

## **University Athletics Board Report to Senate**

**on**

### **OUR DIVISION I STATUS, AND THE ATHLETIC FIELDS RENOVATION PROJECT**

**8 March, 2008**

#### **BACKGROUND**

“Campus Plan 1998-1999” announced that “The large University parcel of land north of Ella Grasso Boulevard . . . will be developed . . . [into] a regulation 400-meter track and turf soccer field as well as spectator seating, adequate storage, and toilet facilities.” A project of this size, estimated at \$16M, ordinarily requires state bonding. That involves legislative approval and Public Works procedures, a long and complex process. As of 2006, this track and field project, estimated to cost \$7.7M, was “a lower level priority” on the master plan.

A 2002 Staff Report to the BOT recommended

an Intramural/Recreation/Athletic Fee of \$150, which would be charged to all students as part of the University General Fee, and would be earmarked to support Central’s Division I program and Recreation needs. . . . The Student Advisory Board met on November 9, 2000 to hear the proposed tuition and fees. . . . Students from Central objected to the Intramural/Recreation/Athletic Fee unless a portion of the fee was devoted to the general student population.

Before 2006, there is no record of any formal faculty objection to this fee increase or the specific support it might provide to our Division I or our Recreation program.

Because of increased enrollments, tuition, and fees, the university’s financial reserve has increased to roughly \$20M. Current BOT policy is that this reserve lie between 5% and 7% of our Operating Budget, which is now \$177M. As one way of reducing the reserve, the BOT approved a feasibility study in July 2006 to determine if our intramural/recreation/athletic needs could be met with a “fields renovation project.” It would move our existing baseball and softball fields eastward so that an artificially turfed and lighted soccer field, surrounded by a track, could be sited between those fields and the existing football field. Because the soccer field as well as the baseball and softball fields would be covered with artificial turf, they would be usable by intercollegiate and by recreational student athletes even after a rainfall. The baseball and softball fields would not be lighted, however. Thus, except when the intercollegiate teams travel to away games, these fields would be of limited use to recreational athletes when the reservation time for intercollegiate athletes normally ends at 6:30p. On the other hand, an additional field dedicated for recreational athletes would be built with lighting between the relocated baseball field and Ella Grasso Blvd.

Based on estimates from professional consultants, the university has begun to invite bids on this project up to a limit of \$9.6M. Cost overruns would not be permitted under any contract subsequently signed, though the legislature has authorized overruns of \$400,000. The BOT has already “earmarked” \$6.6M towards this goal in our financial reserve, and the remaining costs would be met by the roughly \$1.2M collected each year from the \$150 per year addition to each student’s General Fee. The \$7.7M already on the master plan to build the track and soccer complex north of Ella Grasso Blvd. has been eliminated.

The project is expected to last four years, with May 2008 as the deadline for bids on the first of seven phases. Since bids on later phases will not be invited until previous phases have been initiated, it is possible that the actual cost of some previous phase would prevent completion of later phases unless some or all of them were scaled back.

## **THE CHARGE**

1 This report was initiated by a request from Senate President Tim Craine to the UAB on 9/21/07, in which he asked that we address the following issues:

1.1 What is “the place of intercollegiate athletics at CCSU in relation to our mission”?

1.2 “[O]ur division one status . . . should be reviewed in terms of its costs and benefits.”

2 President Craine also requested that the UAB report be coordinated with one from the University Planning and Budget Cmte dated 7/12/07.

2.1 That report maintains “the UPBC can and should review major decisions, such as that to go ahead with the Athletic field project . . . [T]he absence of such a review is the source of much of the current controversy.”

2.2 The report is concerned “that cost overruns . . . could be on the order of 1/3 to 1/2 times the bid amount.”

2.3 The report asks whether the proposed renovation of athletic fields will serve “our stated university goals for strategic planning” as well as would “an indoor health and exercise facility.”

## **RESPONSIVE EXPLICATIONS FROM ADMINISTRATORS, TOGETHER WITH OBSERVATIONS THE UAB RAISES FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION**

(Administrative explications are presented in Times font while *UAB observations are presented in italicized Courier font.*)

This draft report is based on data from e-mails and/or meetings with the following administrators: Athletics Director Jones; Associate Director of Athletics Strickland; Athletics Fiscal Officer Abel; Director of the Academic Center for Student Athletes Oliva; Men's Track Coach Kawecki; Vice President for Student Affairs Toston; Director of Student Activities/Leadership Development Hazan; Assistant Director of Recreation & Intramural Programs DeStefanis; Director of Institutional Research and Assessment Hosch; Director of Financial Aid Bishop; Associate Vice-President for Institutional Advancement Pettinico; Vice-President for Institutional Advancement Galligan; Chief Financial Officer Wilder; Controller Chagnon; Chief Administrative Officer Bachoo; President Miller.

1.1 The following items concern the place of intercollegiate athletics at CCSU in relation to our mission.

In contrast with some initial suggestions by administrators, several of these items indicate there are no measurable correlations between the enhanced visibility that results from our Division I athletic successes and the university's overall success at improving the quantity and academic quality of admissions and enrollments. The Director of Institutional Research and Assessment cautions, however, that these data need not be interpreted as indicating that athletics has no impact at all on student recruitment. The reason is that we have not yet collected survey data asking the extent to which our Division I status influenced students' decisions to enroll.

1.1.1 Academic achievements at CCSU are largely, though not entirely, ignored in the local media. Our Philosophy Department, for example, is never compared there with that of Harvard. In contrast, all local media emphasized that our men's soccer team recently beat that of Harvard. While our Division I athletic successes do not draw increased funding from the legislature, they do draw attention to the university in many ways, including:

A) CCSU teams made ten television appearances last year. ESPN Radio 1410 has a three-year contract to broadcast all home and away men's basketball games, as well as five football games.

B) CCSU teams have had more championship appearances in the past ten years than those of any university in Connecticut except UConn:

UConn	41
<b>CCSU</b>	<b>17</b>
Yale	14
U. Hart.	13

Fairfield	11
S. Heart	4
Quinnipiac	2

C) CCSU teams are regularly covered in the sports pages of *The New Britain Herald* and *The Hartford Courant*.

As a result of our Division I visibility, admissions, enrollments, SAT-status, and class rank-status might subsequently improve.

*The Director of Institutional Research and Assessment reports "that extant data do not point toward a definitive relationship between applications for admission to CCSU and subsequent enrollment," on the one hand, "and the wins and losses of our major athletic teams" on the other – namely, men's and women's basketball as well as football. Since Fall 2003, for instance, the number of applications for admission has ranged each fall "between 7,000 and 7,300 in a pattern that does not appear related to the wins and losses of these three athletic teams. Similarly, the rate at which accepted applicants then enroll has ranged . . . between 45.5% and 48% in a manner that does not appear related to strong or weak seasons of these teams." (We have found no explanation for the 16.7% increase in 06-07 enrollments.) Furthermore, "correlations were not observed between athletic successes or losses, and the mean combined SAT score or the mean high school class rank of entering full-time, first-time students." See the attached graphs as compared with the following data from the Athletics archive, which begins with the 2003-04 season, and from a CCSU Planning database.<sup>1</sup>*

<b>Year/Result</b>	<b>Change</b>				
	<b>% apps</b>	<b>% enrolled</b>	<b>SAT</b>		
			<b>Verbal</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Cl rk</b>
06-07	+4.9	+16.7	-1.7	+0.78	0.0
05-06	+3.9	+0.70	+0.38	-0.38	+1.70
MBB: NEC Semis					
WBB: 9-19 & 6-12					

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ccsubluedevils.com/>

and

<http://www.ccsu.edu/planning/IR/Statistics/Facts/Admissions.htm>



*effective recruiting tool for academically excellent high school students.*

B) Diversification with students recruited from underrepresented ethnic groups.

*In 2007-08, there are 219 student-athletes with grants-in-aid. Of these, 59 or 27% are from underrepresented ethnic groups. Compared with all CCSU students, the Director of Financial Aid judges this to be not statistically significant: "with regard to the recruitment of students from underrepresented groups to CCSU, it is fair to say that there is no systematic evidence one way or the other that athletic programs really produce an increase in their representation." On the other hand, Athletic grants-in-aid bring in more than 90% of our out-of-state students.*

C) Entertainment through spectatorship: CCSU has led the conference in average-per-game attendance during the 2005-06 and 2006-07 seasons: football = 3150 and 2735; basketball (men's and women's teams play double-headers) = 2013 and 2015.

*There are no data available that compare our current athletic spectatorship with that when we moved from Division II in 1986-87. Nor are data available that distinguish between spectators who are students and those who are not. Indeed, since no data are available that describe spectatorship other than for 2005-06 and for 2006-07, there is no way to calculate significant correlations between the wins and losses of our athletic teams and spectatorship. Anecdotal evidence from many sources, on the other hand, suggests increases in attendance at football and at basketball games since our move to Division I. In addition, Outside Gifts to Athletics has increased from \$174,365 in 1999-00 to \$373,992 in 2005-06.<sup>2</sup>*

D) Affiliation with notable alumni, thirty-nine of whom are listed in this year's football program. They include Scott Pioli, Vice President of Player Personnel for the New England Patriots; Mike Sherman, Assistant Head Coach for the Houston Texans; Dave Campo, Secondary Coach for the Dallas Cowboys.

*The data and comments in 1.1.1 above also address the benefits of attracting and graduating well-known athletic figures. Specifically, there is no measurable correlation between the successes of our athletic alumni and the quantity or academic quality of our admissions applications or enrollments.*

---

<sup>2</sup> NCAA Audit of CCSU for 9/24/07.

E) Facilities shared with recreational athletics, physical education classes, CCSU marching band; and such special events as: Robotics Convention, concerts, university fairs, high school championships (boys basketball, girls basketball; football).

F) Hands-on experience provided for students majoring in Physical Education, especially those in the Athletic Training Program.

*Shared facilities and hands-on experience in physical education are truly positive factors resulting from intercollegiate athletics. However, it can be argued these would exist equally if we moved to Division II or to Division III, and if our athletic facilities were maintained at the appropriate level.*

## 1.2 Costs and benefits of Division I status.

Nationally, fewer than a dozen of the more than 320 Division I Athletics programs are financially self-supporting. CCSU expenses for 2005-2006 were actually the lowest of any Division I program in the state:<sup>3</sup>

<b>CCSU</b>	<b>\$ 5.7 M</b>
Fairfield	\$9.1 M
U. Hart.	\$9.4 M
S.Heart	\$12.9 M
Quinnipiac	\$13.1 M
Yale	\$17.9 M
UConn	\$49.8 M

As indicated in 1.1.1-B above, on the other hand, our intercollegiate athletes have won more athletic championships than those in any other Connecticut Division I Athletics program except UConn's.

*According to a 12/18/07 e-mail from the AD, our Operating Budget for Athletics in 2005-06 was \$3.8M with revenues of \$637,000. (This does not include full-time personnel salaries and benefits.) In other words, the Operating Budget for our Division I program would appear to involve a university expense of \$3.16M: \$3.8M expenses minus \$637,000 revenues.<sup>4</sup> For the*

---

<sup>3</sup> These figures, the only relevant ones we could find, appear as undefined "Budget Information" in "In Hamden, A Major Investment in Sports," a 4/8/07 article in *The Sunday Republican* (Waterbury), pp. 1C, 8C.

<sup>4</sup> Different university sources use different terms for financial data, and use different subcategories in computing values for these terms. Instead of 'Operating Budget,' for example, the NCAA Audit of CCSU for 9/24/07 uses 'Total Operating Expenditures,' which does include

*Division II program at SCSU, on the other hand, the correlative figure is \$2.2M: \$2.2M expenses minus \$3,000 revenues. The major difference in expenses between Division I and Division II Athletics programs lies in student grants-in-aid: \$1.96M went to athletically based grants-in-aid at CCSU in 2005-06 while \$1.2M did so at SCSU. Thus, our Division I status appears to cost roughly \$960,000 per year more than would Division II status: \$3.16M minus \$2.2M.*

*The difference between Division I expenses and those at Division III is much larger. In 2002-03, the latest year for which we could find authoritative data regarding Division III universities, "The average expense per student-athlete for football schools is \$3,400."<sup>5</sup> In contrast, the average expense for a CCSU intercollegiate athlete in 2002-03 was \$13,790: (\$6.22M Total Athletic Operating Expenses minus \$774,728 Athletic Revenues<sup>6</sup>) divided by an estimated 395 intercollegiate athletes. A move to Division III might therefore seem to save roughly \$4.1M per year: (\$13,790 minus \$3,400) times 395.*

*Several factors would reduce this figure, however. The Athletics contribution to facilities maintenance would remain unchanged. Simply leaving the NEC would involve a one-time exit fee of \$250,000. According to the Associate Vice-President for Institutional Advancement, leaving for a Division III conference would probably reduce average yearly donations of roughly \$230,000 to the Athletics Fund within the CCSU Foundation. Coca-Cola would certainly reduce its five-year \$95,000 per year sponsorship. Commercial advertising from smaller companies is likely to be reduced as well. Furthermore, the \$1.96M now spent on athletic grants-in-aid would not be eliminated until current grant-supported athletes completed their eligibility. Likewise, the \$2.4M in salaries and benefits for our full-time Division I coaches would not be reduced until they leave. (On the other hand, the AD has several times observed that he as well as our Division I coaches and staff would leave as soon as possible if we moved even to Division II.) Finally, as is true of other components of CCSU, fund-raising for Athletics has only recently been "professionalized." In particular, it now has a dedicated fund-raiser and a directive that coaches themselves seek to raise funds for their sports and for the university. In short, beyond the eventual \$1.96M savings from athletic grants-in-aid, we cannot precisely predict the net savings from a move to Division III.*

---

salaries for full-time as well as for part-time personnel, staff as well as coaches (\$4.03M for 2005-06).

<sup>5</sup> "Revenues and Expenses of Division III Intercollegiate Athletics Programs."

Cf: [http://www.ncaa.org/library/research/iii\\_rev\\_exp/](http://www.ncaa.org/library/research/iii_rev_exp/), p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> NCAA Audit of 9/24/07.



*In addition to President Miller, both Chancellor Carter and the BOT would probably reject our moving to Division III. Moreover, both the AD and the CAO predict that the Athletics Program generally, and the recruitment of intercollegiate athletes specifically, would suffer if this possibility is officially discussed any further. Furthermore, it is possible that the legislature would reduce state funding if we moved to Division III.*

*Currently, however, the available data do not show that our Division I status has any measurable benefits regarding the academic quality or quantity of our admissions or enrollments. It has not brought entering students with higher average combined SAT scores than those at Division III ECSU:<sup>7</sup>*

	<i>CCSU</i>	<i>ECSU</i>
<i>2004</i>	<i>1032</i>	<i>1026</i>
<i>2003</i>	<i>1029</i>	<i>1029</i>
<i>2002</i>	<i>984</i>	<i>1017</i>
<i>2001</i>	<i>981</i>	<i>1008</i>
<i>2000</i>	<i>975</i>	<i>983</i>

*Furthermore, even when increased fundraising is considered, this status seems to involve a net expense of roughly \$0.96M when compared to a Division II status, and at least \$1.96M when compared to a Division III status.*

2 The following items concern the 7/12/07 UBPC Report to Senate.

2.1 The following items concern communication between the CAO and faculty regarding the fields renovation project:

A) In his 5/14/07 address to Senate, the CAO declared he will provide the UPBC with “a detailed bid report on every one of these projects prior to their commencement.”

The CAO also observed “the presiding committee on all buildings and grounds and all facilities issues resides with the University Facilities Planning Committee.”

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.ccsu.edu/planning/ir/Statistics/Facts/Admissions.htm>

and

[www.easternct.edu/depts/fiscal/SPNarrative2007.pdf](http://www.easternct.edu/depts/fiscal/SPNarrative2007.pdf)

Finally, the CAO observed that, in his seven years at CCSU, he has “never been asked or required to bring such requests to the UPBC before submitting it.”

B) In an e-mail on 10/18/07, the CAO described his communications with faculty concerning the fields renovation project as of May 2007:

The CAO briefed the UPBC in December 2006.

The CAO briefed the Facilities Planning Cmte, which includes two Senate representatives, three times: 8/16/06; 11/14/06; and 4/17/07.

*As early as 7/13/06, President Craine notified President Miller that “none of the relevant committees -- University Planning and Budget, Facilities Planning, nor the University Athletic Board -- has been aware of this particular plan” even to study the feasibility of renovating the athletic fields. President Craine observed that “A major concern of faculty will be that improvements for athletics not detract from much needed improvements in the academic infrastructure.” Assuming that shared governance serves the university’s mission well, the UPBC might therefore be thanked for stepping somewhat unorthodoxically into the decision to expend funds collected from the \$150 increase in the General Fee. Furthermore, the UPBC has agreed that its chair should resume ex-officio status at the FPC. Thus, future coordination between faculty and the CAO should be improved regarding decisions about university facilities.*

2.2 President Miller offered to make the UPBC responsible for monitoring renovation expenditures. This was declined. There have been no cost-overruns so far. The administration is responsible for preventing future overruns.

2.3 Renovating the fields would offer home field advantages during conference playoffs for soccer and for track. It would not only create an on-campus practice facility for the track team and for recreational athletes but also enhance campus aesthetics.

Concerning the indoor health and exercise facility, President Miller and CAO Bachoo believe it could easily cost twice as much as renovating the fields. This would require either the complex process of state bonding, or enlarging our financial reserve with the \$150 fee increase beyond BOT guidelines. Furthermore, President Miller saw no good evidence that students would prefer a fitness center more than renovating the fields.

*The 395 students per year participating in intercollegiate athletics would benefit from the fields renovation in many obvious ways. The 600-700 students per day participating in recreational athletics would also benefit, primarily from the lighted field dedicated for recreational activities but also from nightly access to the lighted track and to the turfed and lighted soccer field.*

*Physical education classes focused on track would use and appreciate an outdoor track. Walkers and joggers could also use an outdoor track.*

*On the other hand, an inquiry made by the Associate Director of Athletics shows that roughly 300 CCSU students now purchase memberships to the near-by, off-campus recreational fitness center known as Big Sky. This suggests students need an indoor fitness and exercise facility on campus.*

*Would students actually prefer to replace the fields renovation project with an indoor fitness and exercise facility focused on recreational athletes, but open to intercollegiate athletes on a recreational basis? An informal survey of four classes indicated students' preference for the project that could be completed most immediately – namely, the fields renovation project.*

*In his meeting with the UAB co-chairs on 11/15/07, President Miller suggested he would nonetheless welcome a proposal from Senate to build an indoor fitness and recreation facility in the future. He also observed this would detract from other priorities such as equipment for offices and classrooms.*

## **FINDINGS**

The following findings are based on the observations above.

1.1 Division I intercollegiate athletics serves the university's mission by enhancing our exposure, our visibility. For example, our Division I men's basketball team received more media coverage by losing in the first round of the NCAA play-offs than did SCSU's Division II women's basketball national championship team. However, this has not measurably affected the quantity or academic quality of our admissions or enrollments. Nor does it draw increased state funding. Nor does it affect recruitment from underrepresented ethnic groups in statistically significant ways. We would better understand how Division I status serves the university's mission if the biennial CIRP Freshman Survey asked the extent to which enrolled freshmen chose CCSU because of its Division I status.

1.2 Our Division I status costs roughly \$960,000 more than would Division II status. Moving to Division III would eventually save at least \$1.96M per year, the expense for

athletic grants-in-aid. This savings could be used to recruit students based on academic excellence and/or financial need, for example, or simply to reduce overall student expenses. It can be assumed that more savings would result if, as the AD predicts, he as well as our Division I coaches and staff would leave for other Division I jobs. On the other hand, donations and sponsorships would probably be reduced.

Findings 1.1 and 1.2 more or less replicate those summarized in the Abstract to the 2004 Knight Foundation Commission Report on Intercollegiate Athletics:

Do successful college athletic programs stimulate additional applications from prospective students and greater contributions by alumni and other donors? And if so, is it likely that additional investment in such programs is a cost-effective way of increasing these benefits? . . . The findings reported in these studies are mixed, but the overall message is easily summarized: It is that if success in athletics does generate the indirect benefits in question, the effects are almost surely very small.<sup>8</sup>

It is also noteworthy that Division III Athletics programs emphasize student participation rather than spectatorship:

Division III athletics departments place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators. The student-athlete's experience is of paramount concern. Division III athletics feature athletes who receive no financial aid related to their athletic skills . . . Division III athletics encourages participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities available to students, placing primary emphasis on regional in-season and conference competition.<sup>9</sup>

Nonetheless, the vast majority of Division III schools are small, private colleges. In contrast, Division I schools are typically mid-sized and larger public and private universities. Typically, universities of our size are proud to have Division I status, and sufficiently many others are trying to gain it that the NCAA has imposed a two-year moratorium on applications. Given the findings above, this is perplexing.

---

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.knightcommission.org/images/uploads/KCIA\\_Frank\\_report\\_2004.pdf](http://www.knightcommission.org/images/uploads/KCIA_Frank_report_2004.pdf).

<sup>9</sup> "Division III Facts & Figures."

Cf. [http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division\\_III/index.html](http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division_III/index.html).

But these findings are, so far as we know, the first results of seriously scrutinizing the impact of Division I Athletics on the university's mission. Furthermore, this is only the first year of a concerted effort by the administration to "professionalize" Athletics regarding fund-raising. Most importantly, continuing to fact-find at this time could negatively impact athletic recruiting. Thus, further fact-finding at this time is not warranted.

On the other hand, after considering several drafts of this report, the CAO observes the following in a 3/5/08 e-mail.

There needs to be measurements, however, that, over the long haul, can be used to gauge and allow the University community to render opinions on the institution's athletic operation.

Four key measurable areas can be used to help the University community gauge whether or not its present athletic operation and Division I status is compatible with its goals:

- Team APR and overall departmental score
- Competitiveness
- Fundraising
- Public Relations

The University administration is urged to develop a measurement tool from which these four goals can be easily identified and measured by members of the University community. Additionally, benchmarks and milestones should be implemented with the goal of reviewing ICA's [Intercollegiate Athletics'] progress on a six to seven year basis. At the conclusion of such a timeline, it would be appropriate for a community discussion about the status of ICA and CCSU.

Six to seven years is not long in the life of a university. But a yearly report to Senate regarding these four measures would appropriately prepare Senate for an evaluative discussion of our Division I status in another six to seven years. Equally importantly, we must know the extent to which our Division I status influences the decisions of students to enroll. This

might be accomplished with several probing questions on the biennial CIRP Freshman Survey.

2.1 Communication between the CAO and the faculty regarding facilities management has improved as a result of the UPBC's response to Senate President Craine's request that it address several questions about the feasibility study regarding the fields renovation project.

2.2 Based on a consultant's advice, the BOT approved a total of \$9.6M to fund the seven phases of the fields renovation project. We do not yet know whether contractors will agree to the terms of this project. If they do not, the CAO emphasizes that some or all of the phases will be scaled back, that cost overruns will not be accepted. Our administration is responsible for the oversight that prevents such overruns.

2.3 The administration is committed to significant increases in outdoor facilities for recreational athletes as well as for intercollegiate athletes. In addition to enhancing campus aesthetics, the fields renovation project will improve all students' access to outdoor athletic facilities. It is much cheaper than the 1998-1999 plan to site the track and soccer field north of Ella Grasso Blvd. A project such as this (which can probably be completed within the next four years) seems preferable to one (such as an indoor fitness center) whose initiation date cannot be predicted. Regardless, it would be appropriate to formally query all students concerning their desire for an indoor fitness center.

Some but not all administrators think the dedicated recreation field cannot fully serve the needs of recreational athletes unless it is turfed. With reservations, President Miller thinks "Leaving one natural grass surface seems to be a logical alternative" to turfing all of the fields.

Regardless of how this matter is settled, recreation students will still have access to the lighted football field after 6:30p, and they will gain access to the new and lighted soccer field and track after 6:30p. Clearly, however, it is the \$150 per year fee increase levied on every student that is responsible for any turfing at all. And more students will use the recreation field than will use the baseball and softball fields which, as unlighted, offer little access to recreational athletes after the intercollegiate reservation ends at 6:30p.

## ADDENDUM

A September 2007 UPBC report to Senate observes the "Athletic Fee appears as [a] distinct fee for only one year and is thereafter merged into [the] General Fee . . . There was no special account created [in our financial reserve] for [the] Athletic fee, nor was there a distinct BOT resolution creating it; \$150 . . . was simply added to [the] fee schedule -- so there is no accumulating account [in our financial reserve]." On the other hand, the 9/24/07 NCAA Athletics Audit shows that our intercollegiate Athletics program produced a net expense of roughly \$6.74M in 2005-06, the latest year for which relevant data are available: \$7.45M Total Operating Expenditures minus \$707,024 Total Operating Revenues. The report concludes "The student fee money has already been spent, in offsetting . . . that deficit [and those for other years]."

The UPBC report addresses an intriguing feature of the reserve part of our normal budgeting process -- namely, with very few exceptions, the money in our financial reserve is not identified by source. This is true of all sources, however, not just of fees charged to students. It is true, for example, when money budgeted for new faculty positions is not spent because the positions are not filled. All such unspent funds are rolled into the financial reserve for unspecified use later.

In fact, however, the net expense for Athletics was not offset by our financial reserve in any year. Rather it was paid by revenues from a variety of other sources including tuition, state appropriations, fees, and the CCSU Foundation. Similarly, for example, faculty salaries for 2005-06 were paid from a variety of sources including tuition, state appropriations, fees, and the CCSU Foundation.