

Senate Report on UPBC Motions Concerning CCSU's Athletic Program

A Report from One Member of the UPBC

Summary: The Senate has asked for one viewpoint of the UPBC on a series of motions- some of which were not presented to the UPBC. **My viewpoint is simple: The UPBC and Senate should be interested in the planning and budget of our athletics programs, we should gather data we feel is meaningful, and we should exercise our advisory capacity in an order to create a culture of data transparency and dialog.**

Main points:

- The athletic program is of value to CCSU and our community.
- Faculty should support CCSU athletics. It should be in our strategic plan so future expenditure requests can be linked to the strategic plan just like academic departments. The athletic program does a wonderful job with its resources to provide our student-athletes with a meaningful collegiate athletic experience and to provide our students with amateur collegiate entertainment.
- Budgetary decisions regarding athletics, like academics, should be based on meaningful data that the whole campus community can discuss. We are NOT advocating for cuts or drastic reductions; but we the data seen is neither complete nor consistent with the data we collect routinely on academics regarding the costs of student services and productivity (i.e. like the *"Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity"*).
- The comparison of two metrics- spending per FTE student-athlete in athletics compared to spending per FTE student in academics- provides meaningful data that was important to the Knight Commission (a harbinger of NCAA reform); and if we are proactive, this data could be meaningful for us in planning and budget areas.
- This ISN'T a discussion about in which conference or division CCSU should play. Evidence presented in UPBC meetings have shown that the growth in spending per FTE student-athlete in athletics is growing when compared to spending per FTE student in academics is growing regardless of whether or not our program is D1 BCS, D1 FCS, D1 w/no football, D2, or even D3. For CCSU from data obtained directly from the Knight Commission, we currently spend three times as much on our student-athletes which is average for a FCS school. The factors that are causing the rapid growth of athletic programs affect all schools regardless of division and deserve to be part of the advice that faculty provide since they represent planning and budget issues.¹
- We have to decide if students have a right to know how much money from student fees and tuition that goes into the University General Fund (UGF) eventually makes its way to support the administrative costs of our athletics program. The University pays close to 9 million dollars from the UGF annually in direct support of our program which is more than other state public universities. When does the cost become unbalanced?
- Finally, we need clarification on student-athlete financial aid. As mentioned in the UPBC discussions, previous Board of Trustee resolutions restricted where the funds for non-need based student-athlete aid can come. We need to show a breakdown of aid by its source and type to demonstrate that no non-need based aid is given to student-athletes from sources that include state appropriations, student fees, student tuition, or federal funds.

Whether we like it or not.... Whether we are interested in it or not... collegiate athletics is going through changes of fundamental importance to the budget and planning of our University, staff, and students. Are we as faculty going to be proactive... or reactive... or ignorant of these changes which will undoubtedly have a long term impact on our university?

¹ Some of the changes effecting all schools are: Athletic conference alignments are segregating top-tier schools from smaller schools that may not have the revenue generation and complete package of athletic programs (<http://www.baylor.edu/survey/>), coaches salaries are continuing to draw scrutiny as they increase the state payroll while further segregating athletic programs that are haves from the have-nots (<http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/football/story/2011-11-17/cover-college-football-coaches-salaries-rise/51242232/1>), and recent scholarship changes from approved multi-year scholarships to potential \$2,000 per student athlete stipends will further continue to strain college resources and further segregate the schools who can afford to offer non-need based support to "student-athletes/amateur athletes" (http://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/colleges/ncaa-deciding-whether-to-give-stipends-to-student-athletes/2012/02/21/gIQAftQASR_story.html).

I have quickly prepared four summary sheets- I apologize in advance for typos and curttness.

The first motion passed by UPBC and Senate called for the athletic program to publish their summary information. It will not be discussed in this document. The first motion presented here... what is labeled the second motion... was presented to the UPBC and was defeated. The rest of the motions... motions 3-5 here... were withdrawn and never considered by the UPBC. I pulled them because I felt the UPBC was not interested (and I was somewhat frustrated by comments). The data I presented at UPBC stemmed from BoT Resolutions, Internal Data, and the Knight Commission report on BCS schools. The latter mentioned the startling fact that spending per FTE student athletes is rising much faster than spending per FTE student. It is highly advisable that Senators familiarize themselves with my previous presentation to the UPBC because I will not waste Senate time to rehash it. Suffice it to say my preliminary investigation of CCSU trends that relied on the Knight Commission report were verified by the Knight Commission itself-- they sent me the data for FCS schools of which CCSU is a reporting member and they sent me the CCSU data. My preliminary estimate that CCSU is spending three times as much on our student-athletes stands correct.²

A committee member asked in an email: "What is the endgame?"

The endgame is not reclassification to another division. The endgame is not altering the budget.

- 1) The endgame is adding some metrics by which we can compare spending in athletics against spending in academics in order to plan and budget.**
- 2) The endgame is to acknowledge the importance of our athletic program and include it in our strategic plan.**
- 3) The endgame is to ensure that students are well informed as to their financial contributions to our athletic program and to make sure we are not using state appropriations and student fees and tuition improperly. To do so means to collect and reporting meaningful data beyond what we have been reporting.**
- 4) The endgame is that faculty should not think that their advisory capacity in shared governance excludes an open discussion concerning the planning and budgeting of CCSU athletics.**

In the Knight Commission report, "Restoring the Balance: Dollars, Values, and the Future of College Sports",³ they write:

"This report sets forth reforms that are achievable and that, if implemented, will create a foundation upon which future reforms can build. Our blueprint for restoring educational values and priorities begins with strengthening accountability for intercollegiate athletics in three ways:

1. Requiring greater transparency and the reporting of better measures to compare athletics spending to academic spending
2. Rewarding practices that make academic values a priority
3. Treating college athletes as students first and foremost—not as professionals"

Therefore, the motions presented to the UPBC were tagged to one of the important 'blueprint' ideas above. The first motion passed the Senate and is not re-presented here. The other that did not pass and the others that were pulled are presented to the Senate on the following pages. Any supplemental or new information will be provided under the motion. As always, the Senate is highly encouraged to familiarize itself with the already presented material on the UPBC website.⁴

² Email (2/9/2012) from Scott Hirko, Ph.D. Associate, Communications and Research, Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics

³ http://www.knightfoundation.org/media/uploads/publication_pdfs/KCIA_Report_restoring_the_balance_2011.pdf

⁴ <http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=6911>

Motion 2: Defeated by the UPBC

[Transparency and Reporting]

“Concerning the increase in spending in athletics per FTE athlete when compared to spending in academics per FTE student”

The UPBC believes that the rate of increase in spending on CCSU’s athletic program per FTE student athlete shall not rise faster than the spending in academics per FTE student. Therefore, the UPBC recommends the administration work out a feasible equation that determines these ratios and present them in the annual report to the BOT required by Board Policy BR#96-070 “Policy on Intercollegiate Athletics for Connecticut State University Institutions” [Item 6].

New Insights from the Minority and/or the Justification for the Motion:

FACT: The University reports by semester the “Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity” (<http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=3462>) by academic department. It breaks down operations costs per FTE student by academic Department. No Department should feel threatened by this data because it is not used to cut or adjust budgets. It just provides a baseline for year-to-year comparisons. The metrics proposed in the above proposal (collecting data on spending in athletics per FTE student-athlete when compared to spending in academics per FTE student) represents an analogous approach for the athletics program. If one feels the first sentence is not a UPBC or faculty belief, then it should be struck from the motion altogether. If one feels that the first sentence is an attempt to restrict the budget of the athletic program, then one can either realize that it is just a generic belief statement or again remove it from the motion altogether.

From CCSU spending reports and internal emails, it was ballparked that CCSU follows the trends for BCS schools studied in the initial Knight Commission report and has raised its spending per FTE student-athlete by about 3 times as much as its spending per FTE student. (See UPBC PowerPoint presentation for details and an initial ballpark estimate for CCSU [even though CCSU is an FCS school]).⁵

Since then, I received more data directly from the Knight Commission for CCSU as well as an amended table that showed the spending increase proved in the BCS holds true for the FCS as well. The initial estimate for spending was correct. Clearly, the right thing to do is institutionalize the collecting and reporting of these metrics.

Athletics spending per athlete 3 to 12 times greater than academic spending per student
Medians for academic and athletics spending by Division I Subdivision and FBS Conference on a per capita basis, 2009

| Division I Subdivisions and FBS Conferences | Median academic spending per student 2009 | Median athletics spending per athlete 2009 | Median athletics spending per athlete greater than academic spending per student 2009 |
|---|---|--|---|
| Southeastern (SEC) | \$13,471 | \$156,833 | 11.6 |
| Big 12 | \$14,021 | \$131,440 | 9.4 |
| Pacific-10 | \$14,133 | \$98,459 | 7.0 |
| Atlantic Coast (ACC) | \$15,638 | \$106,238 | 6.8 |
| FBS Median | \$13,471 | \$91,053 | 6.8 |
| Big Ten | \$18,406 | \$111,620 | 6.1 |
| Conference USA | \$11,838 | \$66,017 | 5.6 |
| Big East | \$17,735 | \$92,188 | 5.2 |
| Mountain West | \$13,424 | \$69,518 | 5.2 |
| Western Athletic (WAC) | \$12,192 | \$59,995 | 4.9 |
| Sun Belt | \$9,342 | \$42,120 | 4.5 |
| Mid-American (MAC) | \$12,575 | \$48,185 | 3.8 |
| FCS | \$11,776 | \$35,220 | 3.0 |
| D1 No football | \$12,293 | \$37,197 | 3.0 |

This table shows academic and athletics spending on a per capita basis using median expenses in 2009. The data is based on 97 public institutions classified in the NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision; 62 institutions classified in the NCAA Football Championships Subdivision and 36 NCAA Division I institutions that do not sponsor football. The data show that athletics spending per athlete is outpacing academic spending per student by 3 to 12 times.

Source: Produced by The Delta Cost Project for the Knight Commission using data from the following sources: USA Today's NCAA athletics finance database of NCAA financial reports; NCES Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS); Office of Postsecondary Education Equity in Athletics database.



⁵ At the time, I was told that CCSU was different since it was not a BCS school and was only a FCS school; but it turns out that doesn't alter the ballpark estimate. BTW, BCS stands for Bowl Championship Series and consists of “big” schools like UConn, Notre Dame, LSU, etc. whereas FCS is primarily smaller D1 schools like CCSU.

Motion #3: NOT EVEN DISCUSSED BY UPBC (ONLY MENTIONED IN PRESENTATION)

[Transparency and Reporting]

“Concerning the use of student tuition and general fees from the University’s general fund and their use in balancing the expenses of CCSU’s athletic program as direct administrative support”

The UPBC believes that students have the right to know that their tuition and fee monies are being used to balance the annual budget of CCSU’s athletic program. Therefore, the UPBC recommends the administration (i) report what percentage of the University’s general fund comes from student tuition and fees; (ii) report the amount of money used as revenue for the athletic program as direct administrative support and use this data to determine the cost to students; and (iii) report a breakdown of athletic student aid such that it is clear how much is based upon need and how much is not [in order to comply with item 9* in BR#96-070]. All of these items can also be folded into the annual report to the BOT required by Board Policy BR#6-070 “Policy on Intercollegiate Athletics for Connecticut State University Institutions” [Item 6].

New Insights from the Minority and/or the Justification for the Motion:

This motion has a lot in it; but let's start with (iii). Proposed are new metrics related to tracking student-athlete aid as two different categories- student athlete aid (called athletic aid below) and student-athlete financial aid (called need based aid below). Currently in summary reports this data is combined (but shouldn't be). It is unclear whether or not athletic aid that is not need based is being drawn from the University General Fund (UGF). As per standing Board resolutions, there is a standing mandate that *“Funds used in support of grants-in-aid to athletes (not based on financial need) shall not be drawn from student tuition, student fees, state appropriations, or federal funds.”* (Item 9 in BR#96-070) If one traces successive policy revisions backwards to 1985 one finds that the Board passed a simultaneous resolution asking universities to dial down the then practice of using state and student funds to balance the athletic coffers.⁶ This motion sets out to clarify and report the differences between need-based and non-need based aid and to make sure the non-need base aid does not come from Board restricted contributors to the University General Fund.

I requested and received the information asked for (v) for 2008 from the AD in a recent email:

“Approximately 306 received some athletics aid, need based aid or combination of both.

Of the 306 student-athletes:

-123 had some athletics aid and need-based aid

-99 had athletics aid only (ranging from \$1000 to a full scholarship)

-84 had only need based aid and no athletics aid

In FY08 we spent approximately 2.3 million dollars on athletics aid for 222 student-athletes (123 plus 99 from above).

Approximately \$1,439,695 was awarded to student-athletes (84 from above) in the form of need based aid (e.g. federal subsidized loans, federal grants (Pell et al) and/or institutional grants).”

⁶ BR#85-78: CSU Policy on Intercollegiate Athletics

An acknowledgement by the CSUS that **“For some time prior to that revision certain campuses were drawing more money from student fees for the support of intercollegiate athletics than is permitted by the revised policies.”** Resolution BR#85-78 addressed a multi-year plan to 1990 to correct the problem.

So \$2.3 million was not based on need whereas \$1.4 million was based on need; therefore according to Board policy the \$2.3 million should not have been drawn from “*student tuition, student fees, state appropriations, or federal funds.*” Based on the revenue from non-administrative funds from 2008, it seems unlikely that the funds did not come from student tuition, student fees, state appropriations, or federal funds.⁷

On items (i-ii)

It seems clear that the direct administrative support for the athletic program comes out of the UGF. This practice is commonplace and has been noted by several folks who cover college athletic financing.⁸

As seen from the UPBC PowerPoint, CCSU general fund contains contributions from state allocations, student tuition, and student fees. **If athletic expenses are increasing and state allocations are decreasing, then it is obvious who is shouldering the burden of the growth in athletics- the students.** As pointed out in “Sis, Boom, Bust- The High Cost of College Sports”, some schools, like Ohio University in Athens [OU] let students know just how much of their student fee goes for the support of the OU athletic programs.⁹ Do our students have a right to know this?

The worst case scenario down the horizon would be that non-need based aid comes from the UGF... this would mean that regular students are taking out student loans to cover tuition and fees where a portion of these loans are going to support a student-athlete with money the athlete does not need financially. In essence, this particular worst case scenario would reflect a robbing of Peter to play Paul. Acceptance and further tweaking of part (iii) of this motion would suggest a reform that would ensure this doesn’t happen or at least doesn’t happen without the student *knowing* that it’s happening!

⁷ The reporting uncertainties in the data on slides 26 and 27 of the PowerPoint presentation to the UPBC, especially the practice of reporting “Indirect facilities and administrative support” as both a revenue and an expense, obfuscates the issue of whether or not UGF monies are being used.

⁸ <http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/2011/January-February%202011/game-change-full.html> and <http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/football/story/2011-11-17/cover-college-football-coaches-salaries-rise/51242232/1>

⁹ <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/video/video-sis-boom-bust-the-high-cost-of-college-sports-2/11315/>

Motion #4: NOT EVEN DISCUSSED BY UPBC (ONLY MENTIONED IN PRESENTATION)

[Rewarding Practices]

“Concerning the absence of the athletic program in CCSU’s strategic plan”

The UPBC believes that the athletic program is of value to the University. Therefore, the UPBC moves the Senate form an ad hoc committee to suggest objective(s) related to stating CCSU’s commitment and objectives for the athletic program. This committee must report back to the UPBC by March 5th, 2012.

The committee shall consist of the following voting members: 3 members of the UPBC, 3 members of the UAB, and 3 members of the Senate. The following non-voting, ex-officio members shall be invited to participate: The FAR (if not one of the 9 voting members), the UA, the Provost, and the CFO or representative

New Insights from the Minority and/or the Justification for the Motion:

Don’t get hung-up on the constituency of the committee which can be tweaked during consensus building... just focus on the idea behind it all. Expenditures must be linked to the strategic plan; that is how we do budgeting nowadays. However, our athletic program is not in the plan specifically, only in an ancillary fashion. Therefore, what is wrong with telling the students, the staff, the State that one of our priorities is maintaining a quality D1 FCS athletic program? If we believe this and have been spending accordingly... then why not just say it? This motion creates transparency and creates commonality between budget and planning between academics and athletics.

Motion #5: NOT EVEN DISCUSSED BY UPBC (ONLY MENTIONED IN PRESENTATION)

[Rewarding Practices]

“Concerning the long-term planning of CCSU’s athletic program”

(This title contained a typo in the original UPBC hand-out but the below description is unchanged.)

The UPBC believes that the athletic program is of value to the University and applauds the strong efforts behind the recent increase in revenue to support the program that relieves the need for direct administrative support to balance the athletic program budget. However, the direct administrative support and overall operating cost of the athletic program both continue to grow steadily. Therefore, the UPBC requests that the Senate asks the President to charge a Presidential ad hoc committee. This ad hoc committee should investigate long-term planning strategies for revenue generation in athletics as well as possible cost-saving actions. This committee should have adequate representation from the UPBC, UAB, and Faculty Senate and should report by the end of the academic year- holding at least one open public forum.

New Insights from the Minority and/or the Justification for the Motion:

If one checks the UPBC PowerPoint presentation, one will see that in addition to the increase in direct administrative support for CCSU’s program the revenue for the program is increasing to meet the rising cost of the program. It seems logical that an ad hoc committee be formed in order to prepare a long-term planning strategy for revenue generation as well as possible cost-saving actions if deemed necessary. The minority opinion realizes that this need not be an ad hoc committee of the Faculty... but that it should involve faculty with perspective from the UPBC, UAD, and Senate and that it should, at least, report to the Senate for their final advice. An open forum would also be a nice touch.

A Final Note: A few years after CCSU made its move to D1, The Board of Trustees also passed BR#91-73 “Resolution concerning the Continuation of Division I Classification within the NCAA for CCSU”. At the time President Shumaker, the UAB, **and UPBC** with alumni groups reviewed CCSU program status and concluded:

- “a. Academic integrity, gender parity, competitiveness, fiscal responsibility, and balance between athletics and other student support programs will continue to exist within the Division I classification;
- b. Programmatic operational costs between comparable Division I and Division III athletics programs are minimal at Central;
- c. The real difference between Divisions I and III for Central is the cost of athletic grants-in-aid and Central can meet these costs through NCAA Division I revenue, increased revenue generating activities available in Division I, and prudent fiscal management of the athletics budget;”

It is clear to me that the UPBC and Senate *does* indeed have a voice on this issue. Asking for more data, more transparency, and an advisory role along with including athletics in our strategic plan and suggesting clarifications of data presentation and process are well within our advisory capacity in shared governance. This is not an attack on athletics- as they will tell you... they can handle it and appreciate the dialog. It is an attempt to gain useful metrics and useful practices that will help the University grow stronger... and it is an attempt to get faculty interested in all matters of planning and budget at CCSU... not just the planning and budget that goes on inside the classroom.