and early 30s, but if they have a huge student loan, they really can't do that," said Michael Ericson, research analyst for the institute.

Here is an example of debt.

Community College Equity Assessment Lab The CCEAL reports in California, 70 percent experience the threat of housing insecurity or homelessness, and 12 percent experience the threat of hunger.

Imagine the impacts for ALL the college students.

Doing math reveals that student debt is multiplied by ten come retirement.

The negation has proven that by paying SA, there are too many impacts. Deterred education, more debt and more poverty.

This is a moral question: No matter the situation of the players, it is not fair to shift the burden of money away from the players who voluntarily sign up to participate in their recreational sports to the students attending university who have no relations to the sports whatsoever. The Pro accesses no solvency because they simply pass off any impacts to the rest of the university.

To solve, simply vote Neg. Refrain from passing the resolution to protect the students from paying the players salaries.