

No. 06-427

In The

TENNESSEE SECONDARY SCHOOL ATHLETIC
ASSOCIATION,

Petitioner,

v.

BRENTWOOD ACADEMY,

Respondent.

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Sixth Circuit

BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE NATIONAL SCHOOL

Pamee

4607 Asbury Pl., NW
Washington, DC 20016

Thomas C. Goldstein
AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER
& FELD, LLC
1333 New Hampshire Ave. NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

February 20, 2007

STANFORD LAW SCHOOL
SUPREME COURT
LITIGATION CLINIC
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305
(650) 725-4851

Francisco M. Negrón, Jr.
NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS
ASSOCIATION
1680 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
ARGUMENT	4
I. When The Government Contracts With Private Parties, First Amendment Challenges To Contractual Terms, Such As TSSAA's Recruiting Rule, Should Be Analyzed Under The Deferential Standard Used In This Court's Government Employee And Conditional Spending CasesA/2s 9.....	4

A. Speech By A Contracting Party That Does Not Touch A Matter Of Public Concern Is Entitled To Only Minimal Constitutional Protection	12
B. Letters To Eighth Graders About The Place And Time Of Spring Football Practice Do Not Constitute Speech On A Matter Of Public Concern.....	13
III. The Strong Governmental Interest In Ensuring Student Safety And Preserving The Educational Value Of Interscholastic Sports Justifies The Imposition Of Bargained-For Restrictions On Participants’ Speech.....	16
IV. Educational Authorities Such As TSSAA Are Entitled To Particular Deference In Enforcing Rules That Lie Within Their Educational Mission	22
A. Under <i>Brentwood I</i> , TSSAA And Similar Bodies In Which Public Schools Participate Are Education Policymakers	22
B. As An Educator, TSSAA Deserves Deference In Its Administration Of Interscholastic Athletics	23
CONCLUSION.....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Alerding v. Ohio High Sch. Athletic Ass’n</i> , 779 F.2d 315 (6th Cir. 1985)	21
<i>Ambach v. Norwick</i> , 441 U.S. 68 (1979)	24
<i>Angstadt ex rel Angstadt v. Midd-West Sch. Dist.</i> , 286 F. Supp. 2d 436 (M.D. Pa. 2003)	18
<i>Ark. Educ. Television Comm’n v. Forbes</i> , 523 U.S. 666 (1998)	11
<i>Baisden v. W. Va. Secondary Sch. Activities Comm’n</i> , 568 S.E.2d 32 (W. Va. 2002)	19
<i>Baker v. Carr</i> , 369 U.S. 186 (1962)	16
<i>Bethel Sch. Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser</i> , 478 U.S. 675 (1986)	1, 24, 25
<i>Bd. of County Comm’rs v. Umbehr</i> , 518 U.S. 668 (1996)	5, 9, 12
<i>Brentwood Acad. v. Tenn. Secondary Sch. Athletic Ass’n</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Edwards v. Hargett</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Idaho v. Blackfoot Sch. Dist.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Ill. v. Board of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Ind. v. State Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Iowa v. Board of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Kent v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Mich. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Miss. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Mont. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Neb. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>N.H. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>N.J. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>N.M. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>N.Y. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Ohio v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Okla. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Or. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>R.I. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>S.C. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>S.D. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Tenn. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Texas v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Vt. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>W. Va. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Wis. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19
<i>Wyo. v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 100 (1998)	19

<i>City of San Diego v. Roe</i> , 543 U.S. 77 (2004)	14, 15
<i>Connick v. Myers</i> , 461 U.S. 138 (1983).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Def. & Educ. Fund, Inc.</i> , 473 U.S. 788 (1985).....	10
<i>Denis J. O’Connell High Sch. v. Va. High Sch. League</i> , 581 F.2d 81 (4th Cir. 1978)	19, 21
<i>Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.</i> , 472 U.S. 749 (1985).....	12
<i>First Nat’l Bank of Boston v. Bellotti</i> , 435 U.S. 765 (1978).....	13
<i>Forsyth County v. Nationalist Movement</i> , 505 U.S. 123 (1992).....	10
<i>Garcetti v. Ceballos</i> , 126 S. Ct. 1951 (2006)	1, 12
<i>Geldermann, Inc. v. Commodity Futures Trading Co.</i> , 836 F.2d 310 (7th Cir. 1987)	11
<i>Goss v. Lopez</i> , 419 U.S. 565 (1975)	3, 23
<i>Grove City Coll. v. Bell</i> , 465 U.S. 555 (1984).....	6, 7, 9
<i>Hazelwood Sch. Dist. v. Kuhlmeier</i> , 484 U.S. 260 (1988).....	1, 23, 25
<i>Ind. High Sch. Athletic Ass’n v. Carlberg</i> , 694 N.E.2d 222 (Ind. 1998)	19
<i>In re United States ex rel. Mo. State High Sch. Activities Ass’n</i> , 682 F.2d 147 (8th Cir. 1982)	19
<i>Lake James Community Volunteer Fire Dep’t v. Burke County</i> , 149 F.3d 277 (4th Cir. 1998).....	11
<i>Lamb’s Chapel v. Ctr. Moriches Union Free Sch. Dist.</i> , 508 U.S. 384 (1993)	1
<i>Leonard v. Clark</i> , 12 F.3d 885 (9th Cir. 1993).....	11
<i>Milliken v. Bradley</i> , 418 U.S. 717 (1974).....	24
<i>Monell v. Dep’t of Soc. Servs. of New York</i> , 436 U.S. 658 (1978).....	26
<i>Moreland v. W. Pa. Interscholastic Athletic League</i> , 572 F.2d 121 (3d Cir. 1978)	18

<i>Morse v. Frederick</i> , No. 06-278 (cert. granted Dec. 1, 2006)	1
<i>Mt. Healthy City Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle</i> , 429 U.S. 274 (1977).....	14
<i>NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co.</i> , 458 U.S. 886 (1982).....	13
<i>New Jersey v. T.L.O.</i> , 469 U.S. 325 (1985)	25
<i>Nixon v. Herndon</i> , 273 U.S. 536 (1927)	16
<i>Perry v. Sindermann</i> , 408 U.S. 593 (1972)	14
<i>Perry Educ. Ass’n v. Perry Local Educators’ Ass’n</i> , 460 U.S. 37 (1983).....	10
<i>Pickering v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 391 U.S. 563 (1968).....	5, 8, 13, 15
<i>Rankin v. McPherson</i> , 483 U.S. 378 (1987)	14
<i>Robbins v. Ind. High Sch. Athletic Ass’n</i> , 941 F. Supp. 786 (S.D. Ind. 1996).....	19
<i>Rottmann v. Pa. Interscholastic Athletic Ass’n</i> , 349 F. Supp. 2d 922 (W.D. Pa 2004).....	11
<i>Rust v. Sullivan</i> , 500 U.S. 173 (1991).....	6, 9
<i>San Antonio Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Rodriguez</i> , 411 U.S. 1 (1973).....	24
<i>South Dakota v. Dole</i> , 483 U.S. 203 (1987)	6, 7, 8, 9
<i>Southeastern Promotions, Ltd. v. Conrad</i> , 420 U.S. 546 (1975).....	10
<i>Stone v. Kan. State High Sch. Activities Ass’n</i> , 761 P.2d 1255 (Kan. Ct. App. 1988)	18
<i>Tinker v. Des Moines Indep. Community Sch. Dist.</i> , 393 U.S. 503 (1969).....	24
<i>Walsh v. La. High Sch. Athletic Ass’n</i> , 616 F.2d 152 (5th Cir. 1980)	19
<i>Waters v. Churchill</i> , 511 U.S. 661 (1994)	5, 7, 8

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Or. School Activities Ass'n, 2006-2007 Handbook, Mission Statement, <i>available at</i> http://www.osaa.org/publications	17
---	----

STATEMENT OF INTEREST¹

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

When private parties who agree to contractual conditions in return for a discretionary government benefit later challenge those conditions under the First Amendment, this Court has applied a deferential standard of review to the government's actions. Two lines of cases have established this general proposition. First, the government can restrict the speech of government employees and independent contractors when that speech involves only matters of private concern and the restriction relates to the government's interest in effectively carrying out its goals. Second, the government can impose a speech-restrictive condition on the recipients of government subsidies as long as the condition furthers the government's legitimate purpose in offering the subsidy and does not lead the recipient to violate an independent constitutional provision.

Because the relationship between the Tennessee Secondary School Athletic Association (TSSAA) and Brentwood Academy (Brentwood) fits squarely within this Court's First Amendment contract jurisprudence, this Court should uphold TSSAA's enforcement of the recruiting rule as reasonable. In this case, TSSAA offered Brentwood the discretionary benefit of participating in its athletic league in exchange for compliance with the terms of its membership

**A. The Relationship Between TSSAA And Brentwood
In This Case Is Like The Relationship Between A
Government And Its Employees Or Contractors.**

The government may impose speech-related restrictions on employees or contractors that it may not impose on the public at large when those restrictions contribute to effective government operations. *Waters v. Churchill*

Just as the government may impose speech-related conditions on employees or contractors, so too the government may impose speech-related conditions on funding recipients that it may not impose on the public at large when those conditions contribute to achieving the purposes for which the subsidy is being provided. The government can, for example, “selectively fund a program to encourage certain activities it believes to be in the public interest, without at the

Time 13:44:09 from logging on to the T2/TK2 1165344 Dakota pureDialle 817vROMCvT501122 record 010006 1165grf.

funding has long applied to private schools: “Congress is free to attach reasonable and unambiguous conditions to federal financial assistance that educational institutions are not

The recruiting rule satisfies the *Dole* criteria for judging the constitutionality of a condition on government funding. Interscholastic athletics contributes in a number of important ways to the education of secondary school students. Restrictions on athletic recruitment of the kind imposed by TSSAA satisfy the germaneness requirement of *Dole* because they are important to ensuring that athletics does not eclipse academics, that athletics teaches students appropriate and meaningful life lessons, and that athletic participation is physically safe. See Part III, *infra*.

The contract between TSSAA and Brentwood also satisfies the other *Dole* criteria. Participation in TSSAA is unambiguously conditioned on compliance with its recruiting rule, making the conditional nature of the subsidy clear in the contractual agreement. See *Grove City Coll.*, 465 U.S. at 575. The precise contours of the condition need not themselves be

, 1/g 7]006 Tc -c2.145 0 Tdee

relationships into overlapping and ill-defined categories, not presumed exhaustive, including regulatory, funding, subsidy, independent contractor, government speech, and employment. Pet. App. 92a-95a. This level of detail is not only unnecessary but also conceptually misleading. At one point, for example, it leads the Sixth Circuit to conclude that TSSAA's imposition of the recruiting rule is analogous to a unilateral zoning ordinance because this Court described TSSAA's contractual enforcement of its recruiting rule as *regulating* recruitment in its 2001 decision. *Id.* 14a. But many

enforcing contractual terms that limit Brentwood's recruiting speech as long as those terms are directly related to Brentwood's participation in the league TSSAA is operating and the terms serve some legitimate purpose.

A. Speech By A Contracting Party That Does Not Touch A Matter Of Public Concern Is Entitled To Only Minimal Constitutional Protection

When private parties make First Amendment claims against the government's enforcement of a contractual limitation on their speech, they must make "an initial showing" that their speech touches on "a matter of public concern." *Umbehr*, 518 U.S. at 685. Conversely, if the speech does not touch on a matter of public concern, then the contracting party should have "no First Amendment cause of action" based on the government's "reaction to the speech." *Garcetti v. Ceballos*, 126 S. Ct. 1951, 1958 (2006) (citing *Connick*, 461 U.S. at 147); see *Umbehr*, 518 U.S. at 685.

Providing less protection in cases involving speech that is of only private concern reflects a well-established principle of First Amendment jurisprudence. See *Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.*, 472 U.S. 749, 758-59 (1985) (plurality opinion) ("We have long recognized that not all speech is of equal First Amendment importance. It is speech on 'matters of public concern' that is at the heart of the First Amendment's protection. . . . In contrast, speech on matters of purely private concern is of less First Amendment concern.") (citing *Connick*, 461 U.S. at 145; *NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co.*, 458 U.S. 886, 913 (1982); *Carey v. Brown*, 447 U.S. 455, 467 (1980); *First Nat'l Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 776 (1978)). Particularly when imposed contractually rather than unilaterally, governmental limits on speech of purely private concern deserve substantial deference.

B. Letters To Eighth Graders About The Place And Time Of Spring Football Practice Do Not Constitute Speech On A Matter Of Public Concern

The “speech” that triggered TSSAA’s imposition of sanctions on Brentwood consisted of recruiting letters to eighth graders telling them where and when spring football practice would occur and urging them to attend. *See* Pet. App. 34a-35a. These letters, like many of the communications between schools and potential or actual students, contain no speech on a matter of public concern.

This Court’s decisions have established that speech on a matter of public concern must be of “political, social, or other concern to the community.” *Connick*, 461 U.S. at 146. Such speech includes criticisms or reports of governmental action or policy and speech related to other such subjects where “free and open debate is vital to informed decision-making by the electorate.”⁷ *Id.* at 145 (citing *Pickering*, 391 U.S. at 571-

⁷ The protection of public debate and criticism is central to the public concern analysis. Thus, courts have provided First Amendment protection to parties that contract with the government when their criticism has provided information relevant to public debate. For example, a high school teacher’s public criticism of the Board of Education’s funding allocations between athletic and academic expenses, *Pickering*, 391 U.S. at 571-72, a teacher’s criticism of school policy in testimony in front of the state legislature, *Perry v. Sinderman*, 408 U.S. 593 (1972), and a teacher’s informing a radio station about a memo from the school principal announcing a new teacher dress code (where the dress code was allegedly prompted by a belief by administrators that faculty dress was tied to public support of bond issues), *Mt. Healthy City Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274 (1977), were each held to be speech that touched on matters of public concern.

The matter of public concern analysis also protects contracting parties’ ability to participate in public debate and criticism even where that criticism, although related to public matters, is unrelated

72). The test is sensitive to both context and content: whether the “speech addresses a matter of public concern must be determined by the content, form, and context of a given statement.” *Id.* at 147-48. As this Court recently explained, “public concern is something that is a subject of legitimate news interest; that is, a subject of general interest and of value and concern to the public at the time of publication.” *City of San Diego v. Roe*, 543 U.S. 77, 83-84 (2004).

Connick and *City of San Diego* show why Brentwood’s recruiting letters are not a matter of public concern. The content of the letters – the place and timing of a private school’s football practice – are matters internal to the football team, relevant to the coaching staff, players, and players’ parents, but no one else. The letters do not contain criticism of TSSAA’s policies (which would be a matter of public concern, since such speech would pertain to the functioning of a state-run athletic association and invite political debate). Nor is the content of the letters a subject that has news interest of value and concern to the public.

The Sixth Circuit’s ruling to the contrary rests on a serious misunderstanding. That court paradoxically concluded that because TSSAA might have to show that the speech *restriction* imposed by TSSAA-Brentwood contract “embodies substantial governmental interests,”⁸ any *speech*

to the contracting government entity. For example, *Rankin v. McPherson* found the political criticism implicit in a statement wishing for the success of future assassination attempts on President Reagan to be speech on a matter of public concern because the statement was made during a discussion of government policies. 483 U.S. 378, 386-87 (1987).

⁸ This is itself a mistaken proposition. The government interest need not be so weighty as to be “substantial” – as opposed to simply “legitimate” – if a court applies the sort of balancing test used in government contracting and conditional spending cases. See Part I, *supra*.

restricted by the contract “will by definition implicate ‘a matter of public concern.’” Pet. App. 9a.⁹

That analysis cannot be the law. Put simply, what the Sixth Circuit was asserting is that whenever TSSAA has a substantial government interest in regulating speech, the speech it is regulating is necessarily a matter of public concern. This leads to the perverse result that the government’s ability to restrict speech declines as its legitimate interest in regulating the speech increases. The Sixth’s Circuit’s reasoning flatly contravenes this Court’s decision in *City of San Diego v. Roe*, 543 U.S. 77 (2004). There, this Court recognized that a city police department had a substantial, public interest in limiting the injury to the department’s reputation caused by an employee’s selling videos on eBay of himself stripping off a police uniform and masturbating. *See id.* at 77. However, the video itself clearly did not speak to a “matter of public concern,” and so did not merit First Amendment protection under *Connick* and *Pickering*.

The Sixth Circuit’s analysis here rested on a linguistic confusion similar to errors that this Court has noticed and rejected elsewhere. In a case challenging legislative malapportionment, for example, this Court pointed out that “the mere fact that the suit seeks protection of a political right does not mean it presents a political question. Such an

⁹ The 2006 decision adopted the earlier decision’s analysis on TSSAA’s contract-based arguments wholesale. *See* Pet. App. 89a-90a (explaining that TSSAA’s First Amendment arguments were inconsistent with the law of the case).

To be sure, the 2006 decision provided additional reasons for applying intermediate scrutiny. *See id.* 94a-95a. However, the attempts to analogize the facts of this case to application of a municipal ordinance or access to a public forum are unavailing. *See* Part I, *supra*. Furthermore, these newly identified reasons do not redeem the erroneous “matter of public concern” analysis of the Sixth Circuit’s 2001 opinion.

teamwork, discipline, and integrity. It is therefore imperative that educators have the flexibility to structure rules of play to attract as many students as possible to high school sports and to protect them once they decide to play.

To safeguard the essentially educational – rather than athletic – purpose of high school, courts have recognized that schools can condition students’ participation in interscholastic sports on carrying a full courseload, passing a minimum number of classes, and satisfying mandatory attendance policies.¹¹ They have also recognized that athletic leagues should be permitted to impose regulations, on member schools as well as students, designed to encourage students to choose the school they attend based primarily on its academic offerings rather than its sports program. Every state athletic association in the country has some version of an anti-transfer rule that bars students who switch schools from participating in interscholastic competition for a designated period.¹² These

¹¹ See, e.g., *Moreland v. W. Pa. Interscholastic Athletic League*, 572 F.2d 121 (3d Cir. 1978) (barring students with excessive absences); *Angstadt ex rel. Angstadt v. Midd-West Sch. Dist.*, 286 F. Supp. 2d 436 (M.D. Pa. 2003) (barring students who fail to meet academic requirements); *Stone v. Kan. State High Sch. Activities Ass’n*, 761 P.2d 1255 (Kan. Ct. App. 1988) (barring students who fail courses from regaining eligibility to participate in interscholastic sports by completing coursework after the end of the semester).

¹² See e.g., Cal. Interscholastic Federation, 2006-2007 Constitution and Bylaws, art. XX, § 214 (barring, for one year, students who transfer to another school from varsity competition in a sport they have played in the past year), *available at* <http://www.cifstate.org> (last visited Feb. 19, 2007); Mich. High School Athletic Ass’n, Your High School Eligibility: Guide for Student-Athletes (barring students who transfer for athletic reasons from interscholastic competition for two semesters), *available at* <http://www.mhsaa.com/resources/eligibility.pdf> (last visited Feb. 19, 2007); N.J. State Interscholastic Athletic Ass’n, 2005-2006 Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules, and Regulations, art. V, § 4.K(2)

rules seek to shield impressionable young people and sometimes unsophisticated parents from the invidious suggestion that athletics, not academics, should be a student's highest priority. Such rules fit hand-in-glove with other restrictions on recruitment, and they have consistently been upheld against constitutional challenges.¹³

Courts have also consistently upheld other rules designed to ensure a level playing field because such rules promote student safety and broad participation in interscholastic athletics. For example, consider eligibility rules prescribing age cut-offs for participation in high school sports.¹⁴ It would be not only demoralizing but dangerous for thirteen-year-old freshmen to compete against twenty-year-old seniors. For the

(barring varsity athletes who transfer to another school from interscholastic competition for at least 30 days), *available at* <http://www.njsiaa.org/references/0506eligibilrules.pdf> (last visited Feb. 19, 2007).

¹³ See, e.g., *In re United States ex rel. Mo. State High Sch. Activities Ass'n*, 682 F.2d 147, 151 (8th Cir. 1982) (upholding transfer rule challenged by private school athletic league, noting that "federal courts have uniformly upheld comparable rules governing transfers against challenges based on both the due process and equal protection clauses," and collecting cases); *Walsh v. La. High Sch. Athletic Ass'n*, 616 F.2d 152 (5th Cir. 1980) (upholding transfer rule challenged by students of parochial school and their parents); *Denis J. O'Connell High Sch. v. Va. High Sch. League* 581 F.2d 81, 87 (4th Cir. 1978) (upholding exclusion of parochial high school from state athletic league because participation of schools lacking attendance zones would make enforcement of transfer rule impossible); *Robbins v. Ind. High Sch. Athletic Ass'n*, 941 F. Supp. 786 (S.D. Ind. 1996); *Ind. High Sch. Athletic Ass'n v. Carlberg*, 694 N.E.2d 222 (Ind. 1998); *Chabert v. La. High Sch. Athletic Ass'n*, 312 So.2d 343 (La. Ct. App. 1975).

¹⁴ See, e.g., *Baisden v. W. Va. Secondary Sch. Activities Comm'n*, 568 S.E.2d 32 (W. Va. 2002) (recognizing that age eligibility rules serve important safety goals that trump even a claim under state disability law by an overage student).

same reason, courts have upheld rules requiring schools to compete only against other schools of a similar

education or the work force.¹⁶ It would be perverse if officials could forbid students from participating after an improper transfer, but could not penalize the schools encouraging those very transfers. At the very least, organizations such as TSSAA are entitled to deference in determining that significant educational interests justify limits on recruiting speech.

Recruiting restrictions can also reduce the risk of injury. By preventing any one school from amassing a disproportionately large number of big, fast, and skillful athletes, recruiting restrictions reduce the number of mismatched games between mismatched bodies.

Finally, consider the dispiriting effect if schools that recruit across local, state, and even national borders consistently defeat other league participants who are limited to enrolling students from a local neighborhood (as is often the case with public schools). Students at the public schools whose teams consistently lose may become less likely to participate in sports.¹⁷ While part of the value of sports is the rough lesson that sometimes hard work does not translate into a victory on the scoreboard, it is not one that educators can

¹⁶ See *Denis J. O'Connell High Sch.*, 581 F.2d at 86 (observing that the purposes of transfer rules and anti-recruiting rules are “basically the same[:] to deter those who would pressure a student to transfer and to deter the student from succumbing to such pressures by preventing him from becoming immediately eligible to compete at his new school”).

¹⁷ Cf. *Burrows v. Ohio High Sch. Athletic Ass'n*, 891 F.2d 122, 124 (6th Cir. 1989) (upholding rule designed to “prevent unfair development of ‘power squads,’” or teams that practice together year-round, by barring participation in interscholastic athletics by students who play for independent sports teams); *Alerding v. Ohio High Sch. Athletic Ass'n*, 779 F.2d 315 (6th Cir. 1985) (upholding rule limiting participation in interscholastic athletics to state residents to prevent private schools located near state border from gaining an unfair advantage by recruiting out-of-state students).

persuade students to learn if they are already convinced that hard work will never pay off. And if uncontrolled recruiting signals to students that winning is more important than participating and participating is only for the preternaturally talented, then the shy, the clumsy, and the self-doubting will stay away from sports. Unless educators can enforce the rules that maintain “competitive equity,” including anti-recruiting rules, they will lose the ability to influence a large number of students on the field – some of whom they may already have difficulty reaching in the classroom.

IV. Educational Authorities Such As TSSAA Are Entitled To Particular Deference In Enforcing Rules That Lie Within Their Educational Mission.

In *Brentwood I*, this Court held that TSSAA was a state actor because public school officials “overwhelmingly perform all but the purely ministerial acts by which the Association . . . functions” and because the State Board of Education authorizes TSSAA to administer high school athletics in its stead. 531 U.S. at 300, 301. Petitioners are asking this Court to overturn its holding of *Brentwood I*. NSBA takes no position on that question. But as long as TSSAA and other public-private interscholastic athletic leagues are considered state actors because of their entwinement with state educati

necessary to determine how best to pursue substantial educational interests.

The principle of local control over educational decisions is ingrained in our nation's history. "No single tradition in public education is more deeply rooted than local control over the operation of schools; local autonomy has long been thought essential both to the maintenance of community concern and support for public schools and to quality of the educational process." *Milliken v. Bradley*, 418 U.S. 717, 741-42 (1974). Local control of education "affords citizens an opportunity to participate in decision-making, permits the structuring of school programs to fit local needs, and encourages 'experimentation, innovation, and a healthy competition for educational excellence.'" *Id.* at 742 (quoting *San Antonio Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 1, 50 (1973)). Thus local control is both "vital to continued public

sponsored by schools. Athletic

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons as well as those in petitioner's brief, the judgment should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Howe
Kevin K. Russell
HOWE & R