

## **AUDIT AND ADVISORY SERVICES**

Intercollegiate Athletics — Expenses
Audit
Project No. 17-697

September 28, 2017

	September 20, 2017
Prepared by:	
Robert Asato	
Auditor-in-Charge	
Reviewed by:	Approved by:
Jaime Jue	Wanda Lynn Riley
Associate Director	Chief Audit and Risk Executive

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · MERCED · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

AUDIT AND ADVISORY SERVICES Tel: (510) 642-8292

611 UNIVERSITY HALL #1170 BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720-1170

September 28, 2017

H. Michael Williams Athletic Director Intercollegiate Athletics

Athletic Director Williams:

We have completed our audit of Intercollegiate Athletics expenses as per our annual service plan in accordance with the Institute of Internal Auditors' *Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* and the University of California Internal Audit Charter.

Our observations with management action plans is expounded upon in the accompanying report. Please destroy all copies of draft reports and related documents. Thank you to the staff of Intercollegiate Athletics for their cooperative efforts throughout the audit process. Please do not hesitate to call on Audit and Advisory Services if we can be of further assistance in this or other matters.

Respectfully reported,

Wanda Lynn Riley Chief Audit and Risk Executive

cc: Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer Rosemarie Rae

Chief Financial Officer David Secor

Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Alexander Bustamante

Associate Chancellor Khira Griscavage

Assistant Vice Chancellor and Controller Delphine Regalia

### University of California, Berkeley Audit and Advisory Services Intercollegiate Athletics — Expenses

### **Table of Contents**

OVERVIEW	2
Executive Summary	2
Source and Purpose of the Audit	
Scope of the Audit	3
Background Information	4
Summary Conclusion	
SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS & MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND ACTIO	N
PLAN	6
Ongoing Campus Support and Annual Debt Service	6
Event Planner Card Reconciliation Process	11
APPENDICES	12
Appendix A – Pac-12 Conference, Number of Sports by School, 2017	12
Appendix B – USA Today, NCAA Finances, Reported Campus Subsidy to	
Intercollegiate Athletics, 2014-15	13
Appendix C - US Department of Education, Number of Student Athletes for	
Selected Schools, 2006-2015	14
Appendix D - US Department of Education, Total Athletics Revenue for Sele	ctec
Schools, 2006-2015	15
Appendix E – US Department of Education, Athletic Team Expenses for Selection	
Schools, 2006-2015	
Appendix F – US Department of Education, Athletic Non-Team Expenses for	
Selected Schools, 2006-2015	17
Appendix G – US Department of Education, Athletic Team Revenue by Selec	
Sport, 2015	
Appendix H – US Department of Education, Athletic Team Expense by Selec	ted
Sport, 2015	19
Appendix I –US Department of Education, Athletic Team Net Revenue by	
Selected Sport, 2015	
Appendix J – Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, Compilation of Stateme	
of Operating Revenues and Expenses, FY2002-2016	21

### **OVERVIEW**

### **Executive Summary**

The purpose of the audit was to evaluate Intercollegiate Athletics' (IA's) current processes and controls related to

- the alignment of expenses with the campus/departmental business purpose, compliance with internal policies, reasonableness, appropriate classification, and recording accurately in a timely manner;
- understanding variances over time, against budget, against related revenue streams, and between insourced and outsourced activities; and
- evaluating working assumptions for budgeting expenses.

Based upon our audit work performed, we make the following observations.

- We concur with the conclusions of the most recent Intercollegiate Athletics task force that maintaining the current size of the program, IA being responsible for the annual debt service for California Memorial Stadium (CMS) and the Simpson Center for Student-Athlete High Performance (SCSAHP), and IA having a balanced operating and non-operating (capital) budget are three conditions that appear mutually unsustainable in the short run. Assuming that the campus wishes to keep the current size of the program (number of student athletes and teams), the campus should plan for continuing to support any operating losses and shortfalls in debt service capacity for the foreseeable future.
- Required review and approval of event planner credit card transactions was not conducted during our test period. Management corrected this condition prior to the issuance of our final report.

Management has proposed responses and action plans that we believe adequately address our observations.

### Source and Purpose of the Audit

The purpose of the audit was to evaluate IA's current processes and controls related to

- the alignment of expenses with the campus/departmental business purpose, compliance with internal policies, reasonableness, appropriate classification, and recording accurately in a timely manner;
- understanding variances over time, against budget, against related revenue streams, and between insourced and outsourced activities; and
- evaluating working assumptions for budgeting expenses.

### Scope of the Audit

The audit scope included examining current business processes and internal controls in the prioritized areas of

- travel and entertainment;
- administrative salaries and benefits;
- student aid;
- team travel;
- fundraising and marketing; and
- budgeting and forecasting.

Additionally, the following reports authored by the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics and other campus committees were reviewed for purposes of gathering information and history on topics related to the scope of the audit.

- Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics, Report of the Academic Senate, August 30, 2010
- Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) Subcommittee on IA, *IA Finances and Academic Performance of Student Athletes*, 2012-13
- Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, *The Management of Intercollegiate Athletics at UC Berkeley: Turning Points and Consequences*, November 2013
- Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, A Cautionary Analysis of a Billion Dollar Athletic Expenditure: The History of the Renovation of California Memorial Stadium and the Construction of the Barclay Simpson Student Athlete High Performance Center, February 2017
- Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics, Final Report, June 5, 2017

Audit techniques included interviews with Intercollegiate Athletics staff about the current practices and control activities for specific business processes, the review of selected travel expense documentation, and the analysis of budget and operating revenue and expense data. Our fieldwork was completed in June 2017.

### **Background Information**

IA supports 30 men's and women's teams and over 900 student athletes. Over the fifteen year period between 2002 and 2016, operating revenues (including annual campus subsidies and distributions from IA's Endowment Seating Program [ESP] fund functioning as an endowment [FFE]) have grown from \$30 million to \$86 million and operating expenses have grown from \$36 million to \$88 million. For the past six fiscal years, IA has also had non-operating capital expenditures for annual debt service related to the renovation of California Memorial Stadium (CMS) and the construction of the Simpson Center for Student-Athlete High Performance (SCSAHP).

IA has been a subject of internal and external review including the commissioning of three internal task forces in the past seven years. Two of the three task forces (2010 and 2017) were focused on financial issues; the third (2014) was focused on academic performance issues. We also conducted an audit of IA's management of revenue streams in 2015 (Project 15-653).

We discuss long-term trends in IA's finances, revenues and expenses, with particular focus on ongoing campus support and the impact of the CMS/SCSAHP debt service in our first observation.

There continues to be concern as to whether IA's revised financial model related to CMS/SCSAHP developed in early fall 2012 is sustainable and can account for a debt payment aimed at increasing in FY2032-33 to an approximate total of \$26-\$37 million per year when principal payments will become due. The revised model recognizes that the sales from the ESP are a significant source of revenue, however, this model includes additional revenue sources and plans to reach a wider group of potential buyers. The revised model's revenue sources are

- The ESP (dedicated sales force; corporate bundles; perk pricing; more realistic sales projections)
- Media rights revenue (Pac-12 and campus)
- Rental of facilities (third party and campus unit rentals)
- Naming rights (revised approach from the original model)
- Philanthropy (designated for the facilities)

We reviewed and used externally available financial information for our report. As a member of the NCAA, the campus is required to collect and report certain financial information related to its intercollegiate athletics program each year. There is a standard reporting criteria that is used for all Division I-FBS schools and the university's external auditor conducts an annual agreed-upon-procedure engagement based upon NCAA-defined procedures of the campus' reporting. Submitted NCAA reports for individual schools are not publicly available.

To promote transparency, IA prepares a public statement of revenue and expenses that roughly follows the same reporting categories and conventions used for NCAA reporting. We have compiled a summary of these statements for fiscal years 2002 through 2016 at Appendix J. We note that, although we used data in these statements to prepare our summary and perform our analysis, we did not independently validate the statements through audit test work.

To obtain perspectives on other Pac-12 conference schools and other comparable large public research universities with Division I athletic programs, we used publicly available data from USA Today's NCAA Finances database (http://sports.usatoday.com/ncaa/finances/) and the US Department of Education's (ED) Equity in Athletics Data Analysis (https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/). We note that both USA Today and US ED used data collection and reporting conventions that may differ somewhat from NCAA reporting conventions. We noted that data from the two databases were generally consistent with the figures reported on the public statements prepared by IA and we did not reconcile any identified differences as our analysis was focused more on higher level trends over time rather than precise numbers for any given reporting category or specific year.

### **Summary Conclusion**

Based upon our audit work performed, we make the following observations.

- We concur with the conclusions of the most recent Intercollegiate Athletics task force that maintaining the current size of the program, IA being responsible for the annual debt service for CMS/SCSAHP, and IA having a balanced operating and non-operating (capital) budget are three conditions that appear mutually unsustainable in the short run. Assuming that the campus wishes to keep the current size of the program (number of student athletes and teams), the campus should plan for continuing to support any operating losses and shortfalls in debt service capacity for the foreseeable future. Even if the campus assumed responsibility for the debt service and reassigned the dedicated annual income stream of the ESP FFE endowment income distribution, the endowment income itself (averaging \$9-\$13 million over the last three years) is insufficient to cover the debt service and the campus would need to cover the difference. The situation becomes more serious when principal payments become due and if the FFE has not grown by that time to be large enough to support the increase per the debt repayment schedule.
- Required review and approval of event planner credit card transactions was not conducted during our test period. Management corrected this condition prior to the issuance of our final report.

# SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS & MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND ACTION PLAN

### **Ongoing Campus Support and Annual Debt Service**

### Observation

As with other peer institutions, IA's finances have been a topic of intense scrutiny by both internal and external stakeholders for well over a decade. IA is considered an auxiliary enterprise, as defined in university policy Business and Finance Bulletin (BFB) BUS-72 *Establishment of Auxiliary Enterprises*. A defining characteristic of an auxiliary enterprise is that it is "essentially self-supporting" and provides "non-instructional support in the form of goods and services to students, faculty, and staff upon payment of a specific user charge or fee." Athletic programs are considered hybrid auxiliaries because their activities "include characteristics....that are complementary to the core instructional program, that contribute to students' physical and psychological well-being, or enrich their social, recreational, or cultural experience."

As part of our audit, we sought perspectives on the following topics, which have also been considered by prior task forces as well as internal and external stakeholders.

- The size of the campus subsidy relative to peer institutions
- Ongoing institutional support, annual debt service, and financial viability
- Long-term trends in IA's operating and non-operating revenues and expenses

Our goal was to provide an independent view, free from any particular stakeholder bias. Our perspective on these topics, which is primarily from a financial perspective, is only one of many. We do not explicitly consider the intangible benefits of IA to the greater campus, which we agree may be significant and important on its own merits. Those points of view can be found in other studies and prior task force reports.

The size of the campus subsidy relative to peer institutions

The annual campus subsidy to IA can be measured in different ways. The most direct measure of campus support is about \$5 million for FY2015-16. However, in recent years the central campus has increased the administrative full costing assessment to 9 percent and is more consistently recouping costs from auxiliary units. If you include these transfers back to the campus the net campus subsidy (excluding funds to support debt service) is now close to zero. We discuss this in more detail below.

Many peer institutions provide ongoing financial institutional support to athletic programs. For mandatory annual financial reporting by NCAA members, the NCAA defines three categories of institutional support:

Direct Institutional	Direct funds provided by the institution to athletics for the operations of intercollegiate
Support	athletics including
	• unrestricted funds allocated to the Athletics department by the university (e.g., state
	funds, tuition, tuition discounts/waivers, transfers);
	• federal work study support for student workers employed by Athletics; and
	• endowment unrestricted income, spending policy distributions and other investment
. y	income distributed to Athletics in the reporting year to support athletic operations.
	(restricted endowment income for athletics is considered separately as Athletic
w	Restricted Endowment and Investment Income)
Indirect Institutional	Value of costs covered and services provided by the institution to Athletics but not
Support	charged to Athletics including
	• administrative services provided by the university to Athletics but not charged such
	as HR, Accounting and IT;
	• facilities maintenance;
	• security;
	• risk management; and
	• utilities.
Indirect Institutional	Debt service payments (principal and interest, including internal loan programs), leases
Support – Athletic	and rental fees for athletics facilities for the reporting year provided by the institution
Facilities Debt Service,	to Athletics but not charged to Athletics.
Lease and Rental Fees	

USA Today collected data from public universities for 2014-15 and calculated a "total subsidy" figure for each school that represents "The sum of student fees, direct and indirect institutional support and state money, minus certain funds transferred back to the school. The transfer amount cannot exceed the sum of student fees and direct institutional support that the department receives from the school."<sup>1</sup>

Appendix B presents *USA Today*'s data for 2014-15 (the most recent available year) for other public Pac-12 universities as well as six large, public research universities with Division I athletic programs. The campus IA net subsidy is reported at \$1.25 million, but a footnote indicates that this amount is net of transfers back to campus and the combined amount of student fees and direct institutional support was approximately \$5 million (\$3.5 million in direct institutional support and \$1.4 million in student fees). Using this \$5 million figure for comparative purposes, the campus subsidy is toward the lower end of other Pac-12 conference schools, with subsidies that ranged from \$2 to \$19.3 million. Relative to other large public research universities, the campus falls between schools with large revenue streams and minimal campus support (University of Texas at Austin, Ohio State, Michigan and Penn State) and those with similar total revenue but more campus support (University of Virginia with \$13.5 million and University of North Carolina Chapel Hill with \$9 million).

For FY2015-16 [see Appendix J], not yet reported by *USA Today*, IA's combined amount of student fees and direct institutional support remained at roughly \$5 million even though the composition changed (student fees decreased \$1 million to \$400,000 and direct institutional support increased \$1 million to \$4.5 million). However, transfers back to campus increased from \$3.8 to \$4.6 million, so the net subsidy (excluding student fees) decreased from \$1.2 million in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> USA Today, Methodology for NCAA Athletic Department Revenue Database, <a href="http://sports.usatoday.com/2016/04/14/methodology-for-ncaa-athletic-department-revenue-database/">http://sports.usatoday.com/2016/04/14/methodology-for-ncaa-athletic-department-revenue-database/</a>

2014-15 to roughly zero. However, this data excludes the effect of the annual debt service for the stadium renovation and new high performance center.

What has been notable in the last six years is the appearance and growth of expenses classified by the NCAA as "transfers to the institution" that are offsets to the direct institutional support. These transfers were reported as zero from FY2001-02 through FY2010-11 but have grown to the point that in FY 2015-16 direct institutional support roughly equals transfers back to the campus. As such, one could argue that there is no net operating subsidy anymore, but the campus does end up paying for an overall unit deficit (operating deficit and non-operating debt service).

In the past three years, IA has had to cover a deficiency of operating revenues over expenditures through principal withdrawals from their FFEs as well as one-time transfers from the central campus that were approved by the chancellor separate from the normal annual budget process. In FY2013-14 and FY2014-15 [see Appendix J], IA has had a significant operating profit (\$13.8 and \$9.2 million, respectively) but an overall loss due to the CMS/SCSAHP debt service. In FY2015-16, IA had both an operating loss of \$2.5 million and an overall loss of \$21.7 million after including the \$18.6 million debt service and other non-operating expenses.

Ongoing institutional support, annual debt service, and financial viability

The 2010 IA task force recommended reducing direct institutional support, which at the time was deemed unsustainable at about \$7-\$10 million annually (at that time there were no transfers back to the institution reported). That has been accomplished in that it has been reduced to \$4.5 million (excluding student fees) in FY2016 and simultaneously transfers back to the campus have gone from zero to \$4.6 million, resulting in a roughly net zero operating subsidy position. However, now the campus clears an annual overall IA deficit due to the incremental effect of non-operating debt service that was not present at the time of the 2010 task force.

The CMS/SCSAHP debt service is \$18-\$20 million annually until principal payments commence in 2033. Logically, IA would need to generate \$18-\$20 million in net operating profit to service its debt for the near term. As with most athletic programs, men's football and basketball are by far the largest revenue generating sources. For this campus, men's basketball has a small operating loss, which leaves men's football that currently generates approximately \$19 million in operating profit.

If the campus eliminated all other sports, all IA administration and support functions, and only had a football program, IA would currently just barely be able to service its debt. However, such a program change is not a viable option as the campus would not be Title IX compliant; donors and alumni, as seen in 2010 with prior attempts to cut individual sports, would likely protest; and IA would not be able to make larger principal payments when they become due in the 2030's.

If IA was relieved by the campus of the debt service and ongoing ESP program revenue (recently averaging between \$8-\$13 million per year) but the historic annual campus operating subsidy remained (of approximately \$5-\$7 million), football would generate roughly enough operating income to support operating losses from other sports and for athletic program administration. All other things being equal, IA would generate relatively small operating profits or losses from year to year, similar to the FY2007-2012 period before significant debt service payments began in FY2012-13.

### Long-term trends in IA's operating and non-operating revenues

Notably, according to data submitted annually to the US ED, IA has consistently grown operating revenue over the past ten years [see Appendix D]. However the average annual growth rate of 3.35 percent has been below peers in the Pac-12 and other comparable large public research universities with Division I programs. In addition, the stadium financing model used to demonstrate financial viability makes certain assumptions about ESP sales, FFE investment returns, and withdrawal patterns. Under the model, IA develops over time a large quasiendowment that will be large enough to generate enough annual income to ensure a healthy operating budget. However, ESP sales have been below projections, particularly for the most expensive seats, and IA has made unscheduled principal withdrawals from the FFE to cover operating losses and debt service that will impact its long run goal of attaining a large quasiendowment.

### Long-term trends in IA's operating and non-operating expenses

IA has also controlled the growth of expenses, excluding debt service, over the past ten years relative to peers according campus submitted to US ED data. The average annual compound growth rate of expenses was 3.56 percent for the ten years ending 2015 [see Appendix E]. This is lower than all the other Pac-12 schools and most comparable public research universities. However, since its rate of revenue growth was 3.35 percent for the same period [see Appendix D], it was not consistently growing operating profit margins.

Furthermore, IA has experienced increases in certain expense categories due to external factors beyond their control. The campus has asked IA to directly pay for items that were previously absorbed elsewhere by the campus, such as salaries for certain administrators and services provided by University Health Services. The cost of supporting student athletes has also increased as the NCAA has raised limits or expanded categories of allowable expenses for student support. In addition, recommendations from the 2014 IA task force related to the academic performance of student athletes were implemented by IA without a commensurate increase in campus support to fund additional positions or increase student services.

Another less publicized factor that has impacted IA's expenses is the growth in the number of student athletes. IA supports 30 men's and women's sports, more than any other school in the Pac-12 besides Stanford and four more sports than sister campus UCLA. However, there has also been a significant increase in the number of student athletes in the past ten years.<sup>2</sup> In 2006 the campus had the most student athletes in the Pac-12 (then the Pac-10) with 798 athletes. Since then the number of student athletes has grown by 15.7 percent to 923 athletes in 2015. By contrast, UCLA has stayed roughly constant at 704 athletes in 2006 and 701 athletes in 2015 and even Stanford, the second largest program in 2006 with 794 athletes only grew by 5.4 percent to 837 athletes by 2015. Whereas in 2006 the campus roughly tied Stanford for the most student athletes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> We used participation data submitted by individual schools to the US Department of Education and publicly available on their Equity in Athletics Data Analysis website (ope.ed.gov/athletics). To calculate the total number of student athletes for a given year, we combined their unduplicated counts of men's and women's participation, which controls for athletes that participate in more than one sport and prevents double or triple counting. See Appendix C for a summary of the data we extracted and used.

(798 vs. 794) in the Pac-10 conference, by 2015 the campus was by far the largest program in the Pac-12 (923 vs. number 2 Stanford with 837) even though Stanford has seven more sports teams. Other programs like the University of Southern California (USC), Colorado, Oregon State, and Utah shrank the number of athletes between 2006 and 2015. USC shrank its program by almost 20 percent, from 691 athletes in 2006 to 554 in 2015.

Growing the number of athletes considerably in ten years while controlling the relative growth in expenses better than anyone else in the Pac-12 is admirable. However, since IA had operating losses in 2006 and since revenues only grew at roughly the same rate as expenses the net operating position has not materially improved. Any serious discussion of IA's expenses would have to include consideration of the current program size, including the number of student athletes and number of sports, if the campus is reluctant to continue the level of support it currently provides to cover operating losses and debt service.

### Our Conclusion

We concur with the conclusions of the most recent Intercollegiate Athletics task force that maintaining the current size of the program, IA being responsible for the annual debt service for CMS/SCSAHP, and IA having a balanced operating and non-operating (capital) budget are three conditions that appear mutually unsustainable in the short run.

Assuming that the campus wishes to keep the current size of the program (number of student athletes and teams), the campus should plan for continuing to support IA's operating losses and shortfalls in debt service capacity for the foreseeable future. Even if the campus assumed responsibility for the debt service and reassigned the dedicated annual income stream of the ESP FFE endowment income distribution, the endowment income itself (averaging \$9-\$13 million over the last three years) is insufficient to cover the debt service and the campus would need to cover the difference. The situation becomes more serious when principal payments become due and if the FFE endowment has not grown by that time to be large enough to support the increase per the debt repayment schedule.

### **Management Response and Action Plan**

Athletics concurs with the conclusions made in this report that arriving at a balanced budget given the amount of the debt service and numbers of sports supported by Athletics is not possible without a significant increase in institutional support. Chancellor Christ has indicated to Athletics that she wants to have a balanced budget solution by 2020 and senior leadership within Athletics have already begun developing proposed solutions. Chancellor Christ has also indicated that the campus will explore potentially assuming some of the seismic portion of the debt service, recently calculated as 77 percent of the California Memorial Stadium (CMS) debt and 54 percent of the combined debt between CMS and Simpson Center for Student-Athlete High Performance. The Chancellor has also indicated that she wants to review cross-subsidies between Athletics and the rest of the campus and address inequities where Athletics might be unfairly burdened similar to how the deficit was addressed in Student Affairs. The Chancellor has not indicated what level of institutional support she considers appropriate for Athletics and understands that some of these decisions will be made after a review of the Athletics department by a consultant scheduled for this fall. Nonetheless Athletics has already begun work on balanced budgets and intends to submit

a draft of them in September that reflects the transfer of the seismic costs to the campus, reduced program scope, possible financial adjustments, and new revenue opportunities.

### **Event Planner Card Reconciliation Process**

### **Observation**

The event planner card program, similar to procurement cards, requires that the cardholder or designated reconciler log into the campus financial system (BFS) to review the card activity. They collect and review order, payment, and receipt documentation. They can also change the general ledger chartstring from a default chartstring for their card to another one so that the expense can be applied to the correct fund, org node, or other chartfield value. Once the reviewer finishes their review, BFS workflow routes the activity to a designated approver and the transaction status is updated to "verified".

Once the designated approver reviews and reconciles the documentation and charges, they approve the transactions to be posted in BFS and the transaction status is updated to "approved". This reconciliation and approval process must be completed within 15 calendar days of the staging date noted in BFS. After the 15 calendar day staging period has passed, transactions will post to the general ledger, therefore, no changes can be made to the transaction in BFS. If the reviewer completes their work step, but the approver does not, the transactions will still post to BFS after the staging period closes.

Our review of IA's event planner card transactions for FY2015-16 found that the procurement card approval process had not been completed by the designated approver for any of the cardholder's transactions. For this period, there were 177 purchase transactions totaling approximately \$310,000. Additionally, for the FY2016-17 as of May 26, 2017, the same observation applied to 96 purchase transactions totaling approximately \$152,000.

### **Management Response and Action Plan**

Immediately following our discussion of this observation, we worked with US Bank Card Program office and updated BFS system security access to be able to login and view/approve EPC card transactions in BFS. We have been regularly completing this approval progess in BFS and will continue to follow this approval process as outlined. We are also planning on shifting the cardholder role to another member of the business office to allow for a backup reconciler/approver. We expect to have this role transfer completed by the end of September 2017.

### APPENDICES

Appendix A — Pac-12 Conference, Number of Sports by School, 2017

	Men's	Sports							
8	Sponsored by	Not Sponsored	Sponsored by	Not Sponsored	Total				
	Pac-12	by Pac-12	Pac-12	by Pac-12	Sports				
Stanford	11	6	12	8	37				
California	10	4	12	4	30				
UCLA	8	4	12	2	26				
Arizona State	8	2	11	2	23				
Arizona	8	2	11	1	22				
Washington	9	1	11	1	22				
USC	7	2	10	2	21				
Oregon	7	1	9	3	20				
Utah	6	2	10	1	19				
Oregon State	. 7	1	10	[not reported by Pac-12]	18 (1)				
Colorado	5	2	7	3	17				
Washington State	6	1	9	1	17				

Notes:

<sup>(1)</sup> Total excludes women's sports not sponsored by the Pac-12 which was not reported.

Source:

Pac-12 Conference, http://pac-12.com/sports

Appendix B — USA Today, NCAA Finances, Reported Campus Subsidy to Intercollegiate Athletics, 2014-15

		T			
-				Total	
		Total	Total	Campus	
80		Revenues	Expenses	Subsidy	Subsidy as %
School (1)	Comparison Group	(in '000s)	(in '000s)	(in '000s)	of Revenue
Oregon	Pac-12	\$105,702	\$103,881	\$2,009(2)	1.90
Washington	Pac-12	103,540	104,403	3,895	3.76
UCLA	Pac-12	\$96,913	96,213	2,669	2.75
Arizona	Pac-12	87,135	80,706	8,965	10.29
California	Pac-12	85,540	94,017	1,253 <sup>(3)</sup>	1.46
Arizona State	Pac-12	84,440	83,874	19,379	22.95
Colorado	Pac-12	67,852	65,273	12,217	18.00
Oregon State	Pac-12	64,876	72,558	6,943	10.70
Utah	Pac-12	62,442	58,734	$8,800^{(4)}$	14.09
Washington State	Pac-12	54,113	67,387	6,112	11.30
UT Austin	Public Research University	183,521	173,248	0	0.00
Ohio State	Public Research University	167,166	154,033	0 <sup>(5)</sup>	0.00
Michigan – Ann	Public Research University	152,477	151,145	263	0.17
Arbor		, ,		_ 30	
Penn State	Public Research University	125,721	122,271	0	0.00
UVA	Public Research University	91,257	91,346	13,555	14.85
UNC Chapel Hill	Public Research University	89,128	89,080	9,040	10.14

### Notes:

Source: USA Today, <a href="http://sports.usatoday.com/ncaa/finances/">http://sports.usatoday.com/ncaa/finances/</a>

<sup>(1)</sup> The USA Today data does not include Stanford University and the University of Southern California

<sup>(2)</sup> Oregon: Per *USA Today*, this amount takes into account \$197,428 that the athletics department transferred back to the school and — under a 2015 change in the NCAA's reporting system — is recorded as a revenue loss. This transfer amount cannot exceed the sum of money the department received from student fees and the school: \$1,766,553.

<sup>(3)</sup> California: Per *USA Today*, this amount takes into account \$3,747,281 that the athletics department transferred back to the school and — under a 2015 change in the NCAA's reporting system — is recorded as a revenue loss. This transfer amount cannot exceed the sum of money the department received from student fees and the school: \$5,000,000.

<sup>(4)</sup> Utah: Per *USA Today*, this amount takes into account \$1,422,152 that the athletics department transferred back to the school and — under a 2015 change in the NCAA's reporting system — is recorded as a revenue loss. This transfer amount cannot exceed the sum of money the department received from student fees and the school: \$10,222,091.

<sup>(5)</sup> Ohio State: Per *USA Today*, this amount takes into account \$75,470 that the athletics department transferred back to the school and — under a 2015 change in the NCAA's reporting system — is recorded as a revenue loss. This transfer amount cannot exceed the sum of money the department received from student fees and the school: \$75,470.

Appendix C — US Department of Education, Number of Student Athletes for Selected Schools, 2006-2015 Men and Women Combined and De-duplicated for Multi-sport Athletes

10-Year Annual Average Compound Growth_	1.47%	0.92% 0.98% -0.04% -1.45% -0.43% 1.25% -0.25% 1.96% 0.18% 0.53% 2.10% -0.11%	0.3070
10-Year Change	15.7%	9.6% 10.2% -0.4% -13.6% -2.4% 21.4% 11.8% 5.4% 5.4% 5.4% 1.18% 5.4% 1.18% 5.4% 1.18% 5.4%	3.770
2015	923	584 463 701 554 355 563 454 402 533 663 837 766 1045 842	000
2014	931	520 480 760 577 340 449 417 513 632 829 829 771 1050 827	5
2013	894	488 455 834 626 336 492 449 419 527 637 839 839 837 850	610
2012	895	481 444 803 639 301 504 447 515 621 874 873 873 815	000
2011	887	518 431 760 616 327 477 477 492 685 850 853 772 783 771	140
2010	968	517 426 785 620 332 541 414 419 471 668 853 773 773 773 773 773 765 765 775	000
2009	894	521 448 755 609 609 358 412 397 484 646 646 764 764 769 709 560	110
2008	872	518 416 700 669 669 344 444 406 388 506 656 843 787 787 787 787 787 787 787 787 787 78	100
2007	882	517 448 769 649 649 475 385 396 672 818 753 765 894 702 525	ì
2006	798	533 420 691 411 412 439 651 784 849 849 851	5
Comparator Group	Pac-12	Pac-12 Pa	r dollo Moscarcii
State	CA	AZ CA AZ CA CA CO CCA CCA CCA CCA CCA CCA CCA CC	ζ,
) Institution Name	University of California-Berkeley		Cinversity of vinginia-iviality campus
US ED	110635	104151 1104179 1110662 123961 220554 220554 23639 23639 236348 243744 170976 199120 204796 214777 228778	010107

Source: US Department of Education, Equity in Athletics Data Analysis, https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/

Note: Unduplicated counts reported above control for student athletes that participate in more than one sport and thus prevents double or triple counting.

Appendix D — US Department of Education, Total Athletics Revenue for Selected Schools, 2006-2015 In Thousands

10-Year Annual Average Compound Growth Rate	3.35%	5.59% 6.02% 4.90%	3.35%	6.20% 5.51% 6.23% 8.36% 10.50% 6.03% 5.52%	2.08%	4.57%	4.50%	2.65%	2.66%	4.49%
Change	39.1%	72.3% 79.3% 61.3%	39.0%	82.5% 71.0% 83.0% 123.3% 171.5% 79.6%	64.1%	56.3%	55.3%	73.3%	73.4%	55.2%
2015	84,201	92,146 81,279 98,913	106,195	77,277 77,668 92,375 71,286 70,346 107,155	146,220	90,970	169,905	132,307	182,104	100,633
2014	85,540	83,706 85,370 96,913	105,919	67,852 72,134 85,824 66,144 64,629 103,540 109,671	132,336	85,288	170,903	127,930	179,555	87,059
2013	90,262	72,776 97,631 86,427	106,529	64,303 67,034 81,546 60,727 59,005 100,275	135,870	79,846	143,719	117,591	161,035	80,983
2012	91,815	63,771 66,328 83,927	97,802	66,327 60,193 81,374 50,154 51,793 85,073 90,490	122,742	78,141	123,605	104,751	165,691	84,403
2011	68,183	63,751 76,000 70,741	84,149	57,099 53,842 73,912 47,962 46,153 82,595 89,133	128,750	78,830	142,043	108,252	163,295	81,321
2010	65,006	55,379 58,274 66,004	75,707	60,923 50,844 85,740 40,617 38,091 70,231 81,125	122,486	71,370	131,816	116,118	150,296	78,439
2009	69,035	57,060 56,363 61,876	75,749	49,522 51,652 75,412 39,352 31,859 64,034 81,720	106,666	67,614	123,174	106,615	143,555	81,842
2008	73,355	53,298 51,823 66,178	80,151	49,860 50,211 60,284 38,294 31,777 60,576 74,695	95,193	70,153	119,860	95,978	138,459	67,141
2007	63,885	53,479 46,988 66,088	76,410	52,632 47,186 56,624 39,621 26,949 60,729 76,661	99,027	61,263	117,954	91,570	120,288	65,400
2006	60,539	53,473 45,320 61,310	76,384	42,355 45,410 50,490 31,928 25,913 59,648 65,480	89,080	58,189	109,382	76,328	105,049	64,852
Comparator Group	Pac-12	Pac-12 Pac-12 Pac-12	Pac-12	Pac-12 Pac-12 Pac-12 Pac-12 Pac-12 Pac-12	Public Research	Public Research	Public Research	Public Research	Public Research	Public Research
Institution Name	University of California- Berkeley	Arizona State University-Tempe Pac-12 University of Arizona Pac-12 University of California-Los Pac-12	University of Southern	Cantonna University of Colorado Boulder Pac-12 Oregon State University Pac-12 University of Oregon Pac-12 Washington State University Pac-12 University of Utah Pac-12 University of Washington-Seattle Pac-12 Stanford University	University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Ohio State University-Main	Pennsylvania State University- Main Campus	The University of Texas at	University of Virginia-Main Campus
US ED	110635	104151 104179 110662	123961	126614 209542 209551 236939 230764 236948 243744	170976	199120	204796	214777	228778	234076

Source: US Department of Education, Equity in Athletics Data Analysis, https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/

Appendix E — US Department of Education, Athletic Team Expenses for Selected Schools, 2006-2015 In Thousands

														10-Year Annual Average
US ED												r	10-Year	Compound Growth
ID # Institution Name	State	State Comparator Group	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		Rate
110635 University of California- Berkeley	CA	Pac-12	40,495	40,067	47,228	46,369	43,023	49,897	54,456	52,985	53,573	57,449	41.9%	3.56%
104151 Arizona State University-Tempe	AZ	Pac-12	38,502	39,195	37,918	42,380	41,521	49,963	49,930	56,293	61,869	60,554	57.3%	4.63%
104179 University of Arizona	AZ	Pac-12	22,777	23,415	30,643	31,999	48,277	65,733	55,812	82,262	48,141	53,115	133.2%	8.84%
110662 University of California-Los Angeles	CA	Pac-12	37,202	40,192	44,867	41,946	45,499	49,436	57,239	59,193	64,220	66,532	78.8%	2.99%
123961 University of Southern California	CA	Pac-12	40,480	45,415	44,771	43,670	43,290	48,501	51,074	61,457	60,578	62,065	53.3%	4.37%
126614 University of Colorado Boulder	00	Pac-12	22,757	27,151	26,365	26,402	30,709	30,324	36,540	36,443	36,282	39,373	73.0%	5.64%
209542 Oregon State University	OR	Pac-12	27,011	28,144	29,295	28,952	29,117	30,158	33,388	39,298	37,242	40,611	50.4%	4.16%
209551 University of Oregon	OR	Pac-12	30,538	32,222	34,896	39,409	40,433	43,297	45,433	45,136	49,132	54,559	78.7%	5.97%
230764 University of Utah	UT	Pac-12	18,473	18,227	20,857	21,738	24,941	29,595	31,086	33,503	41,364	48,114	160.5%	10.05%
236939 Washington State University		Pac-12	18,943	21,025	22,481	22,594	23,797	28,052	29,194	36,097	38,236	41,237	117.7%	8.09%
236948 University of Washington-Seattle	-	Pac-12	34,233	38,918	41,247	41,628	44,899	51,303	52,333	59,385	61,124	67,133	96.1%	6.97%
243744 Stanford University	CA	Pac-12	40,507	44,193	44,590	48,616	48,002	52,636	51,368	58,187	58,647	65,872	62.6%	4.98%
170976 Univiversity of Michigan-Ann Arbor	M	Public Research	42,203	45,880	48,434	48,962	56,679	60,347	63,608	70,929	77,741	87,637	107.7%	7.58%
199120 University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	NC	Public Research	34,182	33,799	37,628	36,101	38,734	41,903	43,353	45,932	50,886	56,006	63.8%	2.06%
204796 Ohio State Univiversity-Main Campus	НО	Public Research	63,781	66,894	69,101	71,172	75,209	77,228	66,773	67,246	79,196	89,262	40.0%	3.42%
214777 Pennsylvania State University- Main Campus	PA	Public Research	35,489	38,758	44,194	45,048	47,974	60,226	63,152	70,419	74,044	78,993	122.6%	8.33%
228778 The University of Texas at Austin TX 234076 Univiversity of Virginia-Main VA Campus	TX VA	Public Research Public Research	47,241 40,909	51,426 42,973	56,424 44,687	60,182 44,744	61,534 47,236	62,192 49,305	65,310 58,340	82,467 54,906	78,008 54,489	78,415 59,528	66.0% 45.5%	5.20%

Source: US Department of Education, Equity in Athletics Data Analysis, https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/

# Appendix F — US Department of Education, Athletic Non-Team Expenses for Selected Schools, 2006-2015 In Thousands

10-Year Annual Average Compound Growth	2.93%	5.68% 1.72% 2.99% 2.08% 7.63% 7.25% 6.70% 8.75% 10.79% 7.06%	3.26% 1.72% 6.21% 5.43%
10-Year_ Change	33.5%	73.8% 18.6% 34.3% 22.9% 108.7% 91.2% 131.4% 178.6% 59.0% 97.9%	45.6% 37.8% 18.6% 82.7% 69.7%
2015	26,751	26,016 21,695 32,381 44,131 35,360 37,057 36,317 17,214 30,048 26,365 46,159	34,964 62,602 43,267 76,867 40,638
2014	22,775	21,271 32,899 32,899 45,341 28,992 34,810 21,518 27,907 27,456 51,022 53,262	34,225 57,771 43,774 74,845 31,266
2013	23,462	16,306 11,012 27,234 45,072 27,861 27,861 27,863 24,317 24,631 26,712 52,054 51,902	33,587 52,822 38,353 63,518 24,584
2012	21,906	13,767 10,258 26,687 46,728 29,788 25,649 30,167 20,960 23,877 39,123	34,778 55,844 37,363 72,896 25,799
2011	17,738	13,788 9,045 21,304 23,933 22,993 22,796 26,795 16,558 19,910 22,531 36,497	36,369 39,173 33,975 67,043 25,176
2010	21,802	13,858 8,473 20,505 20,505 32,417 20,772 20,772 20,772 12,004 16,820 23,002 33,123	31,975 37,976 36,524 64,444 25,165
2009	22,666	14,680 23,164 19,229 32,189 19,757 26,250 10,121 15,452 20,013 33,104	31,275 33,762 35,213 53,770 26,126
2008	26,127	15,380 20,985 20,985 21,310 33,380 20,916 25,316 10,127 113,387 119,329 30,105	32,332 32,963 32,306 56,511 19,010
2007	23,766	13,710 20,543 25,896 31,095 21,095 24,038 8,722 15,471 18,413 30,934	27,246 32,087 40,518 49,557 22,428
2006	20,044	14,972 18,291 24,107 35,904 16,399 18,399 18,399 17,441 10,787 16,580 23,328	24,007 45,417 36,485 42,073 23,943
Comparison Group	Pac-12	Pac-12	Public Research Public Research Public Research Public Research Public Research
Institution Name	University of California-Berkeley	Arizona State University-Tempe University of Arizona University of California-Los Angeles University of Colorado Boulder Origon State University University of Oregon University of Utah Washington State University University of Washington-Seattle Stanford University	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Ohio State University-Main Campus Pennsylvania State University-Main Campus The University of Texas at Austin University of Virginia-Main Campus
US ED ID#	110635	104151 104179 110662 123961 126614 209542 209551 230764 236939 236939 236938 243744	204796 214777 228778 234076

Source: US Department of Education, Equity in Athletics Data Analysis, https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/

Appendix G — US Department of Education, Athletic Team Revenue by Selected Sport, 2015 In Thousands, Men's, Women's and Coed Teams Combined by Sport

ОТНЕК SPORTS	643	1 1 1 1	152	, ,	6 '	1 1
MATER POLO	1,137	180 - 558 1,470	630	50	I I	T T
NOLLEYBALL	1,674	360 433 762 2,741	555 1,912 467 205 910 734 603	161 674	367 1,599	1,798
LENNIS	1,759	164 525 1,035 1,974	163 - 121 125 612 719 326	104	189	462
VND DIAING RMIWWING	1,954	331 909 452 2,321	219	189	1,367	1,421
SOFTBALL	1,479	674 698 903	1,395 700 278 - 726	376 496	188	674 706
SOCCER	1,370	199 485 1,064 1,740	2,247 221 198 1,075 733	142	466 1,322	665
KOMING	2,688	121	1,626 1,164 1,291 809	76 103	77	269
LACROSSE	622	1,491	533	187	1,001	2,016
GYMNASTICS	1,201	143 261 1,013	1,642 108 644 - 413 368	252 585	238	1 1
GOLF	1,047	550 454 851 1,513	437 1,078 275 81 624 833 882	128 591	182 548	611
FOOTBALL	41,527	42,892 41,388 38,548 51,240	37,545 32,942 66,576 47,686 34,458 69,134 43,745	97,150 40,523	86,646 75,463	127,465 27,931
HOCKEA EIELD	1,126	1111	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	75	102	-
TRACK (ALL)	1,394	619 1,022 529 -	639 1,162 1,047 - 1,743 878 905	159	143	1,125
NOFFEABALE BEACH	136	94 419 144 585	115	1 1	1 1	1 1
BASKETBALL	11,690	7,926 22,283 12,700 7,658	8,730 9,222 9,527 9,137 8,089 11,499 26,891	17,105	20,951 12,339	19,947 11,360
ВУЗЕВУГГ	1,554	1,476 1,022 976 1,916	2,835 1,047 268 1,097 522 799	335	448 759	5,399
State	CA	AZ AZ CA	CO OR OR UT WA WA	NC MI	OH PA	XX VA
US ED Institution Name	110635 University of California-Berkeley	104151 Arizona State University-Tempe 104179 University of Arizona 110662 University of California-Los Angeles 123961 University of Southern California	126614 University of Colorado Boulder 209542 Oregon State University 209551 University of Oregon 230764 University of Utah 236939 Washington State University 236948 University of Washington-Seattle 243744 Stanford University	170976 University of Michigan-Ann Arbor 199120 University of North Carolina at Chapel 1331	204796 Ohio State University-Main Campus 214777 Pennsylvania State University-Main	228778 The University of Texas at Austin 234076 University of Virginia-Main Campus

Source: US Department of Education, Equity in Athletics Data Analysis, https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/

Appendix H — US Department of Education, Athletic Team Expense by Selected Sport, 2015 In Thousands, Men's, Women's and Coed Teams Combined by Sport

OTHER SPORTS	1,069	ı			1		1	,			398	1 I	287	i 1
MATER POLO	1,524	1,073	1001	1,782		<u>-</u> -	<u>-</u> -	ī	·····		1,622	1,246	1 1	TT
AOFFEKBYFF	1,674	1,531	1,344	2,769	1,862	1,912	1,977	1,319	1,721	2,246	2,539	1,746	2,898	3,492
LENNIS	1,466	962	1,465	2,720	899	T	1,549	1,374	1,014	2,028	2,155	1,994	1,867	2,260
VAD DIVING SWIMMING	2,667	2,748	2,541	2,682	· ·	·····i	1	2,063			2,690	3,694	2,515	5,154
SOFTBALL	1,479	1,741	1,721	1,020	ī	1,395	2,047	1,449	····	2,519	1,346	2,393	1,485	2,070
ЗОССЕК	2,039	1,378	1,318	1.757	1,805	2,247	1,515	1,237	1,845	3,439	3,018	3,103	2,824 2,845	2,410
ROWING	2,996	ı	1 250	1.957	ı	1,626		1	1,778	4,562	2,732	2,427	1,966	2,797
LACROSSE	622	ı	ı	1.491	1,248	1	1,452	•	•	1	1,314	3,866	3,666	3,007
GYMNASTICS	1,261	1,433	1,087	1, 1	1	1,642	1,112	2,504	•	1,633	2,377	2,952	2,351	T T
COLF	1,386	1,796	1,263	1,694	1,380	1,078	1,768	452	1,357	2,271	1,777	1,439	1,322	2,294
FOOTBALL	1,126 22,079	26,602	21,400	31,186	18,372	15,746	23,768	22,045	18,431	31,811	23,724	36,598 23,461	37,378 36,163	30,269 20,333
HOCKEA EIELD		ı	1	ī	ı	1	ī	ī	ī	1	1,380	1,605	1,140	1,256
TRACK (ALL)	2,340	3,277	3,640	)	2,667	1,162	5,442	1	3,269	3,882	3,968	4,579	2,982	6,294
AOFFEABAFF BEACH	136	288	822	999	ī	'	38	1	ï	19	. 167	1 1	1 1	× 1 1
BASKETBALL	12,032	9,736	17 053				_	11,185		088'6	10,275	12,621	14,177 10,250	15,559 12,921
BYZEBYTT	1,552	3,732	1,978	2,023		2,835	2,863	1,769	2,422	2,803	2,184	2,382	2,152	5,816
	CA	AZ	Z Z		00	OR	OR	UT	WA	WA	CA	$\stackrel{\rm M}{\sim}$	OH PA	TX s
	110635 University of California-Berkeley	104151 Arizona State University-Tempe	1041/9 University of Arizona	123961 University of Southern California	126614 University of Colorado Boulder	209542 Oregon State University	209551 University of Oregon	230764 University of Utah	236939 Washington State University	236948 University of Washington-Seattle	Campus 243744 Stanford University	170976 University of Michigan-Ann Arbor 199120 University of North Carolina at Chanel Hill	204796 Ohio State University-Main Campus 214777 Pennsylvania State University-Main	Campus 228778 The University of Texas at Austin 234076 University of Virginia-Main Campus

Source: US Department of Education, Equity in Athletics Data Analysis, https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/

Appendix I — US Department of Education, Athletic Team Net Revenue by Selected Sport, 2015 In Thousands, Men's, Women's and Coed Teams Combined by Sport

e n	TOTAL FOR SPORTS	15,551	(688) 16,785 (6,878)	18,147 11,623 17,532	25,569	20,410 14,029	33,844 18,278	34,511	29,341	81,421 (3,954)
	ОТНЕК ЅРОКТЅ	(426)			1 1	. (246)	1 1	(278)	'	1 1
	WATER POLO	(388)	(894)	(335)	, ,	(992)	(1,196)	ı	ī	1 1
	AOFFEABALL	T	(1,171) (911) (2,256)	(28)	じじ	(1,512) (1,512) (1,936)	(1,585)	(2,532)	(1,431)	(1,694)
	LENNIS	293	(797) (940) (1,392)	(313)		(402) (1,309) (1,830)	(1,890)	(1,678)	(870)	(1,798)
	VND DIAING SMIWWING	(714)	(2,417) (1,632) (1,088)	(361)	(1,844)	(2,349)	(3,504)	············	(1,148)	(3,733)
	SOFTBALL	1	(1,067) (1,023) (918)	1 1 1	(1,346)	(1,792) (1,135)	(2,961) (2,017) (1,025) (560)	(1,297)	(705)	(1,396)
ñ	SOCCER	(699)	(1,179) (832) (2,499)	(1,103)	(1,039)	(2,706)	(2,961)	(1,889) (2,359)	(1,522)	(1,744)
	KOMING	(308)	(1,237)	(39)	1 1 6	(3,271)	(2,352)		ı	(588)
	LACROSSE	ı	1 1 1	(715)	(1,339)	(1,194)	(3,679)	(1,139) (2,113) (2,665)	(1,507)	(066)
	GYMNASTICS	(61)	(1,290) (826) (1,438)		(1,004)	(1,220)	(2,700)	(2,113)	(1,189)	T T
,	COLF	(339)	(1,246) (809) (1,114)	(181) (943)	(1,493)	(1,438) (895)	(1,310)	(1,139)	(595)	(1,683)
	FOOŢBALL	19,448	16,290 19,989 11,813	20,054 19,172	42,808	37,323 20,020	60,552 17,062	49,268	39,299	97,196
	LIEFD HOCKEA	ı	1 1 1		1 1	(1,194)	(1,530) (548)	(1,038)	(616)	(479)
	TRACK (ALL)	(946)	(2,658) (2,618) (3,049)	(2,028)	(4,395)	(1,329) (3,004) (3,062)	- (4,420)	(2,839)	(1,770)	- (5,170)
	AOFFEABAFF BEACH	1	(193) (402) (291)	(81)		. (157)	ıı	ı	1	1 1
	BASKETBALL	(342)	(1,810) 7,745 (253)	(446) (718) 336	(1,504)	1,619 16,616	4,484	6,774	2,089	4,388
	BYZEBYLL	7	(2,256) (956) (1,931)	(106)	(1,817) (1,504) (1,501) (2,047)	(1,324) (2,280) (1,385)	(2,047)	(1,704)	(724)	(1,895)
		110635 University of California- Berkeley	104151 Arizona State University-Tempe 104179 University of Arizona 110662 University of California-Los Anoeles	University of Southern California University of Colorado Boulder Orecon State University	University of Oregon University of Utah	washington state Oniversity University of Washington-Seattle Stanford University	170976 University of Michigan-Ann Arbor (2,047) 199120 University of North Carolina at (1,484)	Onio State University-Main	Campus Pennsylvania State University- Main Campus	228778 The University of Texas at Austin 234076 University of Virginia-Main Campus
	. *	110635 U <sub>1</sub>	104151 Ar 104179 Ur 110662 Ur	123961 Ur 126614 Ur 209542 Or			170976 U <sub>1</sub> 199120 U <sub>1</sub>	204796 OF	214777 Pe	228778 Th 234076 Ur Ca

Source: US Department of Education, Equity in Athletics Data Analysis, https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/

# Appendix J — Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, Compilation of Statements of Operating Revenues and Expenses, FY2002-2016

(Dollars in thousands) Operating Revenues

(Donats in thousands)															
Operating Accentures	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	681,6	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/Government Support	1	,	4	ı	1	,		1	ı	. 1	. 1	ı	1	'	,
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	,		1	1	1	ı	,	ı	ì	ı	1	1	1	61	23
Media Rights	,	ı	. 1	ı	1	,	,	1	ı	l	1	1	1	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
1 V/Naturo/internet rogins	2,037	2,743	107	0110	93	, ,		i c	: (	1 1	1 3	1	1	1	1
Athletic Privilege Cards	134	499	88/	403	400	465	/84	/88	737	1,591	699	1,196	1,325	649	203
Sponsorehine/Roughties	Ì	7	7330						1 0		, (	, ,			
Sports Comme	1	,	2,004	4,144	4,5//	5,046	0,3/4	6,404	196,9	8,432	7,204	6,972	9,469	9,548	8,789
Sports Camps	- 1		1,62,1	1,449	1,616	1,805	2,021	2,534	2,236	1,510	1,700	1,389	638	-	ı
Pour Come Boronie	1,557	1,428	1,039	1,626	1,600	1,751	7,526	2,888	8,330	7,250	5,885	11,488	13,359	9,193	11,135
Down Callie Acvellue	6,134	5,004		0,0	. 0		100	- 0	, (	, ,	,				780
Total Operating Revenues	30.161	34.634	39.599	45.786	48 444	61 451	706,7	71 150	977	65 343	403	841	939	1,855	1,366
Operating Expenses	Tarkas	10011	22,000	00767	ann'or	101,10	04,240	001,17	07,50	C+7*C0	100,104	1,616,17	707,06	/87,68	80,204
Condens Aid	7007	C C C	, ,		00.0										
Student Ald	4,984	2,782	6,186	8,043	8,402	8,447	8,997	9,957	11,131	8,899	10,053	10,001	9,865	989'6	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	,	1	,	1	,	,	,	•	,	,	1	,	ŧ
Severance Payments	,	,	10	17	27	1	16	82	1	4	5	2,115	2,403	2,291	23
Recruiting	49	53	9	v	7	77	4	_	1,006	6	928	912	1,143	1,265	9
Films	_	∞	657	699	683	0	741	838	,	945	,	•	1	. 1	1,308
Team Travel	127	375	1	,	1	1	1	,	4,868	,	6,447	5,588	6,117	6,150	. '
Equipment/Uniform/Supplies Game	3,478	3,689	3,679	3,843	3,914	4,985	4,669	5,503	1,934	5,176	1,708	1,898	3,203	3,137	7,225
Expenses	2,384	2,518	2,159	2,317	2,802	2,203	1,534	2,433	2,975	1,758	1,499	3,619	3,603	3,766	2,929
Fundraising/Marketing/Promotion		1	1,655	1,747	1,884	2,305	2,356	3,210	3,246	2,760	3,008	3,879	4,172	4,228	4,055
Telephone	34	1,040	2,227	4,120	2,598	2,747	2,634	2,740	1	3,110	,	ı	,	,	3,558
Entertainment	9	411	•	,		1	1	,	1	1	,	1	1	,	,
Campus Administration	557	384	,	,			•	t	,		1	1	1	,	,
Interest Expense Sports	441	664	1	,		,		,	,	1	,	1	,	,	'
Camps	285	401	,	1	1	,	,	'	1,417	1	83	95.	35	p=1	'
Maintenance and General	225	ı	54	69	179	98	1,152	1,204	1	74	3	0	0	p=1	-
Direct Facilities Cost	1	7,072	7	6	4	e	,	,	4,018	4	1	1	•	,	,
Direct Support to University	7,260	,		r			4,981	4,318	1	1	2,111	3,747	4,446	6,031	4,897
Indirect Support	1 -		1,834	2,545	2,318	3,656			, '	1,922		i	•	,	1
Medical Expenses and Insurance		, '	1 152				, "	, «	~ 0	1	. :	, ,	, ,	1 ,	, ç
Memberships/Dues	,	24	1	24	12		0 00	, 4	1 572	, «	- 0	± c	 t o	Ξ ,	2 6
Team Meal Expenses Bowl	22	ဇာ	,	_	9	7	1,366	1,122	1,041	) -	1.393	1.231	1.430	1.583	2 669
Game Expenses Transfers to	_	,		1,122	1,063	911	44	51	. '	1,170	1,548	1,468	49	51	77
Institution Other Operating	1	•	1	43	47	80	1	ı	•	1,435	1	, ,	ı	,	930
Expenses	1		1	-	-	,	ı	1	1	1	1	ı	ı	,	1,040
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)	t	992	549	15,453	13,816	9,192	(2,547)
Non-Operating Revene — Capital		,	•	,							3 000				
Non-Operating Expenses — Capital		,	1	,	1	,	,	: 1		28			. 916		£10
Loan repayment and/or Debt Service				1		,	,	,	,	557	87	15.384	9	213	18 562
Proceeds from Debt Issuance		•	•			,	•		1						
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over Expenditures	(6.146)	(4.408)	(8,568)	(7.888)	(87.6.5)		15	(1 580)		161	137	1 401	(046 67	027 07	1000
and the second of the second o	("Tx(")	(aartr)	(anota)	(cood)	(0)460)	_	10	(40001)		101	1 / 61	1,401	(3,529)	(8,4/6)	(21,728)

Source: Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, Statement of Operating Revenues and Expenses, Fiscal Years Ending 2002-2016