

No. 10-1048
In the
**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

JAMES PURDHAM,
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD,
Defendant-Appellee

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Eastern District of Virginia, Alexandria Division

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS
ASSOCIATION, NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, AND VIRGINIA
SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION**

FRANCISCO M. NEGRÓN, JR.*
General Counsel
LISA E. SORONEN
NANCY DINSMORE
National School Boards Association
1680 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-838-6722
*Counsel of Record

Counsel for *Amici Curiae*

Brief Supporting Appellee and Affirmance
of Decision of U.S. District Court for
Eastern District of Virginia

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

June 17, 2010

Case Number 10-1048

Purdham v. Fairfax County School Board

**Disclosure of Corporate Affiliations and Other Entities
with a Direct Financial Interest in Litigation**

Pursuant to FRAP 26.1 and Local Rule 26.1, the National School Boards Association, the North Carolina School Boards Association, the South Carolina School Boards Association, and the Virginia School Boards Association, who are Amici Curiae, make the following disclosures:

1. Is party a publicly held corporation or other publicly held entity?
 YES NO
2. Does party have any parent corporations?
 YES NO
If yes, identify all parent corporations, including grandparent and great-grandparent corporations:
3. Is 10% of more of a party's stock owned by a publicly held corporation or other publicly held entity?
 YES NO
If yes, identify all such owners:
4. Is there any other publicly held corporation or other publicly held entity that has a direct financial interest in the outcome of the litigation (Local Rule 26.1(b))?
 YES NO
If yes, identify entity and nature of interest:
5. Is party a trade association?
 YES NO
If yes, identify all members of the association, their parent corporations, and any publicly held companies that own 10% or more of a party's stock:
6. If case arises out of a bankruptcy proceeding, identify any trustee and the members of any creditors committee: N/A

/S/Francisco M. Negron, Jr.

June 17, 2010

Signature

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
STATEMENT OF IDENTITY, INTEREST IN CASE, AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY TO FILE	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	3
ARGUMENT	5
I. Providing Small Stipends to Coaches/Extracurricular Advisors Is a National Practice	5
II. The Law is Unclear About What Amount Is a “Nominal Fee”....	6
III. School Districts Receive Many Benefits from Support Staff Coaches/Advisors	9
IV. School Districts Cannot Afford To Pay Support Staff Overtime To Coach/Advise	14
V. Concluding That a Small Stipend Is Not a “Nominal Fee” or That Support Staff Employees Who Coach/Advise Must Be Paid Overtime Will Have Negative Consequences for Support Staff Employees	18
VI. If Support Staff Employees Cannot “Volunteer” as Coaches/ Advisors Then Sports/Extracurricular Activities May be Cancelled.....	20
VII. Allowing Support Staff To “Volunteer” and Receive No Compensation at All Would Likely Lead to Sports/Extracurricular Activities Being Cancelled, Among Other Practical Problems..	23

CONCLUSION..... 26

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

STATUTES:

29 U.S.C. § 203(e)(4)(A) (2010) 7

REGULATIONS:

29 C.F.R. § 106.41 (c) (5) 22

29 C.F.R. § 778.115 17

OTHER AUTHORITIES:

Aaron McFarling, *Coaches Losing Jobs to Fair-Labor Law*,
ROANOKE TIMES, July 2, 2004 8, 20

Acalanes Union High School District Coaching Stipends, *available at*,
<http://www.acalanes.k12.ca.us/hr/approvedcoachstipends.pdf> 5

Alex Johnson, *U.S. Schools in “Category 5” Budget Crisis*, MSNBC.com,
Mar. 18, 2010, *available at*,
http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/35883971/ns/us_news-education/ 14

Cathy Grimes, *Governor’s Proposed K-12 Budget Cuts Hit School Breakfast Programs and Coaches’ Salaries*, DAILY PRESS, Feb. 17, 2010 15

Census data, *available at*
<http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2009/tables/09s0256.pdf/> 22

Christine Willmsen & Maureen O’Hagan, *Coaches Continue Working for Schools and Teams After Being Caught for Sexual Misconduct*,
SEATTLE TIMES, Dec. 14, 2003 11

Cobb County School District Athletic Supplements, *available at*,
<http://www.cobbk12.org/centraloffice/athletics/2009-10AthleticSupplements.pdf> 5, 6

Collective Bargaining Agreement Between Central Valley School District and Central Valley Co-Curricular Activities Association, <i>available at</i> http://www.cvsd.org/documents/HR/Coaches%20Agreement%20FINAL%20COPY%202009-12.pdf	5
Dave Johnson & Marty O’Brien, <i>Coaches: Loss of Stipends Would Hurt High School Athletics</i> , DAILY PRESS, Feb. 19, 2010.....	6, 19, 25
David Lee Morgan, Jr., <i>Benching of Coaches Difficult to Swallow</i> , AKRON BEACON JOURNAL, Apr. 29, 2004.....	8, 14, 19
Douglas B. Reeves, <i>The Extracurricular Advantage</i> , EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, Sept. 2008.....	22
Frank Wolfe, <i>States, Cities Brace for More Education Cuts</i> , EDUC. DAILY, Jan. 22, 2010.....	14
Frank Wolfe, <i>States, Districts Expect Money Woes to Worsen</i> , EDUC. DAILY, Jan. 14, 2010.....	14
Gary Young, <i>Overtime Suits 101</i> , NATIONAL LAW JOURNAL, Mar. 19, 2003.....	7, 8
Greg Scholand, <i>Keeping Score on Overtime</i> , ATHLETIC MGMT., April/May 2005.....	16-17
Jason Schrieber, <i>Play Ball! Despite Grievance Threat, Candia Votes to Go Ahead</i> , UNION LEADER, Jan. 10, 2003.....	25
Jeff Graham, <i>Coaching Stipends Subject to District Approval</i> , KITSAP SUN, Apr. 24, 2007.....	6
John Harvey, <i>Loss of Stipends Threatens Sports</i> , VIRGINIA GAZETTE, Feb. 20, 2010, <i>available at</i> , http://www.vagazette.com/articles/2010/02/27/news/doc4b7f1f8138112958637484.prt	15
John Jarvis, <i>Coaches’ OT Pay Concern for Valley</i> , MARION STAR, July 21, 2004.....	8

Joey Knight, <i>Coaching Stipends Don't Stack Up</i> , TAMPABAY.COM, Sept. 25, 2007.....	5, 6
John Murphy, <i>District Policies Differ on Classified Coaches to Pay or Not to Pay?</i> , PRESS ENTERPRISE, Aug. 16, 2009.....	passim
Kyle Neddenriep, <i>Dollars and Sense in High School Sports</i> , INDYSTAR.COM, Jan. 25, 2010	5, 21
Kyra Kitlowski, <i>School Board Still Faces Cuts to its Budget; Extracurricular Stipends are Vulnerable</i> , SAN RAMON VALLEY TIMES, June 13, 2001.....	15
Laura Smith, <i>Working Overtime</i> , ATHLETIC MANAGEMENT, Aug/Sept. 2004.....	7, 15, 17
Lenny Wiersma & Clay Sherman, <i>Volunteer Youth Sport Coaches' Perspectives of Coaching Education/Certification and Parental Codes of Conduct</i> , 76 RES. Q. FOR EXERCISE & SPORT 324 (2005)	11
Letter FLSA2005-51 from Alfred B. Robinson, Jr., Deputy Administrator (Nov. 10, 2005)	8
Letter from Daniel F. Sweeney, Deputy Assistant Administrator (July 11, 1995)	7
Louise Radnofsky, <i>Duncan Scolds Hawaii on School Furloughs</i> , WALL ST. J., Oct. 24, 2009.....	14
Marietta Nelson, <i>Three Brenerton Coaches Who Don't Teach Fall Under Budget Ax</i> , KITSAP SUN, July 3, 2009	20
Mark Gormus, <i>Chesterfield Budget Woes Could Eliminate Sports Teams</i> , TIMES-DISPATCH, Jan. 26, 2010	25
Markham Evans, <i>Police: Enraged Youth Coach Attacks Refs</i> , ABC7News.com, May 5, 2010, available at http://www.wjla.com/news/stories/0510/732947.html	11

Melanie C. Johnson, *Rialto School District Eliminates Coaching Stipends for Classified Employees*, PRESS-ENTERPRISE, July 13, 2008 13, 23

Michelle Hatfield, *Will Schools Turn to Volunteer Coaches?*, THE MODESTO BEE, Jan. 19, 2010, *available at* <http://www.modbee.com/2010/01/19/1013216/will-schools-turn-to-volunteer.html>10, 11, 12

Mike Gruss & Darren Freedman, *Overtime-pay Lawsuits Hand Coaches, Public Schools A Worrisome Game Plan*, VIRGINIAN-PILOT, June 30, 2004 13, 19

Oregon City School District, *True Talent Behind the Wheel, What it Takes to be a School Bus Driver in Oregon City*, *available at* <http://www.orecity.k12.or.us/node/449> 12

ScienceDaily, *Social Skills, Extracurricular Activities in High School Pay Off Later in Life*, Mar. 26, 2009, *available at* <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/03/090325132536.htm> 23

S.G. McCallister et al., *Problematic Aspects of the Role of Youth Sport Coach*, 4 INT’L SPORTS J. 9 (2000) 12

Staci Haight, *Coaches, Activity Leaders Keeping Eye on Budget Cuts*, VENTURA COUNTY STAR, Feb. 24, 2003 6

Trent Moore, *County Schools Consider Allowing Non-employees to Fill Coaching Positions*, CULLMAN TIMES, Jan. 17, 2010..... 12, 20

Whitelaw Reid, *With Budget Constraints, Coaches Find their Athletic Programs . . . Stuck in the Middle*, SAN DIEGO UNION-TRIBUNE, Mar. 6, 2005 22

STATEMENT OF IDENTITY, INTEREST IN CASE, AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY TO FILE

The National School Boards Association (NSBA) is a nonprofit organization representing state associations of school boards, as well as the Hawaii State Board of Education and the Board of Education of the U.S. Virgin Islands. Through its member state associations, NSBA represents over 95,000 school board members who govern more than 14,000 local school districts serving about 49.8 million students. NSBA regularly represents its members' interests before Congress and federal and state courts and has participated as *amicus curiae* in many cases involving the impact of federal employment laws on public school districts.

The North Carolina School Boards Association (NCSBA) is a voluntary, nonprofit association supporting all 115 local school boards across the state. The Association advocates for the concerns of local school boards in the state and federal courts and legislatures. No other state level entity represents the interests of North Carolina boards of education.

The South Carolina School Boards Association (SCSBA), a non-profit organization, serves as a source of information and as a statewide voice for boards governing the state's 85 public school districts. SCSBA's mission is to ensure excellence in school board performance through advocacy, training and service as catalysts for positive change.

The Virginia School Boards Association (VSBA) is a private, voluntary non-partisan organization representing every local school board in Virginia. VSBA's primary mission is the advancement of education through local control of the public schools. VSBA's members are the local school districts responsible for teaching students.

All of *amici's* members are subject to the mandates of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). As public employers, school districts strive to comply with federal employment laws that apply to the personnel that work in many capacities to ensure that public schools are able to fulfill their educational mission in an efficient and effective manner. When the requirements of federal employment law are not clear, *amici* have over the years made concerted efforts to gain clarification through judicial interpretation, legislative amendments, regulatory provisions or administrative agency assistance. Despite these efforts, some aspects of the FLSA, such as the "nominal fee" provision at issue here, remain difficult for school districts to understand and implement with assurance that their actions are in compliance with the law. *Amici's* members have a strong interest in advising the Court of these difficulties and of the potential impact this Court's decision will have on the ability of school districts to continue to provide the millions of students they serve with a wide variety of athletic and other extracurricular activities that enhance their educational experience.

Appellant opposes the filing of this brief unless the Court grants additional time to respond. As required by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, this brief is submitted on motion for leave to file.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

The outcome of this case will likely turn on one question: what is the test for determining what amount is a “nominal fee?” This Court’s answer to that question will affect school districts across the nation that, like Fairfax County, depend on a system of volunteer coaches to provide athletic and other extracurricular activities to millions of public school students. Because of the far reaching impact of its decision, this Court should adopt a test that allows public school districts to continue their practice of offering small stipends to nonexempt employees who volunteer to coach/advise students. Likewise, *amici* urge the Court to adopt a test that is clear, easy to apply, relevant to school districts, and that can be applied in all circumstances and yield a definitive answer.

Under the current law, school districts across the country wonder what amount exactly is a nominal fee and whether the stipends they have historically offered to nonexempt employees who coach/advise students are in fact nominal fees. If this Court rules that support staff employees who coach/advise must be paid overtime, most school districts will be forced to stop letting them coach/advise because the districts cannot sustain the cost. Similarly, if this Court

devises a test for “nominal fee” that does not include small stipends or that is too ambiguous to apply—arguably the current state of the law—districts will either only allow support staff to “volunteer” for no compensation at all or will stop allowing them to “volunteer” altogether. In short, in the event of a ruling unfavorable to Fairfax County, many support staff employees will either no longer be able to do something they love or will be deprived of a small stipend that recognizes their efforts.

While the consequences of disallowing support staff employees to receive small stipends for “volunteering” as coaches/advisors will be bad for those employees, the consequences for students will be worse. In the best case scenario, students will be deprived of current and future competent and devoted coaches/advisors. In the worst case scenario, school districts will have to cancel completely some athletics/extracurricular activities for lack of willing and affordable coaches/advisors.

ARGUMENT

I. Providing Small Stipends to Coaches/Extracurricular Advisors Is a National Practice.

School districts across the country offer small stipends to athletic coaches/extracurricular advisors.¹ Coaches lead sports teams while extracurricular advisors lead nonathletic activities such as drama, band, yearbook, etc. Nationally, stipends are calculated differently and coaches/advisors receive different amounts but the concept is the same: coaches/advisors receive a small amount of money for each activity that is not tied to the exact number of hours worked or the results achieved. For example, in some districts stipends are calculated based on a percent of teacher base pay² while in other districts stipends are a flat dollar amount.³ Some districts provide larger stipends based on longevity.⁴ Regardless of the

¹ See, e.g., John Murphy, *District Policies Differ on Classified Coaches to Pay or Not to Pay?*, PRESS ENTERPRISE, Aug. 16, 2009, at B1(California); Kyle Neddenriep, *Dollars and Sense in High School Sports*, INDYSTAR.COM, Jan. 25, 2010 (Indiana); Joey Knight, *Coaching Stipends Don't Stack Up*, TAMPABAY.COM, Sept. 25, 2007 (Florida).

² See, e.g., Collective Bargaining Agreement Between Central Valley School District and Central Valley Co-Curricular Activities Association, <http://www.cvsd.org/documents/HR/Coaches%20Agreement%20FINAL%20COPY%202009-12.pdf>.

³ See, e.g., Cobb County School District Athletic Supplements, <http://www.cobbk12.org/centraloffice/athletics/2009-10AthleticSupplements.pdf>.

⁴ But see Acalanes Union High School District Coaching Stipends, <http://www.acalanes.k12.ca.us/hr/approvedcoachstipends.pdf>.

calculation method, coaches of sports that are more prestigious and that have longer seasons appear to receive larger stipends.⁵

Stipends are essentially a token amount of money thanking coaches/advisors for their service. Stipends nationally are not large compared to the hundreds, or even thousands,⁶ of hours put in by coaches/advisors. It appears that football coaches nationally receive the highest compensation; but even their stipends appear to not usually exceed about \$6,000.⁷ Recent evidence indicates that the highest current football coach stipend in southern Virginia is \$5,300 in Newport News.⁸ Newport News' "low end" coaches (golf, field hockey, soccer, and tennis) receive between \$1,970-\$2,750.⁹

II. The Law is Unclear About What Amount Is a "Nominal Fee."

Pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) nonexempt school district employees may "volunteer" at the district so long as, among other things, the only

⁵ See, e.g., Cobb County School District Athletic Supplements, <http://www.cobbk12.org/centraloffice/athletics/2009-10AthleticSupplements.pdf>.

⁶ See, e.g., Staci Haight, *Coaches, Activity Leaders Keeping Eye on Budget Cuts*, VENTURA COUNTY STAR, Feb. 24, 2003, at B01 (high school football coach estimates he puts in about 3,000 hours a year).

⁷ See, e.g., Knight, *supra* note 1 (in 2007 most experienced football coach at Florida's seventh largest school district receives \$3,448; highest paid Florida football coach in the article receives \$5,440); Jeff Graham, *Coaching Stipends Subject to District Approval*, KITSAP SUN, Apr. 24, 2007 (Washington State head football coaches typically paid between \$3,000-\$8,000). In 2008-09, Fairfax County's highest paid coaches were head football coaches who received \$6,816.

⁸ Dave Johnson & Marty O'Brien, *Coaches: Loss of Stipends Would Hurt High School Athletics*, DAILY PRESS, Feb. 19, 2010.

⁹ *Id.*

compensation they receive is a “nominal fee.”¹⁰ What amount is a “nominal fee” is a question that has plagued school districts since the FLSA was amended to include the “volunteer” exception for public employers in 1985. The question remains unanswered today.

Before the School Litigation Group¹¹ (SLG) brought FLSA lawsuits in the early 2000s against numerous school districts in at least 10 states—claiming among other things that nonexempt employees who were also coaches/advisors should receive overtime instead of stipends—school districts regularly offered nonexempt support staff employees stipends to coach/advise. By and large, school districts seemed unaware that this practice might violate the FLSA.¹² Likewise, a 1995 DOL opinion letter stated that a “nominal fee” for a “volunteer” nonexempt school district employee was an amount less than minimum wage.¹³ Some school districts relied on this letter and thought they were complying with the FLSA

¹⁰ 29 U.S.C. § 203(e)(4)(A) (2010).

¹¹ Gary Young, *Overtime Suits 101*, NATIONAL LAW JOURNAL, Mar. 19, 2003 (providing background information about the SLG).

¹² See, e.g., Laura Smith, *Working Overtime*, ATHLETIC MANAGEMENT, Aug./Sept. 2004. (“Schools have had people in dual roles for a long time, and we’ve never calculated their hours or paid overtime. This is just the way things have always been done,” says Lynn Smith, Superintendent of the Brewton (Ala.) City School District. Before a recent policy change, Brewton made extensive use of its non-professional staff for coaching roles. “This is my 13th year as a superintendent, and I had never thought about wage and hour laws until last year. I just didn’t know that we were impacted by it.”).

¹³ Letter from Daniel F. Sweeney, Deputy Assistant Administrator (July 11, 1995).

because the stipends they gave support staff employees were less than minimum wage based on the amount of hours spent coaching/advising.

The success of the SLG and the lack of a definition of “nominal fee” in the FLSA, its regulations, or case law left many school districts uncomfortable relying on the 1995 DOL letter. In fact, in response to the SLG lawsuits, many school districts stopped allowing nonexempt employees to coach/advise altogether either as “volunteers” or employees.¹⁴ However, some school districts that could afford to do so, allowed nonexempt employees to work as coaches/advisors and paid them overtime.¹⁵

Then in 2005 DOL issued another letter regarding the amount of a “nominal fee.”¹⁶ Fairfax County’s brief explains why this letter is confusing at best and nonsensical and irrelevant in the school context at worst.¹⁷ Fairfax County’s brief also explains how it relied on this letter in good faith and concluded that the

¹⁴ See, e.g., Gary Young, *supra* note 11; David Lee Morgan, Jr., *Benching of Coaches Difficult to Swallow*, AKRON BEACON JOURNAL, Apr. 29, 2004; John Jarvis, *Coaches’ OT Pay Concern for Valley*, MARION STAR, July 21, 2004.

¹⁵ See, e.g., Aaron McFarling, *Coaches Losing Jobs to Fair-Labor Law*, ROANOKE TIMES, July 2, 2004.

¹⁶ Letter FLSA2005-51 from Alfred B. Robinson, Jr., Deputy Administrator (Nov. 10, 2005).

¹⁷ As discussed in Fairfax County’s brief at length, what makes this letter so problematic is that it assumes school districts hire fulltime coaches. While fictional Dillon (Texas) High School in the award winning television show *Friday Night Lights* employs “Coach Taylor” fulltime as its head football coach, the fact that a large school district like Fairfax County does not employ a fulltime head football coach indicates doing so is not a common practice nationally.

plaintiff—under any reasonable interpretation of the letter—received a “nominal fee.”

The 2005 DOL letter has left school districts nationally in a quandary over what amount is a “nominal fee.” For example, a recent newspaper article describes how a number of California school districts struggled over the decision whether to give support staff coaching/advising stipends: two districts decided to disallow stipends but allow support staff to “volunteer” for no compensation; one district pays support staff overtime for coaching; and two districts recently changed their collective bargaining agreements to explicitly allow support staff to receive stipends.¹⁸ Interestingly, while the word “nominal fee” appears nowhere in this article, its amount is clearly the “million dollar question” that no one can answer. This recent, multi-district struggle (3,000 miles from Fairfax County) to comply with the same FLSA provision at issue here illustrates the need for a clear, easy to apply, relevant, and definitive test to calculate “nominal fee.”

III. School Districts Receive Many Benefits from Support Staff Coaches/Advisors.

School districts want support staff employees to be able to “volunteer” as coaches/advisors because they provide many benefits that community member

¹⁸ Murphy, *supra* note 1.

coaches cannot provide.¹⁹ First, allowing support staff to fill open “volunteer” coaching/advising positions means school districts can choose from a pool of familiar people. Accordingly, positions can be filled with quality employees the district trusts, and the coaches/advisors will already be familiar with the school’s mission, culture, and expectations. As described by school principals in a district considering having only community member coaches, community members are not as familiar as school employees are with behavior expected from students, appropriate discipline, and academic eligibility standards.²⁰ Moreover, an outside coach/advisor may not fully understand the considerable time commitment involved in coaching/advising—meaning, a well-intentioned outside coach/advisor might be more likely than a support staff member to quit in the middle of a season. In the same vein, many support staff employees, such as teacher’s assistants or food service employees, have the same work schedule as the students’ school day, which allows support staff employees to be available after school when students are attending practice or games.

¹⁹ Also, as discussed in Section VI, school districts may not be able afford to employ coaches/advisors from the community who would have to be paid at least minimum wage for each hour worked.

²⁰ Michelle Hatfield, *Will Schools Turn to Volunteer Coaches?*, THE MODESTO BEE, Jan. 19, 2010, *available at* <http://www.modbee.com/2010/01/19/1013216/will-schools-turn-to-volunteer.html>.

The second advantage to having support staff coach/advise is that they require less supervision than community members.²¹ School districts want support staff with whom they are familiar to coach/advise precisely because the district often is not able to supervise coaches/advisors closely.²² Many sports and extracurricular practices and activities not only take place after school and away from school grounds, but also involve working closely with the children, sometimes in one-on-one settings.²³ One study of non-school-based youth sports teams found that many volunteer coaches had no formal training in educationally appropriate coaching practices.²⁴ Researchers also have found that volunteer coaches for nonschool-based teams were unprepared to face particular aspects of

²¹ Michelle Hatfield, *supra* note 20.

²² For a good example of a coach who needed, perhaps among other things, more supervision see Markham Evans, *Police: Enraged Youth Coach Attacks Refs*, ABC7News.com, May 5, 2010, <http://www.wjla.com/news/stories/0510/732947.html> (youth soccer coach charged with assault and battery for attacking two referees after allegedly becoming enraged after his team received a penalty).

²³ It is important for school districts to know who is working with their students because there have been unfortunate cases of coaches taking advantage of their positions and having inappropriate relationships with students. See, e.g., Christine Willmsen & Maureen O'Hagan, *Coaches Continue Working for Schools and Teams After Being Caught for Sexual Misconduct*, SEATTLE TIMES, Dec. 14, 2003.

²⁴ Lenny Wiersma & Clay Sherman, *Volunteer Youth Sport Coaches' Perspectives of Coaching Education/Certification and Parental Codes of Conduct*, 76 RES. Q. FOR EXERCISE & SPORT 324, 325 (2005). Interviews with volunteer coaches revealed that "the role of youth sport coach carries a 'general societal perception that anyone can coach,' and the 'criteria for selecting coaches [was often] . . . simply a willingness to assume that role if no one else was available.'" *Id.*

youth sports like negative parental involvement.²⁵ In short, having a trained and familiar support staff member fill a coach/advising position alleviates many concerns about supervision.

The third reason support staff may be a desirable choice for coaching/advising positions is many may already possess the certifications necessary to work with students. Depending on the activity, coaching/advising may require training that ranges from first aid, including cardiopulmonary resuscitation training, to receiving a coach training certification.²⁶ Many support staff positions, such as bus drivers,²⁷ also require first aid training. Members of the community wishing to coach/advise, on the other hand, may not have this training, which is expensive and time consuming to obtain.²⁸ In short, training requirements can make it harder for districts to find outside people who are willing to undertake the extra commitment necessary to meet training or certification requirements.

²⁵ See *id.* (citing S.G. McCallister et al., *Problematic Aspects of the Role of Youth Sport Coach*, 4 INT'L SPORTS J. 9 (2000)).

²⁶ Michelle Hatfield, *supra* note 20.

²⁷ See, e.g., Oregon City School District, True Talent Behind the Wheel, What it Takes to be a School Bus Driver in Oregon City, <http://www.orecity.k12.or.us/node/449> (last visited Mar. 19, 2010).

²⁸ Another district that proposed using non-employees to fill coaching positions required background checks and even considered requiring substitute teacher training for coaches from outside the school system. Trent Moore, *County Schools Consider Allowing Non-employees to Fill Coaching Positions*, CULLMAN TIMES, Jan. 17, 2010.

A fourth advantage to having support staff employees coach/advise is not only are district officials familiar with them, but the students themselves are familiar with the support staff.²⁹ Sports and clubs provide an opportunity for students to build a lasting relationship with an adult mentor that differs from the classroom teacher-student relationship. It may be easier for coaches/advisors to foster these relationships of trust and respect with students when they see students on a regular basis both in school and on the playing field.³⁰

Finally, if support staff can no longer “volunteer” as coaches/advisors, long term coaches/advisors who have established relationships with students and parents will be forced to leave their positions, which will be disruptive to both students and the school community in general. An Akron, Ohio school district provides just one example of the disruptive effects that losing support staff as coaches can have on students. When a multisport coach, who was also a support staff member, told his students he could no longer coach because the district was worried about violating

²⁹ Observing the vested interest support staff have in students, one California official said, “They work around [the students] as security personnel and as custodians and have a lot of influence on attitudes, which has to have a positive effect in the classroom.” See Melanie C. Johnson, *Rialto School District Eliminates Coaching Stipends for Classified Employees*, PRESS-ENTERPRISE, July 13, 2008.

³⁰ As one head high school football coach, Bo Ludwig, noted, “It’s a little bit harder to respect a coach who just shows up two hours a day.” Mike Gruss & Darren Freedman, *Overtime-pay Lawsuits Hand Coaches, Public Schools A Worrisome Game Plan*, VIRGINIAN-PILOT, June 30, 2004, at A1.

the FLSA, he “broke down in tears trying to tell them, and they broke down in tears trying to listen and understand.”³¹

IV. School Districts Cannot Afford To Pay Support Staff Overtime to Coach/Advise.

School districts that want support staff employees to coach/advise could avoid the “nominal fee” issue altogether by paying them overtime. However, school districts cannot afford to pay support staff overtime for coaching/advising, especially considering the current financial situation in most districts. As most, if not all, states struggle with budget deficits, education spending has been drastically cut.³² With districts forced to lay off teachers,³³ institute furlough days,³⁴ and even cut the school year by as many as 17 days, as Hawaii was forced to do this year,³⁵ the budget situation in many districts has hit a crisis point.

³¹ David Lee Morgan, Jr., *supra* note 14.

³² State cuts in education spending are expected to stretch into the next several years. For instance, Colorado school districts experienced a six percent budget cut for 2010 and expect even deeper cuts over 2011 and 2012. Frank Wolfe, *States, Districts Expect Money Woes to Worsen*, EDUC. DAILY, Jan. 14, 2010.

³³ Employee salaries make up about 80 percent of a district’s budget, meaning that many districts must lay off teachers and staff when faced with budget cuts. The superintendent of Portsmouth, Virginia said his district laid off 350 employees in the last few years and expects to cut 90 more jobs in the next year. Alex Johnson, *U.S. Schools in “Category 5” Budget Crisis*, MSNBC.com, Mar. 18, 2010, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/35883971/ns/us_news-education/ (last visited Mar. 18, 2010).

³⁴ See Frank Wolfe, *States, Cities Brace for More Education Cuts*, EDUC. DAILY, Jan. 22, 2010.

³⁵ See Louise Radnofsky, *Duncan Scolds Hawaii on School Furloughs*, WALL ST. J., Oct. 24, 2009, at A3.

Even current coach/advisor stipends are in jeopardy of being cut in states facing severe budget problems. To help close a \$2 billion gap in the state budget, Virginia Governor Bob McDonnell has proposed eliminating \$65 million in stipend funding for coaches, advisors, and department chairs.³⁶ Critics of this proposal said that without the stipends, school districts would lose coaches, have reduced game schedules, and may have to institute pay to play policies.³⁷ Given this already stark financial reality, it simply is not feasible for most school districts to pay support staff overtime for coaching/advising.

Even putting aside the current financial crisis,³⁸ most school districts cannot afford to pay coaches/advisors overtime. The time spent coaching/advising can be substantial. Paying time and a half would be cost-prohibitive, especially for nonexempt employees with high wages.³⁹ One superintendent noted that the overtime rate for the number of hours a typical coach puts in per year could end up

³⁶ See, e.g., Cathy Grimes, *Governor's Proposed K-12 Budget Cuts Hit School Breakfast Programs and Coaches' Salaries*, DAILY PRESS, Feb. 17, 2010.

³⁷ John Harvey, *Loss of Stipends Threatens Sports*, VIRGINIA GAZETTE, Feb. 20, 2010, <http://www.vagazette.com/articles/2010/02/27/news/doc4b7f1f8138112958637484.prt> (last visited Mar. 15, 2010).

³⁸ Extracurricular activity stipends were in danger of being cut in school districts facing budget issues even before the current financial crisis hit. See, e.g., Kyra Kitlowski, *School Board Still Faces Cuts to its Budget; Extracurricular Stipends are Vulnerable*, SAN RAMON VALLEY TIMES, June 13, 2001, at A3.

³⁹ Laura Smith, *supra* note 12.

doubling the normal coaching stipend.⁴⁰ If that was the case, a significant discrepancy in pay would result between teacher-coaches who receive the stipend and support staff-coaches who receive overtime for the same position.⁴¹ Similarly, a nonexempt employee acting as an assistant coach could receive more money over the course of the season than an exempt employee acting as head coach of the same sport. Therefore, paying nonexempt coaches/advisors overtime would not only be cost-prohibitive for districts, but also could create animosity between coaches who receive less money for greater responsibilities.

Furthermore, school districts cannot afford to pay coaches/advisors overtime because districts have little control over the number of hours a coach/advisor puts in during a given week. If, for example, a sports team makes the state or regional championship game, the coach will naturally put in many more hours than he or she would otherwise. But whether the team makes the championship and the number of coaching hours it might require cannot be planned for at the time school district officials are setting the next academic year's budget. At the same time, districts do not want to set a ceiling on the number of hours a particular coach/advisor puts in.⁴² If the district were to do so, it might mean, for instance,

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² Coaches are also generally unhappy when districts seek to control the number of hours spent coaching. See Greg Scholand, *Keeping Score on Overtime*, ATHLETIC

that a coach or advisor would not be able to offer extra assistance to a particular student or accept more players onto the team than usual. Neither situation would result in the best outcome for the students.

Even if a school district can afford to pay a coach/advisor time and a half for overtime hours, the district may not want to fill these positions with nonexempt staff because it is difficult to accurately track hours worked for coaching/advising. Coaching is not a 9 to 5 job in which hours worked can be tracked easily by a time clock. Practically speaking, coaches/advisors would have to keep track of the number of minutes spent coaching/advising every day to accurately determine their hours worked each week. For example, minutes spent by coaches off the field responding to players' emails or talking to recruiters would have to be counted and recorded. Adding to the difficulty, nonexempt staff members with two jobs need to be paid at a "blended" overtime rate that uses a weighted average of how many hours are spent at each job and the salaries of each.⁴³ The blended overtime rate also would need to be recalculated every week for most coaches/advisors, since few of them work exactly the same hours each week.⁴⁴ Given that the hurdles

MGMT., April/May 2005 (quoting college coaches who were "disappointed with what they saw as a cap being imposed on their productivity").

⁴³ See 29 C.F.R. § 778.115; Laura Smith, *supra* note 12; see also 29 C.F.R. § 778.419 (where employers and employees can agree ahead of time that instead of using the blended rate employees will earn overtime at the rate established for the work the employee is performing during overtime hours).

⁴⁴ Laura Smith, *supra* note 12.

involved in tracking hours and calculating overtime rates would overwhelm the payroll departments of most school districts, districts would be less likely to allow nonexempt staff to fill coaching/advising positions even if the budget allowed for paying overtime.

V. Concluding That a Small Stipend Is Not a “Nominal Fee” or That Support Staff Employees Who Coach/Advise Must Be Paid Overtime Will Have Negative Consequences for Support Staff Employees.

If this Court rules that support staff employees who act as coaches/advisors must be paid overtime, as discussed in Section IV, most school districts will not employ them as coaches/advisors, particularly in the current economic climate. Similarly, if this Court comes up with a definition of “nominal fee” that does not include small stipends or that is too difficult to apply, districts will either only allow support staff to “volunteer” for no compensation at all or will stop allowing them to “volunteer” altogether.

In short, a ruling against Fairfax County will have one of two negative consequences for support staff employees: either they will not be able to coach/advise at all or they will not be able to coach/advise and receive any compensation. In newspaper article after newspaper article about support staff employees being told either of the above, support staff employees are quoted as saying that they want to continue coaching because they enjoy working with students. The following statement by Coach Englehart—head girls and boys cross

country coach, head girls track coach, and assistant girls basketball coach—after being told he could no longer coach due to the FLSA is typical: “I love coaching, and it’s not all about the money. You don’t make a living coaching. But my biggest concern is that this is going to hurt the kids. It isn’t fair to the kids.”⁴⁵

Not coaching/advising at all will be devastating for many support staff coaches/advisors—particularly those who have been involved in these activities for many years.⁴⁶ Likewise, while all support staff employees are appreciative⁴⁷ of the small stipends they receive some depend on them and will struggle financially⁴⁸ without them as many support staff employees do not have high paying positions.

⁴⁵ David Lee Morgan, Jr., *supra* note 14; *see also* Dave Johnson & Marty O’Brien, *supra* note 8 (High school coach says: “I love football so much, I would almost coach it for free. I have no complaint about the supplement, because I’m not doing this to get rich.”).

⁴⁶ *See, e.g.*, Mike Gruss & Darren Freedman, *supra* note 30.

⁴⁷ Murphy, *supra* note 1 (Football and softball coach who will no longer receive a stipend will continue as a volunteer but stated, “I’m not in it for the money. I’m invested in kids, and (coaching) helps me give back to the community. All the (season stipend) did was let me give my wife some money at Christmastime so we wouldn’t have to stress about buying presents.”).

⁴⁸ David Lee Morgan, Jr., *supra* note 14 (Support staff employee who was the assistant athletic director and co-cheerleading advisor describes her feelings after being told she can no longer volunteer: “We take on that extra job because we love to be there for the kids, but let’s be honest, we rely on that extra money too. I’m a single parent raising a daughter, and when I found out that I was going to have to give up my (supplemental contract), I cried. The first thing I did was try to figure out how I was going to replace the money that I was going to lose.”).

VI. If Support Staff Employees Cannot “Volunteer” as Coaches/Advisors Then Sports/Extracurricular Activities May be Cancelled.

The only real choice a financially strapped school district has to fill coaching/advising positions, if it cannot allow support staff to “volunteer” and receive small stipends, is to rely on exempt employees. The FLSA clearly allows exempt employees to be given stipends and no overtime for coaching/advising. However, numerous newspaper articles describing school districts that disallowed support staff employees from “volunteering” discuss the difficulty of finding enough exempt employees who are (1) qualified to coach⁴⁹—particularly because recently so few new teachers have been hired;⁵⁰ (2) interested in coaching/advising;⁵¹ (3) willing to accept the responsibility of coaching/advising in light of other additional responsibilities placed on teachers due to the No Child Left Behind Act, layoffs, and unfilled positions at school districts.⁵²

⁴⁹ Aaron McFarling, *supra* note 15 (According to a school district athletic director: “A good coach is hard to find, and if you can’t find one within your teaching ranks and you have to hire within your teaching ranks, that’s going to hurt athletics eventually.”).

⁵⁰ *See, e.g.*, John Murphy, *supra* note 1 (According to a school district athletic director: “We’re cutting teachers and so it’s rare that a teacher comes in who can coach.”).

⁵¹ *See, e.g.*, Trent Moore, *supra* note 28 (According to the leader of a county principals association: “I wish things were still like they were five years ago and we had a ton of teachers that wanted to coach But now they’re just not as interested in coaching.”).

⁵² *See, e.g.*, Marietta Nelson, *Three Brenerton Coaches Who Don’t Teach Fall Under Budget Ax*, KITSAP SUN, July 3, 2009 (According to a school district human

If school districts cannot find enough exempt employees willing to coach/advise they have three options: hire community members, have fewer coaches/advisors, or cease offering some sports/extracurricular activities. For financially strapped school districts, hiring community members may not be possible. Community members have to be paid minimum wage and overtime if their hours exceed 40 in a week. Either way, their compensation in most cases would exceed the stipend the district has paid in the past to exempt employees or support staff. Furthermore, hiring coaches from the community has disadvantages other than greater cost. First, as described in Section III, school districts prefer to have school district employees coach/advise students because they are already part of the school community. Second, community member coaches would be required to track hours worked, which is difficult, as described in Section IV.

While having fewer coaches/advisors may be an option in some instances, doing so has some disadvantages. First, having fewer coaches--particularly for contact and/or high injury sports like football and basketball--could jeopardize the safety of student athletes.⁵³ Second, cutting a coaching position in one sport may mean a coaching position in another sport also has to be cut to comply with Title

resources director: “Teacher’s aren’t coaching as often as in the past as their jobs have become much more complicated . . .”).

⁵³ Kyle Neddenriep, *supra* note 1 (According to a school district superintendent: “People sometimes wonder why we have so many football coaches. Look at how many players we have. Do we really want to have a potential liability issue on the football field because we don’t have enough coaches to supervise them?”).

IX's gender equality in athletics requirement.⁵⁴ For example, if no exempt employee is willing to be the assistant softball coach, the assistant baseball coach may have to be let go to keep in compliance with Title IX.

For all the reasons described above, the ultimate result of school districts not being able to allow support staff employees to “volunteer” as coaches/advisor is that school districts will be forced to offer fewer sports/extracurricular activities. Doing so would have bad consequences for the many⁵⁵ students that participate in these activities. Researchers—and countless coaches/advisors⁵⁶—have “noted a strong association between student involvement in extracurricular activities and improved attendance, behavior, and academic performance.”⁵⁷ In fact, according to a very recent study, high school sophomores who were rated by their teachers as having good social skills and work habits, and who participated in extracurricular activities in high school, made more money and completed higher levels of

⁵⁴ 29 C.F.R. § 106.41 (c) (5) (one factor to determine if an equal opportunity is provided for both sexes in interscholastic athletics is assignment and compensation of coaches).

⁵⁵ Census data indicated over 70% of kindergarten through eighth grade students participate in sports after school. *See* <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2009/tables/09s0256.pdf/>.

⁵⁶ Whitelaw Reid, *With Budget Constraints, Coaches Find their Athletic Programs . . . Stuck in the Middle*, SAN DIEGO UNION-TRIBUNE, Mar. 6, 2005, at N-19 (According to an eighth-grade boys and girls basketball coach: “I notice when they play, a large percentage of them get better grades and aren’t getting into trouble in school. It teaches them a lot of stuff before they get to high school, and that’s our goal—to prepare them.”).

⁵⁷ Douglas B. Reeves, *The Extracurricular Advantage*, EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, Sept. 2008 (citing a number of studies).

education 10 years later than their classmates who had similar standardized test scores but were less socially adroit and participated in fewer extracurricular activities.⁵⁸

VII. Allowing Support Staff To “Volunteer” and Receive No Compensation at All Would Likely Lead to Sports/Extracurricular Activities Being Cancelled, Among Other Practical Problems.

If this Court comes up with a definition of “nominal fee” that is too difficult for school districts to apply or rules that the definition of “nominal fee” does not include small stipends, school districts could allow support staff employees to “volunteer” for no compensation at all. However, numerous practical problems would arise including sports/extracurricular activities being cancelled, poor employee morale, and public relations problems.

If school districts allow support staff employees to continue coaching/ advising without any compensation at all, anecdotal evidence indicates many would simply quit.⁵⁹ If support staff quit and cannot be replaced by exempt employees, as described in Section VI, school districts will have to cancel some sports/extracurricular activities. Similarly, recruiting additional support staff in the

⁵⁸ ScienceDaily, Social Skills, Extracurricular Activities in High School Pay Off Later in Life, Mar. 26, 2009, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/03/090325132536.htm>.

⁵⁹ See, e.g., Melanie C. Johnson, *supra* note 27 (“Goodloe, a classified employee and computer instructor on campus, said he likely won’t volunteer to coach, but it is not about the stipend. The money he gets for coaching he puts back into the program, buying shoes for students whose parents cannot afford them. He spends his own money and free time taking these students to visit colleges, he said.”).

future for “volunteer” positions with no compensation may be difficult--especially when support staff learn that exempt employees receive a stipend for the same duties. Anecdotal evidence and common sense suggest that the morale of those who chose to continue coaching/advising without benefit of the stipend would be negatively affected because not only did they previously receive these nominal amounts but also exempt employees would continue to receive stipends for the same work.⁶⁰ Finally, the fact that the words “nominal fee” *do not appear in any of the newspaper articles cited in this brief* illustrates the difficulty school districts would have explaining to the community why a support staff employee can no longer receive a small amount of compensation for coaching/advising. Trying to explain the (nearly) unexplainable will be a public relations nightmare for school districts that tarnishes their image in their local communities.

To eliminate the issue of inequity between exempt and nonexempt employees receiving stipends, school districts, at least in Virginia and in other non-collective bargaining states, could take stipends away from both exempt and nonexempt employees.⁶¹ Again, the ultimate consequence of taking this measure

⁶⁰ John Murphy, *supra* note 1 (“[No longer receiving a stipend] makes me feel a little bit less appreciated for all the time and effort I put in with the kids,” said Chacon, a campus supervisor. “We don’t get paid that much anyway, and we’re not coaching for the money anyway because if you added up all the hours it would come out to about 55 cents per hour. So this doesn’t make me feel real good.”).

⁶¹ In collective bargaining states, “wages, hours, and conditions of employment” are typically mandatory subjects of bargaining which means that school districts

would be the elimination of some or maybe even all sports/extracurricular activities. Interestingly, *amici* were able to find no anecdotal evidence that any school districts have taken this measure in order to comply with the FLSA. When eliminating stipends for all employees has been suggested for financial reasons, many of the problems described in the above paragraph have been cited--exempt employees would quit volunteering⁶² or suffer a decline in morale,⁶³ and recruiting future coaches/advisors would be difficult. In fact, when school boards have considered cutting stipends entirely to save money, this measure has been perceived as tantamount to eliminating the athletic/extracurricular programs.⁶⁴ An additional problem with eliminating stipends for both nonexempt and exempt

could only stop paying stipends if districts were able to remove them from the contract through the collective bargaining process. *See also* Jason Schrieber, *Play Ball! Despite Grievance Threat, Candia Votes to Go Ahead*, UNION LEADER, Jan. 10, 2003 (“Volunteer coaches would violate contract rules that require school coaches receive a stipend as compensation for their work.”).

⁶² Dave Johnson, *supra* note 8 (School district athletic director said: “There are other ways to save money other than cutting coaching stipends, which are ridiculously small in the first place. If you cut coaching stipends, you’re going to lose a lot of coaches.”).

⁶³ *Id.* (A girls basketball and softball coach said the following about Virginia governor’s recent proposal to eliminate stipends for coaches for the entire state: “That would be a slap in the face to the profession and to those who put in the extra time.”).

⁶⁴ *See, e.g.,* Mark Gormus, *Chesterfield Budget Woes Could Eliminate Sports Teams*, TIMES-DISPATCH, Jan. 26, 2010 (School district athletic director said the following about a proposal to eliminate coaching/advising stipends and transportation to competitions: “I don’t see us offering those programs if this part of the budget is enacted because our staff members, who are coaches and sponsors, are professional people.”).

employees is that teachers and other exempt employees might resent support staff personally for taking their stipends away, which would create untenable tension. Finally, eliminating stipends across the board would put districts in the awkward position of trying to explain to the public why everyone must be punished because of technical FLSA rules.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and those arguments made in Appellee's brief, *amici* urge this Court to affirm the decision below.

Respectfully submitted,
/S/ Francisco M. Negrón, Jr.

Francisco M. Negrón, Jr.
General Counsel
Lisa E. Soronen
Nancy Dinsmore
National School Boards Association
1680 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-838-6722

Counsel for Amici Curiae

June 17, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Fed. R. App.P.28.1(e)(2) or 32(a)(7)(B) because:

[X] this brief contains 6542 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B)(iii).

2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because:

[X] this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2007 in 14-Point Times New Roman.

Dated: June 17, 2010

/S/ Francisco M. Negron, Jr.
Amici Curiae

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 17th day of June 2010, I caused this Brief of Amici Curiae to be filed electronically with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System, which will send notice of such filing to the following CM/ECF users:

Thomas Murphy
Jeffrey Hardy
Hunton & Williams
1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 1700
McLean, VA 22102
Counsel for Appellee

I further certify that on this 17th day of June 2010, I caused the required number of bound copies of the foregoing Brief of Amici Curiae to be mailed first class postage prepaid to the Clerk of this Court at 1100 East Main Street, Suite 501, Richmond, VA 23219, and one copy to be served by first-class mail to:

Nils G. Peterson
2009 N. 14th Street, Suite 708
Arlington, VA 22201
Counsel for Appellant

/S/ Francisco M. Negron, Jr.
Counsel for Amici Curiae