Title: The Future of College Sports in Flux: Big Ten's Private Equity Deal Sparks Uncertainty

Brief Overview: The landscape of college athletics is undergoing a seismic shift, with financial strategies and governance structures being scrutinized more intensely than ever before.

Central to this upheaval is the proposed $2.4 billion private equity deal involving the Big Ten Conference, which has ignited debate among university leaders, lawmakers, and fans alike.

Learn more about this controversy, including takeaways related to the league's governance, the tax-exempt status of college athletics, and the long-term implications for the tradition-rich conference.

Full Article: The landscape of college athletics is undergoing a seismic shift, with financial strategies and governance structures being scrutinized more intensely than ever before. Central to this upheaval is the proposed $2.4 billion private equity deal involving the Big Ten Conference, which has ignited debate among university leaders, lawmakers, and fans alike. At the heart of the controversy are questions about the league's governance, the tax-exempt status of college athletics, and the long-term implications for the tradition-rich conference.

A Skeptical Eye from Washington: Congressional Concerns

Senator Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.), the Ranking Member of the Senate Commerce Committee that has jurisdiction of college sports, has emerged as a prominent critic of the deal. In a recent letter to the Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation, Cantwell requested an analysis of the potential tax consequences for the NCAA, its member schools, and the broader college sports industry. Her concerns center on whether the current tax-exempt regime under which many college athletic programs operate remains appropriate in a landscape increasingly driven by private investments.

The letter highlights a number of fundamental issues in the college sports landscape following the landmark House v. NCAA settlement in June. For example, should NCAA schools and conferences continue to enjoy tax-exempt status when engaging in for-profit activities? How might private equity investments, such as the proposed Big Ten deal, influence the tax treatment of revenues generated through athletic programs? What are the implications for individual athletes, and should they be classified as employees or independent contractors? This question in particular has simmered for years, posing significant tax and labor law consequences, and is currently the subject of litigation in a matter pending in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania under the caption Johnson v. NCAA.

Cantwell's inquiry also reflects overarching questions about the evolving nature of college sports — particularly as lucrative media rights, NIL collectives, and private investments blur the lines between education, entertainment, and commerce. The timing of her intervention is critical, as the Big Ten grapples with internal dissent from universities like Michigan and USC.

Internal Tensions and Allegations of Coercion

Amidst the broader public debate, reports have surfaced of internal conflict within the Big Ten. Recently, a Big Ten university regent accused the league commissioner of threatening to impose penalties on the university if it refused to support the private equity deal. The regent described the situation as a "strong-arm" tactic, suggesting that the league's leadership is attempting to pressure member institutions into acceptance, raising serious governance questions.

The Big Ten has responded by asserting that all discussions have been collaborative and transparent, emphasizing that the university's concerns are being heard and considered as part of the evaluation process. Nonetheless, the allegations of coercion have cast a shadow over the league's unity, with some observers questioning whether the conference is risking its integrity and long-term stability in pursuit of short-term financial gains.

The Deal: What's at Stake?

The proposal involves the creation of a new entity, Big Ten Enterprises, in which UC Investments — linked to the University of California system's pension fund — would hold a 10% stake. In exchange, the conference would receive an immediate infusion of approximately $150 million per school, with the remaining funds distributed based on each school's earning potential in a three-tiered system. Additionally, UC Investments would secure a 10% share of the league's media and sponsorship rights for 15 years, after which it could sell its stake.

A key aspect of the deal is a 10-year extension of the Big Ten's grant of rights from its member schools, which allows the Big Ten Conference to negotiate the media rights of all of its member schools, in exchange for the three-tiered revenue system where schools like Ohio State and Michigan would comprise the top level of earners, while schools like USC and Oregon would be in the middle tier.

Supporters argue that this deal could provide vital funding to member schools, many of which face rising operational costs and increased competition in the NIL era. The influx of capital could help level the playing field, improve facilities, and attract top talent.

However, opponents, including Michigan and USC, see the deal as a threat to the league's autonomy and traditional tax-exempt status. They argue that private equity involvement introduces profit motives that conflict with the schools' core educational mission. Additional concerns regarding uneven revenue distribution and the potential loss of institutional control have fueled resistance from member institutions.

Potential Fallout: Could Michigan or USC Leave?

The opposition from Michigan and USC raises the specter of a conference fracturing. Michigan, a founding member of the Big Ten, has indicated that it might consider leaving the conference altogether if the private equity deal proceeds without full consensus. Regent Jordan Acker has explicitly stated that Michigan could pursue independence in football once the current media rights deal expires in 2036, should the league move forward with the controversial arrangement. Though the Big Ten has media contracts for other men's and women's sports, the vast majority of conference revenue comes from broadcast rights for football (and, to a lesser degree, men's basketball).

USC, one of the four new members of the Big Ten, shares similar reservations, particularly regarding revenue sharing (where USC currently is not receiving a full revenue share from the conference as part of its deal to join the conference) and the league's long-term direction. Both schools' opposition underscores the growing divide within the conference, which could have profound implications for its future cohesion and competitiveness.

The Broader Implications for College Sports

The controversy surrounding the Big Ten's private equity deal exemplifies the underlying tensions facing college athletics today. On one side are those who see the infusion of private capital as a necessary step to sustain and grow programs in an era of skyrocketing costs and NIL-related expenses, despite the Big Ten's current status as the richest college sports conference. On the other side are advocates for maintaining the educational and amateur principles of college sports who are wary of turning universities into profit-driven enterprises.

Lawmakers like Cantwell are adding their voices to the debate, questioning whether the current tax-exempt framework remains appropriate. The American Council of Trustees and Alumni has also expressed concern over the lack of governance oversight, warning that such deals should not proceed without full institutional approval and transparency.

Looking Ahead

As the Big Ten pauses its private equity negotiations to seek consensus among its members, the future of the league — and perhaps college sports as a whole — remains uncertain. The outcome will likely influence how athletic programs are financed, governed, operated and perceived in the years to come.

The league's internal divisions and external scrutiny highlight the complex balancing act faced by conference leadership. Striking a balance between financial sustainability and preserving the traditions of college athletics will be crucial. Whether the Big Ten can navigate these turbulent waters without fracturing remains to be seen, but one thing is clear: the landscape of college sports is entering a new, uncharted era — one marked by high stakes, high tension, and profound questions about the intersection of education, entertainment, and profit.

Buchanan offers a comprehensive suite of services, providing guidance tailored to institutions, collectives, and businesses involved in the NIL space and other activities related to student athletes to ensure compliance and support at every stage.

Author(s)' Name(s), Title(s), and Email(s):

Andrew G. Hope	*610 783 3314*	andrew.hope@bipc.com
Kellen M. Carleton	*412 562 1527*	kellen.carleton@bipc.com
David A. Gurwin	*412 562 1592*	david.gurwin@bipc.com