

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

Family Impact Analysis of CA SB206

Collegiate Athletics: Student Athlete Compensation and Representation

A graduate project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Master of Social Work

By

Moses Hernandez

May 2020

The graduate project of Moses Hernandez is approved:

---

Dr. Hyun-Sun Park

---

Date

---

Dr. Wendy Ashley

---

Date

---

Dr. Jodi Brown, Chair

---

Date

California State University, Northridge

## Dedication

Para mis padres, espero seguir honrándolos y hacerlos sentir orgullosos. Toda la gloria a Dios.

To my wife, you are the dream.

To my son, there are not enough assignments in the world that will keep me from playing with you, baby.

## Table of Contents

Signature Page	ii
Dedication	iii
Abstract	v
Introduction	1
Family Impact Analysis Framework	6
Family Impact Policy Analysis	7
Discussion	13
References	16

Abstract:

Family Impact Analysis of CA SB206:  
Collegiate Athletics: Student Athlete Compensation and Representation

By

Moses Hernandez

Master of Social Work

**Purpose:** The purpose of this policy analysis is to evaluate the current state of amateurism in collegiate athletic programs and the impact it is having on student-athletes. **Research question:** How will California Senate Bill 206: Student Athlete Compensation and Representation impact the well being of student-athletes and their families? **Methods:** The Family Impact Analysis (FIA) model was utilized to measure the impact of SB 206. SB 206 was viewed through the lens of four of the FIA principles, Family Responsibility, Family Stability, Family Relationships, and Family Diversity. **Results:** SB 206 takes steps in the right direction for student athletes to be able to maximize their opportunity of access to higher education and participating in collegiate athletics while promoting family stability. **Discussion:** The NCAA's longstanding position to disallow student athletes from benefiting from their name, image, or likeness was stance taken to protect them from unscrupulous actors and avoid exploitation. However, the NCAA managed to commercialize the collegiate athletics, distribute the revenue with involved participants other than student athletes, and in the process gain the attention of legislators willing to advocate for student athletes.

**Keywords:** Family Impact Analysis, FIA, NCAA, Collegiate Athlete, Student Athlete, SB 206, Pay to Play, Amateurism.

## Introduction

A brilliant chemical engineer once said, “If you’re good at something never do it for free”. This man of course was none other than The Joker. Although he was also a criminal, psychopath, sadist, and fictional character, the premise behind that statement is not only logical, but also compelling. The multi-million dollar commercialized business of collegiate athletics nationwide (Deloitte & Touche LLP, 2018) is built upon the backs of student-athletes in exchange for an opportunity to attend school for free or at a reduced cost (NCAA, 2018). The National Collegiate Athletic Association, hereinafter referred to as the NCAA, classifies these student-athletes as “amateurs” and have very detailed and comprehensive guidelines students have to abide by under the NCAA Constitution, Operating Bylaws, and Administrative Bylaws (2009). The NCAA outlines the principle of amateurism in article 2.9 by stating:

Student-athletes shall be amateurs in an intercollegiate sport, and their participation should be motivated primarily by education and by the physical, mental, and social benefits to be derived. Student participation in intercollegiate athletics is an avocation, and student-athletes should be protected from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises (2009, pg. 4).

The NCAA makes it abundantly clear that the expectation of benefits for the students participating in collegiate athletics should primarily be educational and secondarily physical, mental, and social. While the NCAA is able to commercialize and create significant financial revenue from collegiate athletics,

their bylaws goes on to state that students participating in this “avocation”, or hobby, should be protected from exploitation.

There is however something to be said about the NCAA taking the position of protecting the young-adult, collegiate athletes from exploitation. According to the Equity in Athletics Data Analysis of 2017 by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Postsecondary Education, the average age range of student-athletes in California is 18-23, an age where the average 18-23 year old in the United States is still living at home. In fact, the US Census Bureau, *The Changing Economics and Demographics of Young Adulthood: 1975–2016* reports that 53% of 18 – 24 year olds in the U.S. reside with their parents. That includes young adults that may be attending college but still living at home. The average US family unit with young-adult children actively enrolled in college remain intact, protected, supporting each other financially, emotionally, developmentally and without undue restrictions. Of those 53% of 18-24 year olds in the US, over 19 million students that will enroll in colleges and universities this year (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019) and have the ability to secure a living using their skills and abilities unless they are collegiate athletes. For student athletes in their active sporting season, working is strictly prohibited (NCAA, 2009). During the offseason, student athletes are eligible to work if they are enrolled a full-time student, maintain academic eligibility, fulfill their athletic obligations, employment is approved by the academic institution, employment is approved by the NCAA Associate Athletic Director of Compliance every academic year, employment is not contingent

upon the student athlete's association to an academic institution or athletic program, pay is commensurate with the going rate in that locality for similar services, and a signed statement by the student athlete and prospective employer must be on file (NCAA Bylaws, 2009).

This is where 9th district California State Senator Nancy Skinner, D-Berkley, aimed to affect change by authoring the CA Senate Bill 206, Collegiate Athletics: Student Athlete Compensation and Representation bill, formerly known as the Fair Pay to Play act. "For decades, college sports have generated billions for all involved except the very people most responsible for creating the wealth. That's wrong. With SB 206 [students] will no longer be the only person on the planet denied the right to monetize 60 million YouTube followers... California leads, that's what we do. By restoring student athletes' rights, we've sent a clear message to the NCAA, our colleges, and the entire sports industry: Equity must be the overriding value" (CA Senate. Gov, 2019). Senator Steve Bradford, who supported the bill, further added, "While our student athletes struggle to get by with basic necessities such as food and clothing, universities and the NCAA make millions off their talent and labor... SB 206 addresses this civil rights issue of today, which is about fairness and equity" (CA Senate. Gov, 2019).

#### **CA Senate Bill 206:**

California Senate Bill 206 was passed on September 11, 2019, was signed by Governor Gavin Newsom on September 27, 2019, and will take effect January 1, 2023. Major provisions of the Collegiate Athletics: Student Athlete

Compensation And Representation bill include (a) the prevention of postsecondary educational institutions except community colleges, and every athletic association, conference, or other group or organization with authority over intercollegiate athletics, from providing a prospective intercollegiate student athlete with compensation for use of the athlete's name, image, or likeness; (b) require professional representation obtained by student athletes to be from persons licensed by the state; (c) would prohibit the revocation of a student's scholarship as a result of earning compensation or obtaining legal representation; (d) prohibit a student athlete from entering into a contract providing compensation to the athlete for use of the athlete's name, image, or likeness if a provision of the contract is in conflict with a provision of the athlete's team contract; and (e) a postsecondary educational institution, athletic association, conference, or other group or organization with authority over intercollegiate athletics shall not provide a prospective student athlete with compensation in relation to the athlete's name, image, or likeness (California Legislative Information, 2019). It is the intent of the legislature to continue to develop policies to ensure appropriate protections are in place to avoid exploitation of student athletes, colleges, and universities. It is the intent of the Legislature to also monitor the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) working group created in May 2019 to examine issues relating to the use of a student's name, image, and likeness and revisit this issue to implement significant findings and recommendations of the NCAA working group in furtherance of the statutory changes proposed by this act (NCAA, 2019).

The cause and effect of California taking a stance to allow collegiate athletes benefit from their name, image, and likeness has been momentous. Other states have followed California's lead in this fight. States such as Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nevada, New York, and Pennsylvania, have begun to explore or have proposed legislation similar to CA-SB 206. Additionally, some legislation under consideration takes it so far as to pay a flat-rate to student-athletes in profitable sports, pay a percentage of the revenue and divided equally among players, and even require colleges to establish an injured-athlete fund to provide compensation to athletes for career-ending or long-term injuries (Sports Illustrated, 2019).

The NCAA was forced to respond to the efforts and impact made by the legislators in California. On the day the senate bill was signed by Governor Newsome, the NCAA Board of Governors urged the "state of California to reconsider this harmful and unconstitutional bill" as they believed it would "would wipe out the distinction between college and professional athletics and eliminate the element of fairness that supports all of college sports" (NCAA, 2019). They went further and stated "student-athletes are students first and choose to play a sport they love against other students while earning a degree. The action taken by California likely is unconstitutional, and the actions proposed by other states make clear the harmful impact of disparate sets of state laws" (NCAA, 2019). However, On January 17, 2020 the NCAA changed its tone and in the name of maintaining "consistent and fair rules among all NCAA members consistent with the NCAA's core principles, the Association formed a working group of member representatives ... to examine the issue and chart a path forward... The group made recommendations to the Board of Governors, which adopted them and directed

the NCAA's three divisions to pursue rules changes around name, image and likeness, kick-starting a process that will play out over the coming year and result in a national rather than state-by-state solution" (NCAA, 2020). Still, the board directed that "any rules changes must maintain the clear distinction between college sports and professional sports and preserve the higher education focus of the NCAA, reaffirming that student-athletes are students first and not employees" (NCAA, 2020).

### **Family Impact Analysis Framework**

Family Impact Analysis (FIA), which is based on principles developed by Ooms and Preister (1988), is a form of policy analysis that presents a formal, in-depth methodology that uses a checklist as a tool to fully examine rules, legislation, laws, programs, agencies, or organizations for the extent to which they do or do not support families (Bogenschneider, 2012). The family impact lens uses a number of methods that may vary according to the intended audience and use, but the purpose is the same—developing programs and policies that support and strengthen families (Bogenschneider, 2012). When evaluating policies through a FIA lens, it is important to keep in mind the five functions of families: (a) family formation (e.g., to marry or divorce, to bear or adopt children, to provide foster care); (b) partner relationships (e.g., to strengthen commitment and stability); (c) economic support (e.g., to provide for members' basic needs); (d) childrearing (e.g., to socialize the next generation); and (e) caregiving (e.g., to provide assistance for the disabled, frail, ill, and elderly) (Family Impact Institute, 2018). The FIA model has been applied to social policies such as a differential response approach to child protective services (Abner & Gordon, 2012), developing an early childhood and education program (Eddy, 2012), mental health parity policies (Balling, 2003), and program analysis of bone marrow transplantation of adults (Young, 2003).

For the purposes of this policy analysis, I will use the following four FIA principles to analyze the current conditions surrounding student athletes and how California Senate Bill 206 may impact the well being of student-athletes and their families. Principle 1, family responsibility, will analyze how SB 206 may promote family well-being and self- sufficiency. Policy and practice should be aimed at supporting the functions of families—family formation, partner relationships, economic support, childrearing, and caregiving. Principle 2, family stability, will analyze family instability and how it may expose children to an array of negative developmental outcomes, disadvantage adults emotionally and economically, and contribute to growing disparities of income and opportunity. Principle 3, family relationships, will analyze how policy and practice should acknowledge that family ties, whether positive or negative, are powerful and persistent. Lastly, principle 4, family diversity, will analyze how family functioning is influenced by an array of contextual factors including culture, family structure, geographic locale, life stage, race/ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, and special needs (Bogenschneider, 2012).

### **Family Impact Policy Analysis**

This Family Impact Analysis will examine the proposed and passed California senate bill within the context of the four aforementioned FIA principles. Each principle considers specific questions and criteria in order to determine if the identified policy ultimately strengthens and supports families. It is important to note that at the time of drafting this analysis the NCAA has not yet, nor are they required to, present any proposed measures until July 1, 2021 and have until January 1, 2023 to satisfy state legislature.

### **Principle 1: Family Responsibility**

Principle 1 addresses Family Responsibility and asserts that in order to promote family well-being and self-sufficiency, policy and practice should be aimed at supporting the functions of families - family formation, partner relationships, economic support, childrearing, and caregiving - rather than unnecessarily supplanting the family's role (Bogenschneider, 2012). While CA SB 206 does not directly include families in its composition, it does outline measures to address functions that would traditionally be held by family or family function. The FIA model likens family functions and roles with those shared by public and private institutions, providers, services, and systems. For example, the primary intent of this policy is to disallow colleges from prohibiting student-athletes from earning compensation as a result of the use of their name, image, or likeness (California Legislative Information, 2019) which is akin to the family function of provision and economic support. Moreover, the policy sets forth that colleges would be prohibited from disallowing student athletes from procuring professional representation and further would require said representation to be a licensed entity by the state and must comply with federal law in their relationships with the student (California Legislative Information, 2019). This provision aims to protect student athletes and require representatives to be vetted and operated in the best interest of the student, which is akin to common family functions. Just as it would be the function of a parent or caregiver to hold space and provide guidance to allow for a child to become independent and self-sufficient, so does SB 206 allow for the opportunity the student athlete to venture into potentially profitable transactions that would encourage further independence. Similar to the family function of childrearing - ensuring the health, safety, education, and general wellbeing of a child – and economic support – families providing economic support to provide the basic needs – so is this policy's aim to establish professional, qualified, and capable representation that would operate in good faith on behalf of, and in

conjunction with, the student with the objective to provide income maintenance and social insurance (Bogenschneider 2012).

### **Principle 2: Family stability**

Families are comprised in many different arrangements, exist in a variety of contexts, and go through many stages of life cycles. Therefore, policies that promote family stability do so with the understanding that families are also very diverse. Principle 2 contends that instability exposes children to an array of negative developmental outcomes, disadvantages adults emotionally and economically, and contributes to growing disparities of income and opportunity (Bogenschneider, 2012). In these scenarios, having college aged, young adult children does not preclude families and family functions from being impacted by policies. On the contrary, college aged, young adult individuals, having to possibly move away from their families, makes it all the more necessary to have safe guards in place to ensure stability. By allowing for student athletes to financially benefit from their name, image, or likeness, allowing for students to procure licensed representation, and preventing college institutions from being able to revoke scholarships and admission, SB-206 makes the effort to maintain family stability especially in a time of significant change in the family life cycle. This effort comes in the form of supplemental finances, guidance from qualified representation, and potentially alleviating financial burden from the family back home if they are monetarily supporting the student athlete. It can be argued that the NCAA, by maintaining a regimented routine for their student athletes and also entirely disallowing them from entering into contracts and business dealings, was providing a form of protection and stability. However, with limited opportunities available for student athletes to participate in outside of their obligations as students and athletes, SB-206 sets forth the

provisions for student athletes to maximize their opportunities while concurrently offering safeguards to prevent predatory dealings.

### **Principle 3: Family relationships.**

Policies that observe a FIA lens should acknowledge that family ties, whether positive or negative, are powerful and persistent (Conger, 2010). This also applies to concurrent life cycle states of change such as a family now having a young adult, college aged member leave the home and that same member having a newfound state of independence and adult responsibilities to manage. Policies that support family relationships recognize that individuals' development and well-being are profoundly affected by the quality of their relationships with close family members and family members' relationships with each other (Cowan & Cowan, 2003). Policies that support family relationships also acknowledge how life events can affect family dynamics and support the need for balancing change and stability in family roles and functions (Cowan & Cowan, 2003). Unfortunately, SB-206 does little to support family relationships as its effort does more to supplant family function than support familial roles. SB 206 does not consider support systems that may already be available to student athletes or be within their support system and instead institutes agent representation. Professional, qualified, state-licensed representation does provide some measure of safe guard as it is regulated to ensure appropriate practices that operate in good faith, however their purpose is limited to business dealings exclusively and may not have contextual understanding of the demands placed on collegiate athletes. While healthy families are able to maintain stability while accommodating life stage changes (Olson & Gorall, 2003), SB-206 falls short of significantly and directly supporting family relationships.

### **Principle 4: Family diversity**

Well-documented disparities persist in education, employment, health status, and related outcomes among different racial/ethnic, socioeconomic, and other marginalized groups; such groups continue to be over-represented in high-risk populations (Burton, Bonilla-Silva, Ray, Buckelew, & Freeman, 2010). Policies that are in line with the FIA model, namely principle 4, should assess whether their practices respect the diversity of families or whether they create or contribute to inequitable outcomes (Bogenschneider, 2012). In principal, SB-206 addressed income inequality on a base level. While information is not available on the family types, state of life cycle change, socioeconomic status, or other social characteristics of student athletes prior to their participation in collegiate athletics, the NCAA bylaws prohibiting all student-athletes from benefiting from their name, image, or likeness applied equally. SB-206 creates the avenue by which student athletes can maximize the advantage of their circumstances regardless of culture, family structure, geographic locale, life stage, race/ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, and special needs (Leadbeater, 2004). The opportunity of being able to participate in collegiate sports in and of itself also falls in line with the family diversity principle, as students are able to further their abilities, network, gain a post-secondary education, and in some cases on full-scholarships, despite their culture, family structure, geographic locale, life stage, race/ethnicity, religion, and socioeconomic status. SB-206 does however add the element for student athletes to be able to financially benefit from their name, image, likeness, and abilities without having to risk being disqualified from participation in athletics or revocation of their admission to educational institutions.

### **Limitations**

While SB 206 intends to create supplementary opportunities for student athletes, one of the major limitations of this analysis is that this policy is one of the first of its kind, consequently

there is little to no research or scholarly literature regarding policies addressing student athletes being able to benefit from their Name, Image, and Likeness. In fact, at best this analysis is exclusively limited to the text of SB 206, which serves as a broad framework for the NCAA and state regulative bodies, such as the California Secretary of State and the California Business and Profession Code, to then build policies and procedures to satisfy the outlined criteria. Further, any determinations made regarding the policy's intended impact and unintended consequences are done speculatively as no iterations of this policy or similar legislation has actually be enacted to date. Since the passing of SB 206 the NCAA has formed a working group to create the policies and procedures to satisfy the legislation, however they have not made public any proposals that are being considered. This information would have been substantially helpful in the analysis of SB 206.

Another limitation to this analysis is that benchmarks outlined per principle in the FIA model were not entirely addressed by SB 206. It did not appear as if SB 206 was drafted viewing the student-athlete as a member of a family unit. The objective of the policy was less about strengthening the family unit and more about targeting and overcoming barriers to access potentially lucrative opportunities for student athletes by being able to benefit from their name, image, and likeness. The FIA model does address family and its diversity in family type, life stage, and context as well as its shared roles with private and public institutions. This then allows FIA model to be applied to SB 206. And certainly access to an education, education level, and income level can significantly impact a person's life and family. However without being able to compare the life of students and families before and after the policy is enacted, whether nuclear or in an academic context, this FIA is unable to categorically determine how SB 206 is impacting families.

## **Discussion**

California Senate Bill 206 has pioneered the way for all collegiate student athletes to maximize their opportunity to benefit from their name, image, and likeness. Even before the established operative date of January 01, 2023, this inaugural bill has already had an impact by inspiring other states to propose similar legislation across the nation. Consequently, the NCAA has moved to not only satisfy the provisions outlined in the California bill but also have it unilaterally apply to all 490,000 collegiate athletes in the 1,100 participating academic institutions across the nation. Students will still be able to be motivated by educational pursuits, reap the physical, mental, and social benefits of collegiate athletics as the NCAA has asserted, but now will be able to benefit from their name, image, and likeness. That being so, there is something to be said about the NCAA's commitment to maintaining amateurism, even while having to abide by SB 206, being akin to corporate responsibility. While student athletes have been unable to monetize opportunities based off of their name, image, and likeness, they have also been protected from those looking to take advantage of their inexperience in commercial dealings. Up until now, student athletes have had to predominantly focus on being a student and athlete. Academic institutions on the other hand have had the responsibility to properly educate and protect their student body regardless of participation in collegiate sports. Student athletes are made aware of the significant demands of their academic pursuits and athletic pursuits - which are contingent upon their academic performance - along with the stringent adherence to comprehensive NCAA polices. However, when student athletes are the only contributors barred from profiting from the athletic competition that has proven to be significantly lucrative, SB 206 created a manner by

which they too could profit without interfering with participating academic institutions and the NCAA.

While SB 206 is a step in the direction of providing economic support for student athletes, it does fall short of making significant considerations that strengthen and support the family unit. It failed to address the root causes of financial insecurity (Black & Lobo, 2008) or set realistic expectations for families to assume responsibilities during life stage changes (Patterson, 2002). Principle 2, Family Stability, calls for a policy to consider commitment between family members, help families resolve problems that may erode the family structure, balance the safety and well-being of families and integrity of families as a whole, and provide reasonable guidelines for when non-family members are permitted to intervene and make decisions on behalf of the family (Patterson, 2002), which SB 206 does not directly address or make significantly clear. SB 206 predominantly focuses on the student athlete as an individual whereas principle 3, Family Relationships, contends that policies must recognize the impact of family ties, which SB 206 does create an opportunity for a member of a student athlete's family to become their agent. Lastly, while SB 206 initially applied to student athletes only in colleges in California, the NCAA moved to apply these changes to all student athletes collectively thus being inclusive regardless of their demographic or identification. However because SB 206 neither highlights nor discriminates against a particular oppressed group of people, it falls short of adequately considering family diversity.

SB 206 has provisions that call for reviews; reviews for progress on policy creation and for policy impact. In these reviews, it would be beneficial to consider several aspects. SB 206 inspired the NCAA to make sweeping changes to benefit all student athletes but it would be incumbent upon the NCAA and state legislators to survey not only who is most benefiting

from the changes but who may be negatively impacted. As an aside, the NCAA will need to devise a manner in which reporting can be made, by whom, and what will actually need to be reported. Will it fall on the student athletes or their representation? If mandated reporting is not conducted, will the student athlete be liable, and can they be disqualified from participation or expelled from school? Reviewers may consider requiring incorporating prevention strategies - such as financial literacy and management education - to avert crises and chronic situations that can threaten family structure and functioning (Center for the Study of Social Policy, 2008). Reviewers may also consider measurements and impacts of the policy that are not solely economically focused but impact the social-emotional health of the student athletes and their family relationships. And while the NCAA unilaterally decided to apply the changes to all 1,100 academic institutions and 490,000 student athletes, there is nothing to stop another state from proposing and passing their own legislation that does not mirror the SB 206. Therefore, it would also behoove the NCAA to become proactive and initiate the conversation of student athlete compensation and representation on a federal scale in effort to mitigate state-specific provisions and further establish standardization.

## References

- Abner, K., & Gordon, R. A. (2012). Differential response: A family impact analysis (Family Impact Analysis Series). Madison, WI: Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars.
- Balling, K. (2003). A family impact analysis of the Family Mental Health Parity Act. (Family Impact Analysis Series). Madison, WI: Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars.
- Bogenschneider, K., Little, O., Ooms, T., Benning, S., & Cadigan, K. (2012). The family impact handbook: How to view policy and practice through the family impact lens. Retrieved from [http://familyimpactseminars.org/doc.asp?d=fi\\_handbook-0712.pdf](http://familyimpactseminars.org/doc.asp?d=fi_handbook-0712.pdf).
- Burton, L. M., Bonilla-Silva, E., Ray, V., Buckelew, E., & Freeman, H. (2010). Critical Race Theories, Colorism, And The Decade's Research On Families Of Color. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 440-459. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00712.
- Carroll, Charlotte (October 02, 2019). Sports Illustrated: *Tracking NCAA Fair Play Legislation Across the Country*. ABG-SI LLC. Retrieved from: <https://www.si.com/college/2019/10/02/tracking-ncaa-fair-play-image-likeness-laws>
- Center for the Study of Social Policy. (2008). *Policy Matters—2008 Data Update: Twenty state policies to enhance states' prosperity and create bright futures for America's children, families and communities*. Retrieved from [http://www.cssp.org/publications/public-policy/top-five/4\\_policy-matters-20-state-policies-to-enhance-states-prosperity-and-create-bright-futures-for-americas-children.pdf](http://www.cssp.org/publications/public-policy/top-five/4_policy-matters-20-state-policies-to-enhance-states-prosperity-and-create-bright-futures-for-americas-children.pdf)
- Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J., & Martin, M. J. (2010). Socioeconomic status, family

processes, and individual development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, (Vol. 72). DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.

Deloitte & Touche LLP (December 11, 2018). Independent Auditors Report:

*Consolidated Statements Of Financial Position As Of August 31, 2018.*

National Collegiate Athletic Association and Subsidiaries. Retrieved from:

[https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/ncaa/finance/2017-18NCAAFin\\_NCAAFinancialStatement.pdf](https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/ncaa/finance/2017-18NCAAFin_NCAAFinancialStatement.pdf)

Eddy, S. (2012). Viewing Developing an Early Childhood and Education Program:

*Implications from a Family Impact Analysis of the Child-Parent Center Program.*

Madison, WI: Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars. Gross, E., Bogenschneider, K.,

& Johnson, C. (2006). How to conduct a

family impact analysis. *Family Policy Matters: How Policymaking Affects Families and What Professionals Can Do*, 2.

Hawkins, A., & Ooms, T. (2012). Can marriage and relationship education be an

effective policy tool to help low income couples form and sustain healthy marriages and relationships? A review of lessons learned. *Marriage and Family Review*, 48, 524-554.

doi: 10.1080/01494929.2012677751

Leadbeater, B. J., Schellenbach, C. J., Maton, K. I., & Dodgen, D. W. (2004). Research

And Policy For Building Strengths: Processes And Contexts Of Individual, Family, And

Community Development. In K. I. Maton, C. J. Schellenbach, B. J. Leadbeater, & A. L.

Solarz (Eds.), *Investing in children, youth, families, and communities* (pp. 13-30).

Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Musu, L., Fenster, M. National Center for Education Statistics (August 20,

- 2018). Back to school by the numbers: 2018. *NCES Blog*. Retrieved from:  
<https://nces.ed.gov/blogs/nces/post/back-to-school-by-the-numbers-2018>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (September 11, 2019). NCAA responds to California Senate Bill 206: *Measure would upend level playing field for all student-athletes*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/news/ncaa-responds-california-senate-bill-206>.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2018). NCAA Recruiting Facts: *College Sports Create a pathway to opportunity for student-athletes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/Recruiting%20Fact%20Sheet%20WEB.pdf>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2015). Trends in graduation success rates and federal graduation rates at NCAA Division I institutions. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/graduation-rates>.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association Academic and Membership Affairs Staff (2009). NCAA Constitution, Operating Bylaws, Administrative Bylaws. ISSN 1093-3174. NCAA Legislative Services Database for the Internet (LSDBi). Retrieved from:  
<https://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/D110.pdf>
- Olson, D. H., & Gorall, D. M. (2003). Circumplex Model Of Marital And Family Systems. In F. Walsh (Ed.), *Normal family processes* (3rd ed., pp. 514-547). New York: Guilford.
- Ooms, T., & Preister, S. (1988). A strategy for strengthening families: Using family impact criteria in policymaking and program evaluation. Washington, DC: The Family Impact Seminar.
- Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education, Equity in Athletics Data

Analysis (2017). EADA Statistical Data Report [XLS]. Retrieved from  
<https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/customdata/dataselected>.

Senator Nancy Skinner, California Senate Bill 206 “Collegiate athletics: student athlete compensation and representation” (October 01, 2019). Retrieved from:  
[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201920200SB206#](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB206#)

Senator Skinner, Nancy (September 30, 2019). In The News: Gov. Newsom Signs SB 206, the ‘Fair Pay to Play Act’. Retrieved from: <https://sd09.senate.ca.gov/-news/20190930-gov-newsom-signs-sb-206-%E2%80%98fair-pay-play-act%E2%80%99>

Stark-Mason, Rachel (January 17, 2020). National Collegiate Athletic Association, *Champion Magazine: Name, Image, and Likeness*. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.ncaa.org/champion/name-image-likeness>.

Vespa, Jonathan, U.S. Census Bureau, (April 2017). The Changing Economics and Demographics of Young Adulthood: 1975–2016, *Population Characteristics*, Report Number P20-579.

Young, L. (2003). A family impact analysis of programs for bone marrow transplantation of adults. (Family Impact Analysis Series). Madison, WI: Policy Institute for Family Impact Seminars.