



Chick-fil-a  
around town

» PAGE 2



The fight against  
breast cancer

» PAGE 5



Logan Bolin:  
jackpot king

» PAGE 6

# the Collegian

VOLUME 99, ISSUE 5

ASHLAND UNIVERSITY  
WWW.AU-LIVE.COM

OCTOBER 25, 2019

## The fight for college athlete compensation strikes the nation



VS.



EVAN LAUX  
Sports Editor

The National Collegiate Athletic Association, “a member-led organization dedicated to the well-being and lifelong success of college athletes,” has now been around for over 110 years. In that time, the millions of athletes who have played under the association have acquired exactly \$0 from their participation.

To put it in perspective, Alabama’s football team, who currently sits at the top of the week nine Associated Press and coaches polls with a 7-0 record, made a record-breaking \$45.96 million profit in its 2017 season according to USA Today.

In total, the team produced a record \$108.2 million in revenue and accumulated \$62.2 million in operating expenses during the 2017 season time frame. The football team’s \$108.2 million revenue alone accounted for 62 percent of Alabama’s entire athletic department revenue of \$174.3 million. Overall after the football program’s profits and total expenditures, the athletic department netted an overall profit of \$15.7 million.

But where exactly is that \$15 million going? Not to the players. In the NCAA’s 113 years of operating, not a single collegiate athlete has been paid outside of scholarships.

That will change soon though, at least on a small scale following California Governor Gavin Newsom’s signing of bill SB 206, the

“Fair Pay to Play Act” which will go into effect in January 2023.

The act in question will allow collegiate athletes to receive compensation for their participation which will not conflict with scholarship offers.

“It’s a very tough conversation right now,” AU men’s basketball head coach John Ellenwood said. “There’s a lot of people that are opposed to college athletes getting paid, they think they get paid enough with scholarships.”

The key principle of the Fair Pay to Play Act is an athlete’s ability to make money off their own names, images or likenesses, just as professional athletes do with endorsements, sponsorship pacts and other image rights.

The bill does not deal with universities paying their athletes directly, but rather makes it illegal for universities to punish athletes for pursuing compensation opportunities.

“The thing is, the money isn’t coming from the university,” Ellenwood said. “If there’s an 18-year-old kid who is able to benefit from their abilities, why are we prohibiting them from making money off their talents? If the car dealership down the street wants to have an athlete promote their business in order to sell a car and both parties benefit financially, I don’t see a problem with that.”

The bill was passed in California with an outpouring of support from athletes, coaches and even celebrities.

Duke men’s basketball head

coach Mike Krzyzewski said in a statement that the bill stands as a “sign of the times that we in college athletics must continually adapt.”

He went on to explain that he was glad that SB 206 was passed because it “pushes the envelope.”

NBA Los Angeles Lakers star LeBron James has also been very vocal on the effect SB 206 will have on college athletics.

In a tweet posted on his Twitter account on Sept. 5, 2019, James tweeted: “Everyone in California - call your politicians and tell them to support SB 206! This law is a GAME CHANGER. College athletes can responsibly get paid for what they do and the billions they create.”

Draymond Green of the Golden State Warriors even went as far as referring to the NCAA as a “dictatorship” that uses a “bankrupt model,” a term coined by Gov. Newsom.

“Colleges reap billions from these student athletes’ sacrifices and success but, in the same breath, block them from earning a single dollar,” Newsom said. “That’s a bankrupt model — one that puts institutions ahead of the students they are supposed to serve. It needs to be disrupted.”

While the act is currently only going to affect California schools, the act is expected to spread to other states, which poses a major problem for the NCAA.

“The NCAA is trying to figure out how it’s going to affect them,” AU Athletic Director Al King said. “I don’t think anyone knows

exactly what’s going to happen yet in terms of it spreading outside of California. That’s the grand question. The best case scenario is if the NCAA comes up with some broader legislation to handle it.”

The NCAA said it opposes the bill as it would create an imbalance within the sport. The bill gives the 58 NCAA schools in California an unfair recruiting advantage while making them ineligible to compete in NCAA competitions, according to a letter sent to the state of California by the NCAA’s board of governors.

The NCAA isn’t the only entity that opposes the bill, however.

“We’re firmly against anything that would lead to a pay-for-play system,” Pac-12 Commissioner Larry Scott said in a press release. “This will create an arms race in California, and the best recruits will go there. Why would someone go to Tuscaloosa, Alabama and make no money, when they could live in LA and make money off endorsements?”

Other opponents of the bill believe that it will take away from the core goal of the NCAA.

The word that is thrown around the most within the Fair Pay to Play debate is amateurism; whether collegiate athletes getting paid like professionals will diminish the line between college athletics and professional athletics.

“I’ve always been big on the amateur piece but college athletics aren’t what they used to be,” said King. “It hasn’t been focused on amateurism in a long time, who

ever would have ever thought there would be this much money in college athletics? We live in a different era now.”

Along with Scot, Ohio State University Athletic Director Gene Smith strongly opposes the bill.

“The NCAA is an organization that has taken a long time to try and modernize itself. What we can’t have is situations where we have schools and/or states with different rules for an organization that’s going to compete together. It can’t happen; it’s not reality,” Smith said in a discussion with ESPN’s Edward Aschoff.

Supporters and opposers of the bill alike are interested to find out what changes will occur to the NCAA landscape before the bill goes into action in January, 2023.

Some believe that if the NCAA does not submit to California’s decision, a new conference may emerge where players would be paid. If the NCAA does submit, many other states would likely follow suit as the NCAA would have to pass legislation that covers all affiliated schools.

“I think at the higher levels, athletes deserve some sort of reward for their achievements,” AU women’s basketball player Jodi Johnson said. “Look at players like Zion Williamson, we’re all amateurs but some of these athletes are earning a ton of money and they should be able to get paid for.”

Johnson went on to say the bill may pose problems, too, however.

Read the rest on AU-Live.com

## A glimpse at the 2020 presidential candidates

AVAERIE FITZGERALD  
AU-Live Managing Editor

“O-H,” David Pepper, chairman of the Ohio Democratic Party, shouted to the crowd who had gathered to watch the next democratic candidates take their podium. The crowd followed with the infamous, “I-O”- ready to hear the big debate of 2019.

As the election draws near, debates take place all over the country in an attempt to draw voters into choosing certain candidates as their choice for president. Otterbein University was chosen as the debate location for the 2019 dem-

ocratic presidential candidates, which took place on Oct. 15.

Ohio is said to be one of the most important states in the presidential race, as it is a “swing state”- a term coined to depict a state that swings both red for Republican or blue for Democrat. It is never truly consistent, and the votes range and are difficult to predict.

This means Ohio is targeted by political campaigns for rallies and speeches and is often visited by those running for office. It is said by political scientists that whatever Ohio votes, will win.

Nov. 3, 2020, two candidates will remain, while the rest either

prepare for another chance next election, or choose to change their direction.

Tom Perez, chair of Democratic National Committee (DNC), said in his introductory speech that he is, “watching the president poison democracy,” he gained applause and attention following that statement, and took leave for the 12 democratic candidates that took the stage.

Joe Biden, Cory Booker, Pete Buttigieg, Julián Castro, Tulsi Gabbard, Kamala Harris, Amy Klobuchar, Beto O’Rourke, Bernie Sanders, Tom Steyer, Elizabeth Warren and Andrew Yang are just

the candidates that attended the debate- there are 19 politicians in running for that fall under the democratic party.

Michael Bennet, Steve Bullock, John Delaney, Wayne Messam, Tim Ryan, Joe Sestak and Marianne Williamson are the seven other democratic candidates that did not attend the debate.

Taking a look at the presidential candidates between both parties, there is a clear difference: a 19-4 difference.

Business Insider hosted a debate between Joe Walsh and Bill Weld, as President Donald Trump and the other republican candidate,

Mark Sanford, declined the invitation for a debate (meaning no official 2019 debate plans for the Republican Party).

Getting acquainted with the presidential candidates, as well as any candidates running for a powerful position, keeps citizens informed on both policies and stances with certain issues.

Listed below are the current and past positions held by each candidate as well as their slogan for their individual campaigns. For more in-depth information and statistics, visit ballotpedia.org.

Read the rest on AU-Live.com

### INDEX

Opinion	2
News	3
Features	4
Sports	6
Entertainment	8

