



Nicholas B. Dirks
CHANCELLOR
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY
PROFESSOR OF
ANTHROPOLOGY

200 California Hall #1500
Berkeley, CA 94720-1500
510 642-7464
510 643-5499 FAX
chancellor@berkeley.edu



June 5, 2017

Dear campus community,

We wish to thank the members of the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics (TFIA) for their diligence and hard work on this most complicated of subjects. The values, principles, findings, and recommendations enunciated in the report that follows are important; campus leadership will now carefully consider them. While the financial challenges facing the campus and Cal Athletics are urgent, the issues are complex, and we must be deliberate in making our decisions.

At the same time, we fully endorse two crucial areas of consensus captured in the report's opening statement. The first echoes our own belief that intercollegiate athletics are an inseparable part of the University of California at Berkeley and an important contributor to the excellence and unique character of our University. The second point of consensus aligns with our conviction that Cal Athletics, as an integral part of the campus, must participate in our efforts to create strong, sustainable financial models for all of our operating units. In this and many other regards we see much commonality between the best interests of the campus and our intercollegiate athletics program.

There is, however, one recommendation that we hope to implement as quickly as possible. An independent review of Cal Athletics financial controls and efficiency of operations and organizational structure could be of significant benefit if it can be completed without undue delay. We will immediately begin to assess options for such a review, and expect to launch that effort in the very near future. Meanwhile, we should also note that as part of the budgeting process for the coming fiscal year, Intercollegiate Athletics is already on course to reduce its deficit by a target of \$4.65m, through a combination of new revenues and strategic cuts.

The timing of the report's completion means that we are beginning to consider its recommendations and findings with only a few weeks left before the transition in the Chancellor's office at the end of this month. While we will be working closely together and conferring about this report in the weeks to come, it is evident that key decisions cannot be made until after July 1st. In her current role as interim Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Carol Christ has been deeply immersed in the ongoing efforts to bring the University's budget into balance. While that has provided her with insight and understanding relevant to Cal Athletics financial issues, there are a number of areas, such as the stadium's financial model, where the Chancellor Designate intends to gather more detailed historical and contemporary information. By the same token, she wants to hear first-hand from faculty, coaches, alumni, student athletes, and others in order to fully understand their perspectives and solicit their input. Meetings with representatives of these groups are now in the process of being scheduled.

Finally, we want to offer assurance that even as all options remain on the table, no decisions have been made. Yes, our binding commitment to balance the University's budget by 2020 requires us all to accept that the status quo cannot persist. However, we are determined to ensure that our final decisions are based on our shared values, the best possible data, and with consideration for the perspectives and ideas of all those who care deeply about our University, our campus community, and our students.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nicholas Dirks". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Nicholas Dirks
Chancellor

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Carol Christ". The signature is cursive and somewhat stylized, with a large initial "C".

Carol Christ
Interim Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
Chancellor-designate

**REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
JUNE 2017**

Intercollegiate athletics are an integral part of the University of California at Berkeley. Since the earliest days of the university, intercollegiate sports have been part of what makes Berkeley the finest public university in the country. The values of intercollegiate athletics are many:

- Students who participate in sports can and often do learn the value of hard work, commitment, leadership, loyalty and teamwork – qualities that serve them, their families, and their broader communities for the rest of their lives.
- Intercollegiate athletics promote socioeconomic and racial diversity at Berkeley.
- Intercollegiate athletics generate a broader sense of pride in Berkeley as a whole.
- Intercollegiate athletics create a lasting bond to Berkeley among many alumni and help stimulate generous philanthropic giving by those alumni.

None of these benefits diminish the importance of the graduate and undergraduate departments at Berkeley, the arts programs, and the many other activities of which this University is so proud. All of them complement each other, creating a diverse and energetic educational institution that stands apart from the other great universities in this country.

Our Task Force recognizes, however, that Berkeley faces significant financial challenges. The campus as a whole, and the Intercollegiate Athletics Department (“IA”) itself, are operating under financial deficits that are not sustainable. Like other operating units at Berkeley, IA must take steps to reduce expenses, prepare meaningful operating budgets, and stay within those budgets. Simply stated, IA is not immune to budgetary cuts and must absorb its share of the budgetary pain in order to help solve the current budgetary crisis at Berkeley.

Introduction

In August 2016, Chancellor Dirks established the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics. (See Appendix for the Chancellor’s charge letter). The Task Force has met 18 times and has discussed the issues in some depth. While the charge of the Task Force was to look at the long run, it is beyond our scope to evaluate the Athletics Director’s efforts to meet the FY18 budgetary targets.

Consensus recommendations are presented below. Many of them have been offered before in one form or another in five previous reports on IA stretching back to the Smelser report of 1991.¹ Recommendations per se will not solve these issues. To be meaningful, they require leadership and an appropriate governance structure.

The task force was unable to reach a consensus on a number of important issues in part because of the very complicated trade offs involved, the complexity of the issues, the inability to secure an outside operational review of IA prior to the preparation of this report, limitations of data and analysis, and the very different perspectives of the members of the task force. In particular, the task force was unable to reach a consensus recommendation regarding “an

¹ Previous reports are listed in the Appendix.

appropriate scale and scope for IA's overall program, including the number of programs and roster sizes" as detailed in the Chancellor's charge. The Appendix provides additional details about the work of the task force.

Consensus Recommendations

- 1). We recommend a targeted review of IA's organizational structure and financial controls by an independent, outside party with credibility among the entire campus community. The reviewer should also focus upon possible cost savings in administrative expenses not directly related to sports programs. The analysis should include clear estimates of savings from specific actions. The campus should commit in advance to a written response to this report, including what it plans to implement and how it will measure improvement after implementation. The reviewer should report to the Chancellor.
- 2). We recommend that governance be improved and lines of communication clarified. Working with the administration, IA should submit an annual budget and a 3-5 year budget. The former should be monitored at least quarterly during the year; the latter should include properly vetted estimates of capital commitments. These budgets will necessarily establish the level of what is often termed "institutional support." Further, "institutional support" should be separated between that required for operating costs and that required for capital costs. On an annual basis, IA should submit a report to the Executive Committee that reviews all expenditures made during the year attributable to "special items" in excess of \$1 million. This report should include who authorized the expenditure and how it was paid for. (Examples of "special items" might include litigation settlements, severance agreements, and the like.)
- 3). We recommend that the Vice Chancellor Administration and the Vice Chancellor for Finance play a more significant role in the budgetary review process for IA. While we recognize that Regental policy requires that the Athletic Director report directly to the Chancellor, this should not inhibit this additional review.
- 4). We recommend that the campus hire outside professionals to manage and optimize the use of the California Memorial Stadium.
- 5). We recommend that underutilized facilities and assets be identified and reviewed with an eye either to monetizing them or making them newly available to the campus.
- 6). We recommend that the impact of IA on philanthropy to the entire campus be considered in any analysis of the campus's net cost or benefit from IA. Athletics is the "front porch" to many donors, and any programmatic changes have the potential to significantly impact overall giving.
- 7) We recommend that the campus respect all written donor agreements made to support various sports.
- 8). We recommend a campaign to provide permanent funding for Athletics.

A Brief Overview of IA Finances

The financial report found in the Appendix presents the 15-year history of results in IA. It shows that IA produced a significant operating profit in the three years prior to fiscal 2016. Due to several factors, this reversed to a small operating loss in fiscal 2016. IA forecasts that it will break even from operations in fiscal 2017.

The campus issued debt of more than \$400 million to renovate the California Memorial Stadium (CMS) and to construct the Simpson Athletic High Performance Center (SAHPC). This has resulted in an annual interest charge of approximately \$18 million.² When this charge is deducted from operating profit, it creates an excess of expenditures over revenues. Interest expense is the one line item on the financial statement that is beyond the control of both the campus and the Athletic Director. Given its magnitude, it is virtually certain that interest expense will exceed IA's operating income for the foreseeable future no matter what actions are taken regarding program scope in IA.

Simply put, the following three things cannot hold at the same time for the current 30-sport program or any other NCAA Division I program with fewer sports.³

- (a) the entire interest expense for the CMS/SAHPC is on IA's books;
- (b) IA counts as revenue \$5M in what is called "institutional support" in campus and IA accounting;
- (c) IA has a balanced operating and capital budget.

Though the financial report provides a broad overview of the history of IA finances, several factors must be considered when reviewing it and other financial statements. "Institutional support" appears as a revenue item, but is entirely offset by an expense item termed "transfers to institution." The latter is calculated as a percentage of IA's revenue. We have requested an analysis of how the cost of scholarships charged to IA ("student aid") is determined and why it varies greatly among sports. Further, benefit costs allocated to IA under campus accounting may exceed their actual cost by about \$3-4 million. On the other hand, some campus functions could clearly be charged to IA and are not, including the cost of the Athletic Study Center and other allocations that may be appropriate.

Two Areas of Controversy

In addition to the consensus recommendations, it might be helpful to address briefly the most controversial areas where we could not find a consensus and do not make recommendations. These are the potential savings from a possible reduction in the scope of IA and the implications of Title IX.

² The interest expense is linked to and partially offset by certain items of variable revenue, primarily the Endowment Seating Program, through the debt financing model. Principal payments to retire the debt begin in 2032 and increase in 2039.

³ The minimum number of sports an NCAA Division I program can have is 14. See <http://www.ncaa.org/about/who-we-are/membership/divisional-differences-and-history-multidivision-classification>.

Scope of the Program

If the scope of the program were reduced, what would be the potential savings? To bound the problem, we received estimates that reducing the number of intercollegiate sports from 30 to the NCAA minimum of 14 might produce an initial annual savings on the order of \$9-12 million. In addition, total IA annual capital spending of \$7-8 million might decline to \$3-4 million. Substantial uncertainty surrounds both of these estimates.

Set against these savings is the effect that reducing the number of sports would likely have on philanthropy, not only to IA but also to the entire campus. Development staff estimates that the initial annual impact could be on the order of \$25 million.⁴ While this estimate is consistent with that made in the 2010 report, this number, like the estimated cost savings from reducing sports, is subject to great uncertainty. Notwithstanding this uncertainty, any recommendation must consider the net cost of scope savings after taking into account the potential reduction in philanthropy.

Some members oppose a reduction in the number of sports. The philanthropic loss could be very high. Lasting damage might be done to IA and the campus as a whole, especially in light of the elimination and subsequent re-instatement of 5 sports in 2010. It may also be possible to achieve needed savings through tighter cost controls. Other members believe that the campus must spend significantly less on IA.

Gender Equity and Title IX

All members of the Task Force endorse the principles of gender equity in Athletics and the letter and spirit of Title IX. Title IX provides three “prongs” for legal compliance. Berkeley operates currently under Prong 3, which requires accommodation of the interests and abilities of the under-represented gender. In effect, this requires that Cal add a women’s varsity sport when there is unmet interest, sufficient ability to field a team, and sufficient competition within the our normal competitive region. Such additions have the potential to be a budgetary burden in the future.

Prong 1 of Title IX requires that participation opportunities reflect the gender distribution of the undergraduate population. At present, 52% of our undergraduates are women; among our intercollegiate teams, 42% of the participants are women.⁵

Some members of the Task Force believe that Prong 1 is preferable from the standpoint of gender equity. It also would minimize the risk of additional women’s sports becoming the budgetary burden in operating and capital costs discussed above. Other members of the Task Force note that Prong 3 provides greater flexibility should the undergraduate population continue to shift toward female students. Further, they feel that the spirit of Title IX is to provide participation opportunities for women, not to reduce them for men.

⁴ Total annual philanthropy at Berkeley exceeds \$400 million.

⁵ We do not discuss Prong 2 as it is a rarely used, unrealistic option.

The campus faces hard decisions in the years ahead, and members of the task force are pleased to offer any continuing assistance that might be helpful.

Signed:⁶

Robert G. O'Donnell (co-chair)

Robert Powell (co-chair)

Lisa Alvarez-Cohen

Lishelle Blakemore

Brad Brian

Patricia Dechow

Chris Kutz

Rich Lyons

Caitlin Smith

Nadine Tang

Michael Williams

⁶ While the report was being finalized, Khira Griscavage agreed to serve as chief of staff to incoming Chancellor Carol Christ and recused herself in light of her new position.

APPENDIX

Contents

1. TFIA meetings & stakeholders engaged
2. List of members of the 2016-17 Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics
3. List of previous athletics task forces
4. Chancellor's Charge Letter
5. 15 year history of Intercollegiate Athletics' financials

Task force meetings & Stakeholders engaged

The Task Force met 18 times from August 15, 2016 through April 21, 2017.

The Task Force solicited the views of faculty and alumni/donors at forums held on December 5, 2016 and December 19, 2016, respectively. It also met with the UCBF/Board of Visitors Committee on Athletics on January 30, 2017 and May 12, 2017. And it met as a group with Bill Ausfahl, UCBF Trustee Emeritus, as well as with Professor Michael O'Hare, Goldman School of Public Policy.

To gain the perspectives of Student-Athletes, the Task Force met with Jack Austin (Football), Mia Croonquist (W Crew), and Elliot Gentile (W Soccer).

To learn about IA finances and fundraising, the Task Force met with campus Chief Financial Officer Rosemarie Rae, Vice Chancellor for University Development and Alumni Relations Julie Hooper, and Associate Athletic Director for Development Jeremy Wang.

To understand the Title IX implications of various strategic choices, the Task Force met with Senior Associate Athletics Director & Senior Woman Administrator Jenny Simon-O'Neill, Campus Title IX coordinator Denise Oldham, and Associate Campus Counsel Julie Conner.

For additional diverse perspectives, Task Force co-chairs Robert O'Donnell and Robert Powell also met with Roger Noll, Professor of Economics, Stanford; Bud Lyons, Cal Rugby Association; and the late T. Gary Rogers.

Finally, Task Force Co-Chair Robert Powell also consulted the following coaches:

- Amanda Augustus (W Tennis)
- Brett McClure (M Gym)
- Brooke Eubanks (W Lacrosse)
- David Durden (M Swimming & Diving)
- David Esquer (Baseball)
- Diane Ninemire (Softball)
- Al Acosta (W Rowing)
- Jack Clark (Rugby)
- Justin Howell (W Gymnastics)
- Kevin Grimes (M Soccer)
- Kirk Everist (M Water Polo)
- Meagan Schmitt (Beach Volleyball)
- Mike Teti (M Crew)
- Neil McGuire (W Soccer)
- Peter Wright (M Tennis)
- Rich Feller (Volleyball)
- Shellie Onstead (Field Hockey)
- Teri McKeever (W Swimming & Diving)
- Tony Sandoval (Track & Field)
- Walter Chun (M Golf)
- Coralie Simmons (W Water Polo)

Members of the 2016-17 Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics

Robert Powell, Co-Chair
Robert, O'Donnell, Co-Chair
Lisa Alvarez-Cohen
Lishelle Blakemore
Brad Brian
Patricia Dechow
Khira Griscavage
Christopher Kutz
Richard Lyons
Caitlin Leverenz Smith
Nadine Tang
H. Michael Williams

Staff: Nils Gilman, David Secor

Previous Task Forces on Intercollegiate Athletics

1. August 2010: Report of the Chancellor's Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (Chair: Christopher Kutz)
2. September 2000: "Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreational Sports" (Chair: Earl Cheit)
3. January 1999: Report of the Athletic Funding Task Force (Chair : Ron Coley)
4. December 1993: Report on Gender Equity (Chair : Earl Cheit)
5. May 1991: Blue Ribbon Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics at Berkeley (Chair: Neil Smelser)



Nicholas B. Dirks
CHANCELLOR
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY
PROFESSOR OF
ANTHROPOLOGY

200 California Hall #1500
Berkeley, CA 94720-1500
510 642-7464
510 643-5499 FAX
chancellor@berkeley.edu



August 16, 2016

Robert Powell (co-chair)
Robert G. O'Donnell (co-chair)
Lisa Alvarez-Cohen
Lishelle Blakemore
Brad Brian
Patricia Dechow
Khira Griscavage
Chris Kutz
Rich Lyons
Caitlin Smith
Nadine Tang
Mike Williams

Dear members of the Task Force:

After initial discussions, we have decided to make some small changes to the constitution of the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics (TFIA). Specifically, we have added Faculty Senate Chair Robert Powell and Trustee Robert O'Donnell to the committee. They will serve as co-chairs of the TFIA. Lisa Alvarez-Cohen and Nadine Tang will remain on the TFIA, as regular voting members.

The charge of the TFIA is to review the costs, regulations, and campus impact of IA's various programs, with a view to recommending an appropriate scale and scope for IA's overall program, including the number of programs and roster sizes. Given the serious constraints on overall campus resources, including a structural deficit in 2015-16 of about \$150m, it is imperative that IA be financially stable within the constraint of its fixed debt service obligations. It also must be aligned with Title IX and diversity priorities.

Specifically, the TFIA should answer the following questions:

- For each element of IA's program, what are the costs and benefits to campus?
- How do the requirements of Title IX affect our choices about how to reshape the program?
- Given the costs, benefits and regulatory constraints, what is the appropriate scale and scope for the total program?
- In addition to the scale and scope, are other changes, e.g., organizational or structural, needed to achieve financial stability?
- How much will the campus need to invest on an ongoing basis in order to sustain IA at this new level?

Where appropriate, the TFIA should benchmark its recommendations to programs at comparable universities, that is AAU public universities with NCAA Division I athletics programs – with special reference to our Pac-12 peers: UCLA, Oregon, Arizona, Washington, and the University of Colorado, Boulder.

Ideally, the analysis of these parameters can support modeling that demonstrates an optimal framework for the Athletics program within our very real financial constraints and the existing gender equity compliance context. Arriving at a final recommendation will, of course, also be guided by our institutional values of excellence and access and with respect to long-standing traditions where possible.

Because of the many stakeholders involved with Athletics at Cal, it will be very important that the TFIA meet with and provide regular updates to such groups, including the Faculty Senate Athletics Council, the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, and the Faculty Athletic Representative; the University Athletics Board, the Board of Visitors, the Trustees, and the Foundation; and, for technical support, the Campus Budget Office, as well as the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost's office.

We would like the TFIA to deliver its recommendations by the beginning of the Spring 2017 semester.

Staffing the TFIA will be Associate Chancellor Nils Gilman and Intercollegiate Athletics' Chief Financial Officer David Secor. The Title IX Office and the Office of Legal Affairs will assist the TFIA by providing technical expertise and advice on compliance and legal matters related to the review, analysis and recommendations.

All best,



Nicholas B. Dirks

CC: Scott Bidy, Vice Chancellor
Na'ilah Nasir, Vice Chancellor, Equity & Inclusion
Rosemarie Rae, Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Nils Gilman, Associate Chancellor and Chief of Staff
Phyllis Hoffman, Associate EVCP and Chief of Staff
David Secor, Chief Financial Officer, Intercollegiate Athletics
Robert Jacobsen, Faculty Athletic Representative

Operating Revenues	FY Ended 6/30/2002	FY Ended 6/30/2003	FY Ended 6/30/2004	FY Ended 6/30/2005	FY Ended 6/30/2006	FY Ended 6/30/2007	FY Ended 6/30/2008	FY Ended 6/30/2009	FY Ended 6/30/2010	FY Ended 6/30/2011	FY Ended 6/30/2012	FY Ended 6/30/2013	FY Ended 6/30/2014	FY Ended 6/30/2015	FY Ended 6/30/2016
Ticket sales	6,445	7,184	7,133	9,995	9,494	13,898	15,482	15,674	14,343	15,954	11,126	14,556	14,220	10,956	10,690
Student fees	2,443	2,426	2,013	1,911	1,968	2,070	2,241	3,184	2,146	2,258	2,447	1,447	1,444	1,444	444
Contributions	6,902	7,395	9,189	10,907	12,239	14,715	13,894	15,617	10,232	8,127	12,978	26,063	22,693	22,554	19,752
Guarantees	-	-	2,721	1,285	2,261	1,200	2,063	975	2,336	1,035	3,421	284	44	3,814	332
State/Govt Support	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Institutional Support	-	-	3,430	3,274	3,640	7,716	5,210	8,893	9,952	8,248	7,072	6,121	3,538	3,556	4,556
In-Kind	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	23
Media Rights	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17,044	19,486
NCAA/Conference Distributions	-	-	7,496	9,332	9,884	11,501	10,964	11,396	11,384	10,181	15,279	21,458	22,593	8,654	8,409
TV/Radio/Internet Rights	2,057	2,743	102	110	93	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program/Novelty/Concessions	134	499	788	403	406	465	784	887	737	1,591	669	1,196	1,325	649	502
Athletic Privilege Cards	417	411	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sponsorships/Royalties	-	-	2,554	4,144	4,377	5,046	6,374	6,404	6,967	8,432	7,204	6,972	9,469	9,548	8,789
Sports Camps	-	-	1,257	1,449	1,616	1,805	2,021	2,534	2,236	1,510	1,700	1,389	638	1	-
Endowment Income	1,537	1,428	1,639	1,626	1,600	1,751	2,326	2,888	8,330	7,250	5,885	11,488	13,359	9,193	11,135
Bowl Game Revenue	2,154	3,004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	780
Other	8,072	9,544	1,273	850	866	1,284	2,967	2,698	683	657	403	841	939	1,855	1,366
Total Operating Revenues	30,161	34,634	39,599	45,286	48,444	61,451	64,326	71,150	69,346	65,243	68,184	91,815	90,262	89,287	86,264

Operating Expenses	FY Ended 6/30/2002	FY Ended 6/30/2003	FY Ended 6/30/2004	FY Ended 6/30/2005	FY Ended 6/30/2006	FY Ended 6/30/2007	FY Ended 6/30/2008	FY Ended 6/30/2009	FY Ended 6/30/2010	FY Ended 6/30/2011	FY Ended 6/30/2012	FY Ended 6/30/2013	FY Ended 6/30/2014	FY Ended 6/30/2015	FY Ended 6/30/2016
Student Aid	4,984	5,782	6,186	8,043	8,402	8,447	8,997	9,957	11,131	8,899	10,053	10,001	9,865	9,686	11,682
Guarantees	-	-	1,464	2,429	1,679	3,140	1,832	3,233	1,858	3,041	1,731	1,386	1,517	1,445	1,744
Coaches Compensation and Benefits	6,240	6,590	8,656	10,004	10,647	12,581	13,155	14,691	14,496	14,490	15,784	18,022	14,669	16,430	20,008
Administration Compensation and Benefits	6,683	6,861	8,901	9,317	10,016	10,874	12,179	13,778	13,598	13,187	14,713	15,979	17,250	16,969	19,428
Benefits	2,285	2,474	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Severance Payments	-	-	106	175	272	-	164	821	-	49	5	2,115	2,403	2,291	236
Recruiting	491	538	657	669	683	770	741	838	1,006	945	928	912	1,143	1,265	1,308
Films	127	375	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Team Travel	3,478	3,689	3,679	3,843	3,914	4,985	4,669	5,503	4,868	5,176	6,447	5,588	6,117	6,150	7,225
Equipment/Uniform/Supplies	2,384	2,518	2,159	2,317	2,802	2,203	1,534	2,433	1,934	1,758	1,708	1,898	3,203	3,137	2,929
Game Expenses	-	-	1,655	1,747	1,884	2,305	2,356	3,210	2,975	2,760	1,499	3,619	3,603	3,766	4,055
Fundraising/Marketing/Promotion	346	1,040	2,227	4,120	2,598	2,747	2,634	2,740	3,246	3,110	3,008	3,879	4,172	4,228	3,558
Telephone	557	411	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Entertainment	441	384	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Campus Administration	585	664	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interest Expense	225	401	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sports Camps	-	-	547	699	794	863	1,152	1,204	1,417	744	833	560	350	11	1
Maintenance and General	7,260	7,072	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Facilities Cost	-	-	1,834	2,545	2,318	3,656	4,981	4,318	4,018	1,922	2,111	3,747	4,446	6,031	4,897
Direct Support to University	-	-	427	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indirect Support	-	-	1,152	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spirit Groups	-	-	-	241	126	132	58	94	78	81	119	140	149	114	100
Medical Expenses and Insurance	221	243	-	1,122	1,063	911	1,366	1,122	1,572	1,170	1,393	1,231	1,430	1,583	2,669
Memberships/Dues	-	-	-	43	47	50	44	51	1,041	1,435	1,548	1,468	49	51	71
Team Meal Expenses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	930
Bowl Game Expenses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,040
Transfers to Institution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,392	2,468	2,881	3,483	3,747	4,611
Other Operating Expenses	-	-	5,517	5,860	6,477	7,787	8,413	8,746	6,108	3,318	3,287	2,936	2,597	3,191	2,319
Total Operating Expenses	36,307	39,042	45,167	53,174	53,722	61,451	64,275	72,739	69,346	64,477	67,635	76,362	76,446	80,095	88,811

Total Operating Profit/(Loss)	(6,146)	(4,408)	(5,568)	(7,888)	(5,278)	-	51	(1,589)	-	766	549	15,453	13,816	9,192	(2,547)
--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------	-----------	----------------	----------	------------	------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	----------------

Non-Operating Revenue - Capital	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000	-	-	-	-
Non-Operating Expenses - Capital	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28	25	1,260	276	51	619
Loan repayment and/or Debt Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	557	3,387	15,384	16,869	17,617	18,562
Proceeds from Debt Issuance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,672	-	-	-

Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over Expenditures	(6,146)	(4,408)	(5,568)	(7,888)	(5,278)	-	51	(1,589)	-	181	137	1,481	(3,329)	(8,476)	(21,728)
--	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------	-----------	----------------	----------	------------	------------	--------------	----------------	----------------	-----------------