

NCAA Div III Athletics at UC Santa Cruz

Report of the Ad Hoc Task Force of the
UC Santa Cruz Foundation and the
UC Santa Cruz Alumni Association

Approved January 2017; finalized October 2017

INTRODUCTION¹

The UC Santa Cruz NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics program (“intercollegiate athletics program,” “athletics program,” or “program”) was founded in 1980 upon the initiative of UCSC students then competing in the club sports program.² Over the years, the athletics program has had many successes,³ but has also faced significant funding challenges, most notably since the budget crisis hit California with particular force in FY08.^{4,5}

In December 2008, the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs appointed a task force to advise her on the future of NCAA Division III athletics at UC Santa Cruz (the “2008 Task Force”), citing among other things significant budgetary and programmatic challenges to the Office of Physical Education, Recreation and Sports (“OPERS”) and the Athletics Department in the previous year.⁶ The 2008 Task Force issued its report, titled “Opportunities in Athletics,” in June 2010 (“June 2010 Report”). The report is attached as Appendix A. The 2008 Task Force made a number of findings and recommendations, some repeated in this report, but did not specifically address alternative funding sources.

Expenses for the program in FY08, when UC Santa Cruz sponsored 14 teams,⁷ were \$1.123M.⁸ The “permanent budget” for the year consisted of \$394K, all from Regent-mandated and campus-based student fees. Other revenues included approximately \$200K in donations, \$40K from Student Affairs, and \$100K in “matching funds” from the Chancellor.^{9,10} In contrast, expenses for the program in FY16 were \$1.968M (an increase of more than 75%), and revenues for the year included \$470K from student fees (an increase of less than 20%), \$209K in donations (roughly flat to FY08), \$81K in program revenues

¹ We set out detailed information in the first two sections of this report to insure that the facts on which we have relied in making our findings and coming to our recommendations are stated for the record correctly and completely. We have cited primary sources where available to us, and otherwise secondary source material that we believe to be authoritative.

² See <https://www.ucsc.edu/about/mascot.html> for a thumbnail history of intercollegiate athletics at UC Santa Cruz as seen through the eyes of the campus mascot.

³ See, i.e., “62 Reasons to Vote Yes on Measure 62” published by OPERS in connection with the Measure 62 “Save Our Sammy” campaign at <https://opers.ucsc.edu/archived%20pages/saveoursammy/62reasons.html>.

⁴ See, i.e., “Budget Crisis: A Timeline,” published by SFGATE on November 16, 2010, at <http://www.sfgate.com/politics/article/Budget-crisis-A-timeline-3245745.php>; see, also, Kevin O’Leary, “California’s Crisis Hits its Prized Universities,” published by *Time* on July 18, 2009, at <http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1911455,00.html>.

⁵ The UC system operates on a July 1 – June 30 fiscal year calendar. Throughout this report, FYXX refers to the fiscal year ended June 30, 20XX.

⁶ See December 15, 2008, letter from then Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Felicia McGinty, to prospective task force members attached as Appendix A to the June 2010 report of The Task Force on the Future of Intercollegiate Athletics, “Opportunities in Athletics.”

⁷ See June 2010 Report in the table at page 5 of the report.

⁸ *Ibid.* at page 12 of Appendix A to the report.

⁹ *Ibid.* at pages 24-25 of the report.

¹⁰ It is not clear from the June 2010 Report how the balance of the budget was funded or if the deficit was simply carried forward to the following year, but it does appear that the program operated at a significant deficit because one sport (water polo) was eliminated and other cost-saving measures were taken in the period (see the above-referenced December 15, 2008, letter from Felicia McGinty); see, also, the reference to twelve rather than fourteen sports for FY10 at page 21 of the June 2010 report.

(again, likely about flat to FY08), and a \$1M contribution from central campus funds,¹¹ an amount ten times the FY08 figure and almost double the \$506K median contribution by public Division III (without football) member institutions to intercollegiate athletics in FY15 (the latest year for which figures are available).¹²

It is not practicable to depend on an outsized contribution from UC Santa Cruz central campus funds to support the intercollegiate athletics program in light of the continuing decline of state support for the University of California and the resulting demands on central campus funds to finance core operations. Moreover, despite the sizeable contribution from central campus funds, the athletics program operated at a \$103K deficit in FY16 (even despite a positive carry-forward of \$106K from the prior year) and had projected a deficit of \$600K for the FY17 year.¹³

Concerned with the future of the athletics program, the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate, at its regular Winter 2016 meeting, approved the creation of a Special Committee on Athletics (“SCA”) to provide the Senate with “a report on the values and impacts of having/not-having an NCAA athletic program at UCSC, as regards faculty, students, and the overall university.”¹⁴

Shortly thereafter, at their joint lunch meeting on February 20, 2016, Chancellor George Blumenthal invited the boards of the UC Santa Cruz Foundation and the Alumni Association to form a task force to advise him on whether to continue participation in NCAA Division III athletics at UC Santa Cruz; if so, how to fund it; and, if not, what to consider in its stead. This report will document the proceedings of the joint task force and set forth its findings and recommendations.

BACKGROUND

The UC Santa Cruz athletics program is currently funded in the main by an allocation of the Regent-mandated UC-wide Student Services Fee and a significant contribution from central campus funds. See Appendix B. A portion of the campus-wide Measure 7 Student Programs Fee,¹⁵ enacted in 2003 to mitigate the impact of a state budget reduction targeted at student services,¹⁶ has also been allocated to the athletics program.¹⁷ In addition, in 2007, students enacted Measure 31, a \$5/quarter Intercollegiate

¹¹ See financial statements for the athletics program for FY14 – FY16 prepared by OPERS and updated December 1, 2016, to include audited results for FY16. The financial statements are attached hereto as Appendix B.

¹² Information generated by the NCAA Institutional Performance Program Data Management System accessible by NCAA member schools.

¹³ See worksheet entitled “FY2014-16 Actuals and FY2017 Proj,” attached as Appendix C, which was taken from the Microsoft Excel® workbook “Ath Bdgt Data FY 2014-16 and DII&DIII Proj 8-19-2016” prepared by OPERS.

¹⁴ Item 11.a. of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate held on February 12, 2016, published at <https://senate.ucsc.edu/senate-meetings/minutes/Minutes%20New%20PDFs/minutes%202-12-2106%20final.pdf>.

¹⁵ See <https://studentservices.ucsc.edu/business/student-fees/fee-descriptions.html> for a description of campus-based fees at UC Santa Cruz and their dates of enactment; see, also, <https://deanofstudents.ucsc.edu/elections/pdf/stdnt-program-fee-2003.pdf> for the ballot content of Measure 7, UCSC Student Programs Fee.

¹⁶ December 12, 2003, letter from the Student Fee Advisory Committee to multiple campus addressees regarding revised 2003-2004 Registration Fee recommendations, published under the auspices of the Dean of Students at <https://deanofstudents.ucsc.edu/get-involved/sfac/sfac-docs/sfac-funding-recommendations12-12-03.pdf>, at page two.

¹⁷ See June 2010 Report at page 24; see, also, Appendix B.

Athletics Sports Team Fee.¹⁸ Allocations of the Student Services Fee and the Measure 7 Student Programs Fee to the athletics program, together with the Intercollegiate Athletics Sports Team Fee and \$1K in proceeds from the Men's Tennis Program Endowment Fund, generated a total of approximately \$426K in revenue in FY14, \$497K in FY15, and \$470K in FY16.¹⁹

As mentioned above, the contribution required from central campus funds to fund program expenses has escalated significantly in recent years. In the years FY11 through FY14, as reported to the NCAA in accordance with NCAA guidelines, direct institutional support of the UC Santa Cruz Division III athletics program was \$282K, \$170K, \$282K, and \$158K, respectively.²⁰ Following the decision to significantly increase compensation for both head coaches and assistant coaches, effective in FY15, the annual commitment was temporarily hiked to \$1M for FY15 through FY17 on the understanding that, by FY18, the athletics program would develop a sustainable business model and identify adequate source(s) of funding or face termination.²¹

The athletics program budget is augmented (or, in the case of a deficit, decremented) by any carry-forward balances from prior years, ticket sales, Sammy-the-Slug appearance fees, NCAA conference distributions, game guarantees, summer camp revenues and, most significantly, donations from participants, former participants, their coaches, families and supporters.

All told, athletics program revenues were \$1.091M in FY14, \$1.807M in FY15, and \$1.759M in FY16. Expenses, however, were \$1.139M in FY14, \$1.735M in FY15, and \$1.968M in FY16. See Appendix B. Despite the increase in the campus contribution to \$1M, the athletics program operated at a \$209K deficit in FY16 (when taking into account the \$106K surplus from the previous year) that was then projected by the athletics director to grow to over \$600K in FY17. See Appendix C.

In the spring of 2015, the athletics program submitted a referendum proposing a new student fee of \$117/quarter that, together with existing student fees, would have provided about \$4.0M to the athletics program in its first year, offsetting any need for a contribution from central campus funds.²² The referendum was soundly defeated, with 60.33% opposing the measure.²³ In the spring of 2016, the athletics program proposed a revised business model to be funded by a student fee of \$90/quarter that also would have obviated any need for a contribution from central campus funds. This proposal, which

¹⁸ See <https://studentservices.ucsc.edu/business/student-fees/fee-descriptions.html> for a description of campus-based fees at UC Santa Cruz and their dates of enactment; and see <https://deanofstudents.ucsc.edu/elections/pdf/athletics-funding-2007.pdf> for the ballot content of Measure 31, Intercollegiate Athletics Sports Team Fee.

¹⁹ See Appendix B.

²⁰ Information generated by the NCAA Institutional Performance Program Data Management System accessible by NCAA member schools.

²¹ See the October 31, 2016, letter from Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Alison Galloway to Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Mary Knudtson, attached as Appendix D; see, also, Jake Donahue, "UCSC NCAA Sports to be Eliminated if Referendum Fails," published by *City-on-a-Hill Press* on February 26, 2015, at <http://www.cityonahillpress.com/2015/02/26/ucsc-ncaa-sports-to-be-eliminated-if-referendum-fails/>.

²² The ballot content of Measure 62, Athletics Operations Enhancement Fee, is published under the auspices of the Dean of Students at <https://deanofstudents.ucsc.edu/elections/pdf/2015/measures.pdf>; see, also, materials published by OPERS in connection with the spring 2015 Measure 62 "Save Our Sammy" campaign at <https://opers.ucsc.edu/archived%20pages/saveoursammy/index.html>.

²³ The results of the spring 2015 election are published under the auspices of the Dean of Students at <https://deanofstudents.ucsc.edu/elections/pdf/2015/2015-elections-results.pdf>.

was framed as an opinion poll on the future of athletics at UC Santa Cruz, passed with 63.5% of the vote,²⁴ a number still short of the 66% necessary to pass a new student fee.

In April 2016, the Special Committee on Athletics submitted an interim report to the Academic Senate (“SCA Interim Report”),²⁵ recommending that, irrespective of the outcome of the Spring 2016 student opinion poll, the “Academic Senate advise the administration to take the next year to further consider how the campus can develop a sustainable model for student athletics that incorporates the needs and wishes of all its stakeholders – foremost students, but also faculty, alumni and the community,” and offering to extend its activities through the 2016-2017 academic year to work with the administration and other constituencies to achieve this goal.²⁶

TASK FORCE DELIBERATIONS

The NCAA Division III Ad Hoc Task Force of the UC Santa Cruz Foundation and the Alumni Association (“2016 Joint Task Force,” “Joint Task Force” or “Task Force”) was assembled in April 2016. Members of the Task Force were Foundation Trustees Mary Doyle (who served as chair), Paul Hall, Rob Holo, David Korduner and Loren Steck together with Alumni Council members Charlie Eadie and Paul Simpson. Keith Brant, Vice Chancellor of University Relations, and Sheila Bergman, Director of the UC Santa Cruz Foundation, also participated in deliberations of the Task Force, and Susan Pearson, Administrative Coordinator for the Foundation, attended and recorded the proceedings.

Following its initial teleconference on May 2, 2016, the Joint Task Force was provided voluminous materials for review, including the June 2010 Report of the 2008 Task Force; the 2015-2016 edition of the “UC Santa Cruz Budget – A Bird’s Eye View,” prepared by the UCSC Office of Planning & Budget;²⁷ a compendium of UC Santa Cruz registration fees for graduate and undergraduate students prepared by the UCSC Office of the Registrar and updated through July 14, 2015;²⁸ an NCAA report dated September 2015 and titled “Revenue & Expenses 2004-2014: NCAA Division III Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Report”;²⁹ an NCAA Research presentation dated September 2015 and titled “Eleven-Year Trends in Division III Athletics Finances;”³⁰ the Spring 2016 athletics opinion poll³¹ and associated documents; the SCA Interim Report; and extensive budgetary and other materials.

²⁴ The results of the spring 2016 election are published under the auspices of the Dean of Students at <https://deanofstudents.ucsc.edu/elections/pdf/2016/campus-elections-results.pdf>.

²⁵ A copy of the SCA Interim Report may be viewed at <https://senate.ucsc.edu/senate-meetings/agendas-minutes/2015-2016/2016-May-18-Meeting/1828%20-%20SCDF%2016%20Rpt%20for%20Senate%20CALL%20.pdf>.

²⁶ The Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate of May 18, 2016, can be viewed at <https://senate.ucsc.edu/senate-meetings/agendas-minutes/2015-2016/2016-May-18-Meeting/Minutes%2005-18-16.pdf>.

²⁷ The 2015-16 version of the “UC Santa Cruz Budget – A Bird’s Eye View,” prepared by the UCSC Office of Planning & Budget, can be viewed at <https://planning.ucsc.edu/budget/reports-overviews/pdfs-images/profile2015.pdf>.

²⁸ A list of the 2015-2016 UC Santa Cruz Registration Fees, updated through July 14, 2015, can be viewed at <https://registrar.ucsc.edu/fees/archive/registration-15-16/undergraduate-student-fees-15-16.html#undergraduate-fees>.

²⁹ This report is published by NCAA at <http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/2015%20Division%20III%20RE%20report.pdf>.

³⁰ An updated version of this report, titled “Twelve-Year Trends in Division III Athletics Finances,” is published by NCAA at <http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/2016DIII%20Twelve-Year-Finances%20161117.pdf>.

³¹ The spring 2016 athletics poll was published under the auspices of the Dean of Students at <https://deanofstudents.ucsc.edu/elections/pdf/2016/athletics-opinion-poll.pdf>.

Joint Task Force member Paul Simpson (B.A., Business Management Economics, UCSC '02; M.B.A., U.C. Berkeley Walter A. Haas School of Business, '14) had also been a member of the 2008 Task Force. He shared their June 2010 Report, referenced above, and other pertinent information.

At its next four meetings from May 11 through June 29, 2016, the Joint Task Force heard directly from Peggy Delaney, Vice Chancellor of Budget & Planning; Andrea Willer, Executive Director of OPERS; Cliff Dochterman, Director of Athletics, Sports Clubs and Intramurals; student athletes Emily Albaugh, Vernon Wetzell, and Kristin White; outgoing SUA president Julie Foster; Aykezar Adil, Chair of the Student Fee Advisory Committee ("SFAC"); students Maricela Sagarnaga-Guillean, referred by the Chicano/Latino Resource Center, and Crystal Scherr, referred by the African American Resource and Cultural Center; and Earl Edwards, the Director of Athletics at UC San Diego.³² In preparation for these meetings and to better understand the issues and relevant campus processes, Mary Doyle spoke separately with Peggy Delaney, Andrea Willer and Cliff Dochterman, several student athletes, Lucy Rojas (Interim Dean of Students), David Machuca (Member, SFAC), and Xavier Prochaska (Chair, SFA), and met with the SFA on June 1.³³ The information obtained during these conversations was summarized for the 2016 Joint Task Force at the aforementioned meetings.

At the direction of the Joint Task Force, Paul Simpson and Mary Doyle conducted further research into the budget and budget projections for the athletics program and best practices in NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics programs. They confirmed the funding sources and amounts for the athletics program (set forth in the Background section above), and worked with Andrea Willer and Lela Vasquez (Business Manager for OPERS) to prepare financial statements for fiscal years FY14 – FY16 in a user-friendly format to facilitate evaluation and review by students and other interested stakeholders and to enable apples-to-apples comparisons with other Division III programs that report their information to the NCAA in a similar format. The result of their work is embodied in the financial statements attached as Appendix B. Paul and Mary also collaborated with Andrea and Lela to gain access to additional NCAA research, as well as to Southern California Intercollegiate Athletics Conference data and information reported on the federal Equity in Athletics Data Analysis website.

The Joint Task Force met again on September 26, 2016, to review work of the Task Force to date, to hear a summary of the activities to date of the SCA, to get an overview of the campus elections timeline for FY17, and to review the new, user-friendly financial statements for FY14 – FY16 in detail. Xavier Prochaska as well as Andrea Willer and Lela Vasquez joined the call.

Thereafter, Paul Simpson and/or Mary Doyle continued to attend meetings of the SCA, including the meeting of October 5, where Andrea Willer and Paul Simpson were invited to present the new form of the FY14 – FY16 financial statements for athletics, and to discuss the contents and projections for coming years; the meeting of October 19, where head coaches Ron DuBois (men's basketball), Jamie Harris (track and field), and Amy Jensen (women's tennis) joined the meeting to discuss general concerns of the coaches, the impact of coaches on students and student life, the role of assistant coaches in and beyond athletics, and student athlete concerns; and the meeting of October 26, where

³² Mr. Edwards forwarded to members of the Joint Task Force copies of UC San Diego's March 11, 2011, "Feasibility Study (Options for Reclassifying to NCAA Division I & Adding Football)" for their reference. He also offered his further assistance to UC Santa Cruz in these deliberations.

³³ On June 1, 2016, Xavier Prochaska and the SCA invited a representative of the Joint Task Force to attend meetings of the SCA as observers, and a representative of the SCA in turn was invited to attend each subsequent meeting of the Task Force.

the SCA discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the NCAA Division III and Division II programs vis-à-vis UC Santa Cruz.³⁴ In addition, Paul Simpson attended the October 19 Town Hall to gather student feedback.

On October 25, 2016, Linda Rhoads, Chief of Staff to the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, together with UCOP lead auditor Ben Wong and UC Santa Cruz auditors Barry Long and Frank Beahan, met with Xavier Prochaska, Andrea Willer, Lela Vasquez, Mary Doyle and Paul Simpson to share the results of a financial review of OPERS, including athletics, conducted over the summer. In their September 2016 report, the auditors concluded, *inter alia*, that, based on projected expenses for FY17, “the cost to operate the Athletics program at break-even could be funded if a new student annual fee of \$139 [or \$46.33/quarter] were enacted in addition to the existing \$15 annual Intercollegiate Athletics Sports Team Fee.”³⁵ The auditors’ reconciliation of fee and cost projections at Tables 11 and 12 in Appendix B-5 to their report (Reconciliation of Fee Proposal and Costs OPERS Athletics) indicates that no contribution from central campus funds would have been required to achieve total funding of over \$2.3M for FY17.³⁶ The auditors also appeared to give implicit support to the adequacy of a \$2.3M budget in view of historic spend.³⁷

In November 2016, the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor retained Paul Simpson as a consultant to work with OPERS to develop a sustainable business model for the athletics program anchored in NCAA best practices; to create a viable staffing model (including job descriptions and definitions of roles/responsibilities); to explore revenue opportunities for the program; to partner with the campus community to structure a campus-based student fee proposal and accompanying referendum; to plan and assist OPERS in conducting a campaign for the referendum; and to assist OPERS in a number of business process reengineering efforts, including development of policies, procedures and best practices for business operations, compliance, athletic training, and a restructured summer camp program. Paul kept OPERS and administration leadership, as well as the SCA and the Joint Task Force, advised of his efforts, and actively collaborated with Xavier Prochaska and Mary Doyle as well as many others in the campus community to structure the referendum proposal.

³⁴ There was some sentiment among Joint Task Force members that UC Santa Cruz is a closer peer in terms at least of size and public/private status to NCAA Division II schools, many of which are in California (including, at the time, UC San Diego, CSU Monterey Bay and 11 other CSU schools). Advantages to joining Division II include an increase in the competition level, an increase in in-state and on-campus games (and, consequently, attendance at the games), and an associated reduction in travel expense. See discussion in June 2010 Report at page 31. However, certain Division II requirements may be considered by some to be antithetical to UC Santa Cruz values (foremost among them athletic scholarships). In any case, participation in Division II is likely to be significantly more costly than participation in Division III. See June 2010 Report at page 32. The Joint Task Force therefore concurred with the conclusions in the June 2010 Report to the effect that, before UC Santa Cruz considers a move to Division II, the athletics program must demonstrate not only that it is competitive at Division III, but that it can sustain financial viability at this level. See June 2010 Report at page 31. The Joint Task Force also considered a move to the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) and retrenchment to club sports only. For substantially the same reasons set forth at pages 28-29 of the June 2010 Report, the Joint Task Force did not find these the best options available to the University.

³⁵ Management Advisory Service, “Office of Physical Education, Recreation & Sports (OPERS) Financial Review,” Report No. SC -17-50 (September 2016) at page 3.

³⁶ *Ibid.* at page 16.

³⁷ *Ibid.* at page 3.

Members of the Joint Task Force met on January 23, 2017, and on January 30, 2017,³⁸ to review progress to date, to review the description of and rationale for the first iteration of the referendum language submitted for the spring 2017 campus ballot, and to discuss its findings and recommendations. Prior to the meeting, the SCA Interim Report and a December 2016 draft (v2.0.2) of the Final Report of the SCA to the Academic Senate (“SCA Final Report”),³⁹ together with a preliminary draft of this report, were circulated to Joint Task Force members. After an updated draft of this report was recently circulated to the Joint Task Force, the members agreed to finalize the following findings and recommendations to Chancellor George Blumenthal.

FINDINGS

*Competitive Sports at UC Santa Cruz*⁴⁰

UCSC offers three opportunities for students to engage in athletic competition: intramurals, club sports, and NCAA athletics.⁴¹ Intramurals are open to students, faculty, and staff who wish to compete on-campus in sports including basketball, flag football, soccer, softball, and indoor volleyball.⁴² There are also at least twenty-one student-led and student-operated competitive sport clubs, which compete with other competitive club teams at nearby colleges and universities. Competitive clubs include ballroom dance, sailing, surfing, equestrian, fencing, and men’s and women’s water polo, rugby, lacrosse and Ultimate Frisbee.⁴³ In 2016, UCSC sponsored fifteen NCAA Division III teams, including women’s golf, and men’s and women’s volleyball, basketball, soccer, tennis, swimming and diving, track and field, and cross-country.⁴⁴ NCAA Division III teams offer the most competitive experience to talented student athletes who wish to compete at a high level but whose primary focus is on achieving excellence in the classroom.⁴⁵

*UCSC NCAA Division III Athletes*⁴⁶

Since at least FY03 (the first year for which such data is available on the federal Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act website⁴⁷), a minimum of 235 (in FY09) and as many as 303 (in FY16) students have

³⁸ Paul Hall, David Korduner and Paul Simpson met with Mary Doyle on January 23, 2017, and Charlie Eadie, Rob Holo and Loren Steck met with Mary on January 30, 2017.

³⁹ The final version of the SCA Final Report can be viewed at https://senate.ucsc.edu/senate-meetings/agendas-minutes/2016-2017/2017-March-8-Meeting/1854-SCA_Final_02_27_2017.pdf.

⁴⁰ The Joint Task Force notes with approval the following observations made in the June 2010 Report at page 9: “It is important to recognize that sports programming needs to be as diverse as the people it is designed to serve. Consequently, the overall program should be designed across a broad continuum, beginning with basic instructional programs and incorporating recreational activities, intramural sports programs, club sports programs and finally, intercollegiate athletics programs for the highly skilled student-athletes. The underlying philosophy of each program along the continuum is essentially the same: to fully and effectively accommodate the needs and interests of the student body, the University and the larger community in which it resides.”

⁴¹ <https://admissions.ucsc.edu/why-ucsc/faq/athletics.html>

⁴² <http://www.imleagues.com/spa/intramural/abae2cdb75ef47d3b5634a78e6518f60/home>

⁴³ <https://opers.ucsc.edu/sports-clubs/Competitive%20Sport%20Clubs/index.html>

⁴⁴ <http://www.goslugs.com/landing/index>

⁴⁵ <http://www.ncaa.org/about/what-we-do/academics?division=d3>

⁴⁶ Unless otherwise noted, the information in this section is taken from Section 3, 4 and 5 of the SCA Final Report.

⁴⁷ <https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/>

participated each year in UCSC's NCAA Division III program.⁴⁸ OPERS reports that NCAA student-athletes have performed significantly above campus averages in the classroom, with a 100% federal graduation rate for student-athletes from 2009 to 2014, which significantly exceeded the campus average. Moreover, UCSC student-athletes are at least as diverse as the student body as a whole, and they engage in a range of outreach activities in Santa Cruz County, from volunteer coaching to mentoring in local K-12 programs. Student-athletes who presented to the Joint Task Force as well as those who participated in the October 19 Town Hall unreservedly supported intercollegiate athletics and spoke convincingly about the many benefits of their participation in NCAA Division III athletics at UC Santa Cruz.

Impact of the NCAA Division III Program Beyond Student-Athletes

The Task Force concurs with the findings set forth in the SCA Final Report with respect to the University-wide benefits of an NCAA Division III athletics program to UC Santa Cruz, including its apparent impact on admissions, retention and student success, its appeal to alumni and philanthropists, and the program's commitment to community outreach.⁴⁹ See, also, the general benefits of college athletics described by the 2010 Task Force in its June 2010 Report at page 9, as well as by Robert J. Sternberg, then provost and senior vice president of Oklahoma State University and now Professor of Human Development at Cornell University, in his September 1, 2011, article, "College Athletics: Necessary, Not Just Nice to Have," published on the website for the National Association of College and University Business Officers.⁵⁰

Campus-Wide Student Sentiment

Members of the Task Force gathered input from UCSC students and student organizations by interviewing them directly or by attending meetings, such as the October 19 Town Hall meeting, at which students spoke to the issues. Students who provided their input included leaders of the SUA, one of whom participated as a member of the SCA; members of SFAC; students referred by two of the campus Ethnic Resource Centers; student-athletes; and many others. Of course, also instructive were the results of the Spring 2015 athletics referendum proposing a \$117/quarter fee (which failed) and the Spring 2016 opinion poll asking students: "Would you support a new student fee of approximately \$90 per quarter (\$270 per year) to retain the current NCAA Athletics program at UC Santa Cruz?" (which passed). In an ideal world, it appears the majority of students would favor maintaining an intercollegiate athletics program, but they are concerned about the cost and the distribution of the cost. They asked among other things for assurances that the UCSC athletics budget be pegged at an appropriate level and make efficient use of funds; that the athletics program develop other sources of revenue to shift more of the cost of the program over time from student and central campus funds to self-generated funds; and that efforts such as including a sunset provision be made in drafting the referendum to address the high level of fee fatigue. When asked specifically what quarterly fee students would likely support, students suggested numbers across the board, but most common were

⁴⁸ For the years FY03 – FY15, this data was generated by the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act Data Analysis Cutting Tool at <https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/customdata/dataselected>; and see data generated by the NCAA Institutional Performance Program Data Management System with respect to the numbers of student-athletes in each of the years FY11 – FY16.

⁴⁹ SCA Final Report at Section 5.

⁵⁰ This article may be viewed at http://www.nacubo.org/Business_Officer_Magazine/Business_Officer_Plus/Bonus_Material/College_Athletics_Necessary_Not_Just_Nice_to_Have.html.

numbers in the \$30 to \$50 range. Similar numbers resonated with members of the Task Force, some of whom are parents of current or prospective UC students.

UCSC Athletics Program Budget

Neither tuition nor distributions from the state general fund may be used to fund student services not directly associated with the core instructional and research mission of the University of California.⁵¹ Consequently, the cost of such student services and activities, including intercollegiate athletics, must be funded by student fees, including the Regent-mandated Student Services Fee, campus-based student fees, and revenue generated by the athletics program itself, including everything from philanthropy to Sammy-the-Slug appearance fees. The campus-based fees currently paid by students at other of the UC schools for intercollegiate athletics significantly exceed the \$5/quarter fee at UC Santa Cruz.⁵² Nevertheless, these schools (all of which, other than UC Merced and UCSF, are now Division I or Division II schools), as well as NCAA Division III institutions in general, make a substantial contribution from central campus funds to their intercollegiate athletics programs. The NCAA Division III (public without football) median for FY15 was \$506K.⁵³

Expenditures⁵⁴

Historically, UC Santa Cruz has spent modestly on intercollegiate athletics. In recent years, however, total expenditures have more closely approached the median spend of NCAA Division III schools (without football). For example, total expenses for the UC Santa Cruz athletics program in FY14 were \$1.139M, in FY15 were \$1.735M, and in FY16 were \$1.968M, while the FY15 median expenditure for NCAA Division III schools (without football) was \$2.013M.⁵⁵ Salaries and benefits for coaches, trainers and athletics staff account for the lion's share of expenditures at UC Santa Cruz. In FY16, salaries and benefits totaled \$1.348M, about 68% of all expenses. The next largest expense, at \$361K, was for team travel. The balance was for operational expenses, including NCAA membership dues and game expenses, the cost of uniforms and equipment, IT services, and so on. Travel and operational expenses

⁵¹ See Regents Policy 3101: The University of California Student Tuition and Fee Policy, published at <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/3101.html>, which speaks indirectly to this principal; see, also, October 2015 presentation by Free Moini, UCSC Budget Director, to the Student Fee Advisory Committee titled "Understanding the University's Budget" at page 6, published at <https://deanofstudents.ucsc.edu/get-involved/sfac/sfac-docs/2015-16-sfac-budget-presentation.pdf>, which confirms the practice of the University of California in this regard.

⁵² See, i.e., for the 2016-2017 academic year: UC Irvine - \$33.00/quarter Campus Spirit Fee (<http://www.reg.uci.edu/fees/2016-2017/undergrad.html>); Merced – \$75/semester Intercollegiate Athletics Fee (http://catalog.ucmerced.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=585#fee_schedule); UC Riverside – \$35/quarter Division I Fee (<http://registrar.ucr.edu/docs/2017spring-archive-quarterlyfees.pdf>); UC San Diego – \$131.45/quarter ICA Student Activity Fee (<https://students.ucsd.edu/finances/fees/registration/previous/2016/2017-spring/index.html>). See, also, UC Santa Barbara – \$34.03/quarter Intercollegiate Athletics Facilities Fee (http://registrar.sa.ucsb.edu/RegForms/Fees_2016-17.pdf).

⁵³ Information generated by the NCAA Institutional Performance Program Data Management System accessible by NCAA member schools.

⁵⁴ See Appendix B for the FY16 program expenditures referenced in this section.

⁵⁵ NCAA Division III Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Report, Revenues and Expenses 2011 – 2015, at page 11, available for download at <http://www.ncaapublications.com/p-4446-revenues-and-expenses-2011-2015-ncaa-division-iii-intercollegiate-athletics-programs-report.aspx>.

have remained relatively constant over recent years.⁵⁶ However, effective in FY15, UCSC agreed to boost the compensation of all its coaches, increasing salaries and benefits for the athletics program from \$564K in FY14 to \$1.348M in FY16. Currently, total compensation (including benefits) for head coaches is at or above the NCAA Division III medians for public and private institutions without football in their respective sports, and for assistant coaches is significantly above the median.⁵⁷

*Revenue*⁵⁸

Revenue for the program in FY16 was derived from an allocation of the Regent-mandated UC-wide student services fee (\$258K), a portion of the campus-wide Measure 7 Student Programs Fee (\$34K), the \$5/quarter campus-wide Incollegiate Activities Sports Team Fee (\$176K), and a small distribution from the Men's Tennis Program Endowment Fund (\$1K). These student fees together generated a total of approximately \$470K. The Chancellor contributed \$1,000,000 from central campus funds. The remainder was derived from philanthropy (\$209K), NCAA distributions and game guarantees (\$46K), ticket sales (\$8K), and sports camps (\$28K). After accounting for a \$106K surplus in FY15, the deficit for FY16 was \$103K.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION: Given the demonstrated and widely-recognized benefits of an intercollegiate athletics program to student-athletes and UC Santa Cruz as a whole, the Joint Task Force recommends that the University maintain its NCAA Division III athletics program.

RECOMMENDATION: In light of continued student sentiment in support of the athletics program and in further consideration of the comparatively modest amount of the current \$5/quarter campus-based student fee but also the growing amount of total tuition and fees paid by students and their families, we recommend that OPERS seek a new campus-based student fee of up to \$50/quarter for the purpose of supporting its NCAA Division III athletics program.

RECOMMENDATION: In line with the \$506K NCAA Division III median for public schools without football, we recommend that the campus provide ongoing funding of \$500K/annum to support the intercollegiate athletics program.⁵⁹

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that OPERS develop a sustainable business model for the athletics program modeled on NCAA best practices with a target annual budget in the \$2.3M range, an increase of almost \$300K (or about 17%) over actual expenses for FY16.

⁵⁶ See Appendix B.

⁵⁷ Median values for compensation and benefits for head coaches and all assistant coaches are set forth by sport at Tables 2.10A and 2.10B in the NCAA Division III Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Report, Revenues and Expenses 2011 – 2015, page 26 and 27, available for download at <http://www.ncaapublications.com/p-4446-revenues-and-expenses-2011-2015-ncaa-division-iii-intercollegiate-athletics-programs-report.aspx>.

⁵⁸ See Appendix B for the sources and amounts of FY16 program revenue as well as the amount of the deficit for that year.

⁵⁹ A contribution in the amount of \$500K from central campus funds was agreed to in connection with the preparation of the language for the spring 2017 referendum. See Item 4.a.1. at page 9 of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate of March 8, 2017, published at <https://senate.ucsc.edu/senate-meetings/agendas-minutes/2016-2017/2017-May-19-Meeting/Finalized%20Minutes%2003-08-17.pdf>.

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that OPERS create a viable staffing model aligned with anticipated revenue flows, taking into consideration the cost of living in Santa Cruz but also the staffing and compensation practices typical among NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics programs.

RECOMMENDATION: In view of the desirability of developing sources of revenue beyond student fees and contributions from central campus funds, we recommend that the University work with OPERS and stakeholders throughout the campus community to set annual goals to generate additional funding for the athletics program from, at minimum, philanthropy, corporate sponsorships, merchandising and licensing, summer camps and weekend instruction.

RECOMMENDATION: Along the same lines, we further recommend that OPERS aggressively pursue these revenue opportunities, and that a Development Officer be retained to support this effort.

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that OPERS partner with the campus community to structure a campus-based student fee proposal consistent with these recommendations; we further recommend that the University support OPERS without reservation in these efforts.

CONCLUSION

We are confident that a robust NCAA Division III athletics program can be sustained at UC Santa Cruz for many years to come, but understand and acknowledge that, should the students fail in spring 2017 to pass a campus-based student fee to support the intercollegiate athletics program, it likely will be terminated.

OPPORTUNITIES IN ATHLETICS

2010

Prepared by

**THE TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ
JUNE, 2010**



TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Ryan Andrews, Executive Director-Office of Physical Education, Recreation & Sports (Co-Chair)

**Jessica Gallione, Principle Budget Analyst - Planning & Budget
Associate Vice Chancellor Alma Sifuentes (Co-Chair)**

Robert Hansen, Head Coach/PE Instructor

Dave Keller, Director -Residential and Family Services

Tiffany Loftin, SUA Internal Vice Chair (2009-2010)

Malia Nanbara, Undergraduate Student, Student Athletic Advisory Council

Matt Payne, Undergraduate Student, Student Fee Advisory Council

Lucy Rojas, Special Projects Manager (Staff to the Committee)

Ashish Sahni, Assistant Chancellor - Chancellor's Office

Paul Simpson, Alumni Representative

Adam Snook, Coordinator, Staff Advisory Board

Linda Spradley, Athletic Director

Gene Switkes, Chemistry Department, Faculty Athletic Representative

Michelle Wittingham, Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	4
Preface.....	9
Overview of Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreational Programming in Universities.....	9
History of Athletics at UC Santa Cruz.....	10
Report Structure and Process for Task Force.....	11
1. UC Athletic Program Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Threats.....	12
2. Athletics Vision Statements.....	15
3. Athletics Current Reality.....	19
4. Comparative Data Summary with Division III Institutions.....	27
5. Options Considered	
• No Athletics – club sports only.....	28
• Move from NCAA to NAIA.....	29
• Remain NCAA Division III.....	30
• Move to Division II.....	31
6. Other Considerations and Additional Questions from Charge Letter	32
7. Appendices	
a. Task Force Charge.....	Appendix A
b. Comparative Data.....	Appendix B
c. 3 Year Strategy & Time-Line for Moving Toward Recommendations.....	Appendix C

Executive Summary

As a member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, UC Santa Cruz sponsors twelve intercollegiate athletic teams (7 women's, 5 men's) that allow students the chance to compete at a high level while maintaining a primary identity as a student in an academic program. The Athletics program began in 1980 after much lobbying and activism by students who were then competing in the vibrant sport club program. The Athletic program takes pride in numerous national awards for both athletic and academic accomplishments including 10 team national championships and 288 All American honors. More importantly, however are the benefits gained by the great number of student-athletes who passionately commit themselves to the time and effort required to participate in intercollegiate athletics. These benefits include skill development, physical health as well as social and psychological benefits such as a commitment to a pursuit of personal and team goals, organization of time and the building of lifelong and supportive friendships.

Despite the many benefits of participation and the national honors, the funding to support the program is grossly inadequate and the department remains dependent on fund raising for year to year survival. Additionally, Student Athletes pay upwards of \$1,000 annually to participate, thus creating hardships for students of limited means. Additionally, the program faces three large threats: 1) the discontinuation of the matching funds incentive by the Chancellor's Office; 2) being below the team sponsorship minimum set by the NCAA where UCSC must add one team by fall of 2011; 3) continued budget reductions.

Due to these on-going challenges, Vice Chancellor Felicia McGinty appointed a Task Force in July of 2009 charged to review UCSC Athletics and the feasibility of continuing Division III athletics without encumbering future financial deficits (Appendix A). Included in the charge letter were additional questions pertaining to the necessary infrastructure required to operate a successful Athletic program as well as visionary questions related to the future of athletics and the campus commitment to the program.

Following a series of meetings with stakeholders from throughout the campus as well as program comparisons with both "like" and "ideal" institutions, including a review of financial data from all NCAA Division III institutions, the Task Force found substantial gaps between the UCSC Athletics program and that of comparable institutions. UCSC remains far below the Division III average in terms of operating budgets, administrative salaries and coach salaries. Additionally, UCSC stands alone in requiring fundraising by coaches and student athletes to cover the most basic required expenses of an athletic program.

Despite the gaps, the Task Force found substantial interest by all constituent groups in maintaining and growing a broad based intercollegiate athletics program dedicated to

providing extensive student participation and emphasizing the “student” in student-athlete. The Task Force strongly felt that a vibrant Intercollegiate Athletics program will enhance diversity, expand school spirit, amplify pride in the university and serve as a focal point in building community and connection among all campus constituency groups. Additionally, UCSC Athletics provides a positive connection with other institutions of higher learning with similar interest and focus and brings constant positive attention to the campus both locally and nationally.

The following is a summary of key findings and recommendations based upon this review of data:

Finding Number One – Financial and Administrative Infrastructure

The current operating budget and administrative infrastructure are inadequate in meeting the basic needs and requirements for an NCAA Div. III Intercollegiate Athletics program.

	Average for Division III Programs w/o Football 2007-08	University of California, Santa Cruz 2007-08
Total Student Body	2248	16,087
# of Student Athletes	338 (Men 234, Women 154)	271 (Men 116, Women 155)
# of Teams	Men 8.6, Women 8.9	Men 6, Women 8
Operating Expenses	\$1,872,000 (\$833 per student or \$4,837 per student athlete)	\$1,108,557 (\$69 per student or \$4091 per student athlete)
Coach Salaries	\$331,693 (\$148 per student or \$981 per student athlete)	\$200,219 (\$13 per student or \$739 per student athlete)
Administrative Salaries	\$341,696 (\$152 per student or \$1,011 per student athlete)	\$221,114 (\$14 per student or \$816 per student athlete)
Administrative FTE	5.0	2.0
Fund Raising <i>(from students and coaches)</i>	\$100-\$120K	\$180-\$200K

Recommendation: Establish an Administrative Infrastructure that can meet the operational needs of our chosen model for Athletics. At a minimum, this includes permanent funding for the following additional positions: 1 Assistant Athletic Director, 1 Sports Information Director and 1 Development Officer.

Finding Number Two – Full-Time Coaches

The majority of Division III Athletic programs have full-time coaches. Of the 12 UCSC head coaches, all are part-time and 9 are on annual by-agreement contracts for as little as \$7,000 per year.

Recommendation: Establish full-time positions for coaches that can be 100% coaching, or combined with other administrative duties within the Athletic

Department. Career coaches are more able to establish and develop consistent programs, which ultimately enhances recruitment, retention and builds a strong foundation for alumni relations. Strong leadership and continuity develops culture and traditions for student-athletes and the general student body to identify with. Coaches are teachers, advisors, mentors and partners in outreach, able to recruit and retain diverse students to the campus. Having full-time coaches will allow more involvement in general campus life activities and with the community through donor development and fund raising.

Finding Number Three – Fundraising

Most Division III Athletic programs do not require fundraising from coaches or student athletes for basic team expenses (e.g. travel, uniforms, and equipment). UCSC Coaches and student athletes are required to fundraise to meet these basic team expenses. Additionally, UCSC teams fundraise over 60% of their total team budget. This requirement negatively impacts the student-athlete experience and creates additional challenges for part-time coaches who should be focusing their time on coaching and mentoring our student-athletes rather than seeking external funding.

It should be noted, however, that the UCSC Athletic department currently fund raises approximately \$100,000 more per year than most other Division III institutions. The success of fund raising by the teams has proven the commitment from parents and the local community, however, has also created inequity among the teams due to the economic status of parents. A poorly funded program makes UCSC less desirable as far as attracting and recruiting the top students in the state. A “Pay to Play” system creates a sense of entitlement and shifts the power dynamics within the team concerning playing time and parent involvement. For instance, if parents were paying to fund all aspects of an Academic program, they would feel entitled to evaluate the professors and give their input on how the program is managed.

Recommendation: Appoint a Development Officer to specifically focus on meeting the operational and infrastructure needs of Athletics. Ensure a base level of permanent funding so that fund raising is not a requirement for participation in Athletics, which serves as a barrier for participation for many students.

Finding Number Four – Organizational Structure

More than 80% of all Division III Athletic programs report directly to the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs/Services. At UCSC, the Athletic Director reports to the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs through the Executive Director for the Office of Physical Education, Recreation & Sports and the Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs & Dean of Students. This creates challenges with work process and timeliness as many Athletic department decisions as well as reports that require approval by the Chancellor.

Recommendation: It is recommended by the NCAA Division III Presidents Council that Chancellor’s and President’s take a more active role with Intercollegiate Athletics. It is also recommended by this task force that Athletic

report directly to a Vice Chancellor. This ensures a better flow of information to senior leadership and will facilitate required processes such as annual reports that require Chancellor approval. This change will also lead to a better understanding of intercollegiate athletics issues and greater oversight of the Athletics program. With so many campus offices holding a stake in the visibility and success of Athletics (e.g. Admissions, University Relations, and Chancellor's Office) decisions that impact a program like Athletics need to be made with the input and understanding of senior leadership.

Finding Number Five – Advisory to Athletics

The UCSC Athletic department has an active Student Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC), but does not have an advisory board made up of staff, faculty or alumni. Most NCAA institutions have a broad based advisory board that serves to assist and advise the Director of Athletics in the exercise of institutional responsibility as well as in planning the future direction of the intercollegiate athletic program ensuring the needs of student athletes are being met.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs appoint a broad based Athletic Advisory Committee to advise the Athletic Director on policy, program growth and other issues/concerns of faculty or administration. The board should include representation from the following: Academic Senate, Student Affairs, Admissions, Foundation, Planning & Budget and Alumni Relations and at least one member of the Student Athlete Advisory Council.

It is also recommended that the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs meet at least annually with the Student Athletic Advisory Committee. The primary concern of any Intercollegiate Athletics Program should be the health, welfare and well-being of its student-athletes. As a result, the Student Athletic Advisory Committee should be given opportunity to advise the university administration regarding Athletic Department operations.

Finding Number Six – Facilities Infrastructure

The current recreational sports facilities are inadequate for Intercollegiate Athletics. The facilities are shared with five other university programs creating scheduling challenges resulting in limited use. Many of the current facilities are old and not maintained at a level required of competitive athletics. UCSC facilities are also small in size, limiting participation by spectators. Because of the limited size and poor quality, most UCSC facilities do not meet the NCAA standards for hosting post-season NCAA competition.

Recommendation – Infrastructure/Facilities

It is recommended that a master plan for upgrading and building new facilities be created so that external funding can be sought along with university and student funds to improve the athletic complex. Having larger venues with space for spectators will bring greater interest and participation by the campus and local community and will prove an enhancement for school spirit and pride.

Specifically, special attention should be focused on sports fields, one additional competition pool and a multi-use event center complex for hosting basketball and volleyball competition. A multi-use event center complex will also support larger campus gatherings including commencement ceremonies, lectures, concerts and special events.

Finding Number Seven – NCAA Divisions

UCSC is the only Division III institution in Northern California. This results in more frequent travel, increased expenses related to travel and more time away from class for the student-athletes. The majority of Division III institutions are private institutions with an average enrollment of 2,248 students. As a public institution with an enrollment of 16,763 UC Santa Cruz is not competing against like institutions.

Recommendation

It is recommended that UCSC remain a member of NCAA Division III due to its current financial realities. It is also recommended that UCSC consider competing at NCAA Division II in the future. The problems that membership in NCAA Division II will address include: i) more competition with like-institutions in terms of being a public institution and based upon size and ii) conference affiliation thus creating more “local” competition resulting in reduced travel costs and missed class time. It should be noted that a move to Division II is not possible until our Athletic program has demonstrated the ability to compete in Division III and financially support a robust NCAA Division III program.

The Task Force believes that these recommendations are the best possible for the overall maintenance and improvement of the Intercollegiate Athletics program at UC Santa Cruz. Additionally, we believe that the benefits from these recommendations, once implemented, will go far beyond just the Athletics program and will serve to enhance school spirit, provide a common bond for all campus affiliates and result in pride for our beloved campus.

PREFACE

Overview of Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreational Programs

Sports and recreational activities have long been an integral part of the American culture. Likewise, both competitive and leisure sport activities have long played an important role in the life of institutions of higher education. The benefits derived from participation in such activities are well recognized and documented. They range from simple enjoyment and wellness to a heightened sense of satisfaction gained from testing one's mettle, skill and ability in a highly competitive arena. Intramural and extramural sports also provide opportunities to enhance and support a larger sense of community within the institution.

It is important to recognize that sports programming needs to be as diverse as the people it is designed to serve. Consequently, the overall program should be designed across a broad continuum, beginning with basic instructional programs and incorporating recreational activities, intramural sports programs, club sports programs and finally, intercollegiate athletics programs for the highly skilled student-athletes.

The underlying philosophy of each program along the continuum is essentially the same: to fully and effectively accommodate the needs and interests of the student body, the University and the larger community in which it resides. Consistent with the University's mission, campus recreation and sports programs should be educationally based should focus primarily on the needs and interests of the participants and should be fiscally responsible.

UC Santa Cruz has each component of the sports and recreation continuum; however, due to the current fiscal challenges related to the State budget, each of these programs has received significant funding cuts in recent years. The Intercollegiate Athletics program has the most pressing challenges in terms of its inability to operate given the costs associated with competitive sports programs (e.g. primarily travel costs).

As part of its mission, UC Santa Cruz undergraduates will experience education inside and outside the classroom, applying what they learn through undergraduate research, service learning and leadership development. In keeping with this mission, the intercollegiate athletics and recreation programs are student-centered and provide learning, discovery and engagement opportunities. Seeking excellence in athletics is consistent with the University's mission of providing opportunities for excellence in academics, service and research. The intercollegiate athletics and recreational programs provide students with the opportunity to develop athletic skills and leadership traits that will carry them toward a fulfilling future. In addition to the development of their athletic abilities, these programs focus on providing students with leadership opportunities to enable them to serve as role models within the campus and broader community. It should be noted that our intercollegiate athletic and recreation programs are very integrated with the community and are constantly building partnerships and opportunities to work

together. Ultimately, when a student finishes their time at UCSC, they will not only have improved their athletic skill, but more importantly will have the desire to enjoy lifelong fitness and wellness and engage in service to their community.

History of Athletics at UC Santa Cruz

The University of California, Santa Cruz opened in 1967 with a student body of approximately 3,000 and the vision of creating a small college environment within a large research institution. Part of this vision included the rejection of the traditional intercollegiate competitive sports model and a focus on recreation and physical activity through physical education classes, intramural sports and club sports. The administrative offices and facilities for these programs were housed under the Office of Physical Education, Recreation and Sports (OPERS). Since then, the evolution of competitive sports at UCSC has been a grass-root, student-driven process. With a flourishing sport club program and much lobbying and activism by students, UCSC became a member institution of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1980 at the Division III level. In contrast to almost all other institutions of higher learning, the application was administered and sponsored by OPERS, the logical choice at the time, as this is where the sports facilities were located, rather than from campus administration.

From these very humble beginnings the Intercollegiate Athletic Program at UCSC has steadily grown to become firmly entrenched in the UC Santa Cruz campus culture. New sports were added as the student population grew and as new facilities became available. Institutional support increased for a few years and along with strong fund raising endeavors, the program continued to grow, expanding opportunities for coaches and student-athletes. This growth has produced amazing results as teams, players and coaches have been widely recognized for their accomplishments, including the following:

Athletic Highlights include:

- 10 National Team Championships
- 23 Individual National Championships
- 24 NCAA Final Four Appearances
- 284 All-American Selections
- 4 National Coach of the Year Awards
- 1 National Coach of the Decade Award
- 11 Regional Coach of the Year Awards

Academic Highlights

- 3.04 Student-Athlete GPA
- USA Today Top 10 Grad rate in 2002
- 57 Scholar Student-Athlete awards (established in 2008)
- 47 Academic All-Americans

Despite the success and program growth, the UCSC program has not kept pace with student demand for additional athletic opportunities. Additionally, institutional support

for the program has waned over the years creating large funding gaps with comparable Division III programs.

Athletics Task Force Report Structure & Process

The report structure provides background and history, rather than just listing recommendations. The Task Force felt it was important to convey how we arrived at our recommendations, thus we encourage your to read the report in its entirety.

The Task Force met approximately 9 times with additional meetings for sub-committees involved in data collection from other institutions as well as attendance at NCAA and NAIA conferences (National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics). Due to the broad nature of questions within the charge letter (Appendix A); the group spent time up front envisioning what an ideal athletic program could look like at UC Santa Cruz. This was more of a philosophical approach knowing that many people within the Task Force had little experience with the management and operations of an athletic program. This step was deemed important since the process had yet to be done in the 25 year history of the program and because the current model was proving inadequate on many levels, thus it was a fresh start. This process proved fruitful in that the Task Force was able to clearly articulate a long range vision for a successful program.

The Task Force also spent time learning the history of the Athletics program and becoming familiar with the current challenges as well as our relationship with the National Collegiate Athletic Association and its various divisions and requirements for each.

The committee did comparative research for both “like” and “ideal” academic and athletic institutions within both Division III and II. This data proved very helpful in seeing how we differ and also where other programs acquire their funding and where they place their emphasis in terms of administrative positions, coaching salaries, team budgets, etc.

In reviewing the data, it became apparent that the gap was not only large between UCSC and other Division III institutions, but that there was a significantly larger gap between even the best funded Division III programs and average Division II programs. With that said, it became apparent that considering the possibility of moving to Division II was of future concern and that our pressing task at hand was determining how UCSC Athletics will survive and prosper in Division III. With that, the Task Force spent time trying to understand the possibilities and limitations for the future of the Athletics program and come up with specific recommendations for not only continuing at Division III without encumbering future financial deficits but to become the ideal Division III program in the nation. This may sound like a lofty goal, but it is definitely one within reach especially considering the fact that we are a UC and reside in a very desirable location, thus facilitating recruitment of the best and brightest student-athletes in our state and nation.

Reaching this long-term vision will take an on-going commitment by the campus, but the rewards will be plenty in terms of increased exposure for the campus and an enhanced image as not only a great academic institution, but a strong community with school spirit that supports and encourages athletic excellence as well.

S.W.O.T. Analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) of the Intercollegiate Athletics Program

Strengths

-UC Santa Cruz has a 25 year history of intercollegiate athletics consisting of teams and student-athletes who have distinguished themselves in competition and in the classroom.

-Our participation and success in athletics competition at the local, regional and national levels have brought the campus recognition and have proven a valuable in recruiting students to UCSC.

-Athletics at UCSC is a valuable resource, enhancing the quality of campus life while providing important learning, experiential and leadership opportunities for student participants.

-Our student-athletes have contributed to the academic and cultural richness of the campus and are among our best ambassadors for recruitment and development opportunities.

-Our Athletic program is more than a source of entertainment for the campus and community, but also established important and lasting links between the campus, the community, alumni, our students and their families.

-UC Santa Cruz has a hard-working and dedicated coaching staff that excels under a challenging work environment.

-UCSC Athletics has done a superb job of fund raising and on average raises almost twice as much as average Division III institutions.

-UCSC has won 10 team National Championships, 23 individual National Championships, 23 Final Four appearances, 284 All Americans, 4 National Coach of the Year Honors.

-UCSC student-athletes have a combined average grade point average of 3.04.

-UCSC has 57 Scholar Student-Athlete Awards (established in 2008).

-UCSC has had 41 Academic All-Americans

-UCSC coaches have earned numerous honors bringing recognition to the University. Honors include National Coach of the Year and Regional Coach of the Year.

Weaknesses

-UCSC has minimal financial support and has an annual budget that is approximately ½ the amount of average Division III programs.

-UCSC has a large percentage of part-time head coaches. This reduces coach to student-athlete contact and thus the potential for valuable mentoring. The expertise of the part-time coaches is also unavailable to the greater UCSC community through physical education or other programs. In addition, part-time coaches are subject to high turnover, challenging the time and budgets of the Athletic Director and OPERS Administration to identify, hire, and train personnel.

-UCSC sponsors only the minimum number of sports teams required by the NCAA. Based upon the size and diversity of our campus, there is a desire among the student body to sponsor additional teams.

-UCSC has very limited facility space. All athletic facilities are shared among many programs including Physical Education, Recreation, Intramural and Club sports programs.

-UCSC Athletics does not have a Sports Information Director, thus keeping Athletics in the news, having accurate and up to date web information and having professional game management does not happen.

-UCSC is the only Division III institution in central and northern California, thus our teams must do extensive travel to compete against other Division III institutions. With no viable Division III conference in our region, our teams are forced to play the majority of the competitions away from campus. This equates to high travel costs as well as more time out of the classroom for student-athletes.

-Fundraising requirement: All athletic teams rely on fundraising for even the most basic expenses (uniforms, travel, and equipment). Even in a good year where the economy is not in a recessed state and when budgets are ample, fundraising is challenging. Over the years as costs have increased and budgets have been reduced, the Athletics program has had to create an increased emphasis on fundraising simply for program survival. This equates to coaches and student athlete's spending more time seeking funds rather than participating in their sport. This added stress causes some student-athletes to quit and seek other campus life outlets. It also caused all teams to play only the minimal number

of required competitions to remain eligible with the NCAA. Lastly, it causes high turnover among the coaching staff and creates a climate of frustration where graduating student-athletes don't feel compelled to ever "give back" to the program because there was nobody providing financial support throughout their student-athlete career.

Opportunities

-UCSC has the opportunity to become the finest campus in the UC system: one with proper perspective on student life, academics and athletics.

-UCSC has the opportunity to be the role model for Title IX.

-UCSC has the opportunity to emphasize the importance of diversity by highlighting the diversity of the student-athlete population.

-UCSC should include the athletics program in its campus identity and thus improve school spirit, pride, and "esprit de corps".

-UCSC has the opportunity to gain positive publicity on a daily basis with improved reporting of our athletic program.

-UCSC has the opportunity to engage donors through interest and belonging to the Athletics family at UCSC.

-UCSC has the opportunity with the Athletic program to enhance its image as a campus committed to wellness and athletic excellence and dispel the lingering legacy of a "drug campus".

-UCSC Athletics already has a great community relationship, but can enhance it through youth camps and hosting other local sports championships. This could also equate to more income generation for the OPERS facilities.

Threats

-Non-renewal of Matching Funds Program: The matching funds serve as a great incentive to our current donors. The matching funds alone make up 18% of the total Athletics budget and without them the program will not survive. The Athletic program already generates twice as much as average Division III institutions through fundraising and asking the program to fundraise more without a dedicated Development Officer is incomprehensible.

-Budget Reductions: In the past two years the program has lost over \$53,000 in funding. Projected future cuts include another \$20-\$25K, thus crippling the program.

-Minimum Sports Sponsorship Requirements: UCSC currently sponsors the minimum number of teams as required by the NCAA. Beginning in 2010-11, UCSC will be expected to add an additional team. We have applied and received a waiver to delay the addition of a new team for at least one year. The NCAA will not grant an extension of this waiver beyond the 2010-11 year.

-Fundraising: With the economy in a recessed state, fundraising is only becoming more challenging. Because the athletic teams rely on fundraising for even the most basic needs, there is concern that if fundraising efforts do not match the need, the program will grow further into deficit.

Vision for Athletics

The following is a summary of the task force meetings that discussed the future vision and current reality for the Athletics program. We organized these meetings by dividing the program into six “buckets,” including: Infrastructure, Student-Athletes, Diversity, Coaches, Finances, Community Outreach/School Spirit/Marketing and Development. *July 2009.*

BUCKET ONE: VISION FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

Personnel

1. UCSC has an organizational structure that supports the chosen athletic model including adequate administrative support to meet the operational needs of the Athletic program. This includes:
 - a. Day to day internal operations - support for HR, payroll, budget, purchasing, travel, facility/event management, etc.
 - b. External Operations – Support with alumni & community relations, booster club, marketing, fundraising, etc.
2. All personnel will have a student centered approach to their work tasks (i.e., see the big picture and understand that their work is important to the overall success of the Athletic program).

Facilities

1. We have facilities that support the chosen Athletic model and accommodate the campus population.
2. The facilities promote and accommodate campus and community partnerships and provide adequate space for spectators.

3. All facilities have a financial model that ensures long-term success.

BUCKET TWO: VISION FOR STUDENT ATHLETES

1. UCSC has a strong *slug* culture of athletic engagement through participation and support.
2. Participation in all OPERS programs will increase by at least 30% (based upon 2009 data) and is reflective of the campus population.
3. Academic success of the student athletes exceeds that of the campus norm.
4. The campus regularly celebrates and recognizes the success of student-athlete achievements and contributions to campus through media coverage, letter winner awards and special events.
5. Campus faculty and staff are supportive of the challenges of being a student-athlete and acknowledge how their participation in Athletics enhances their academic success.

BUCKET THREE: VISION FOR DIVERSITY/ACCESS

1. UCSC has an athletic model with engaged student-athletes, coaches and administration that actively support the campus diversity goals.
 - a. We take into account the financial and time commitments for participation and do not limit participation to only those with the ability to pay.
 - b. There is flexibility in the faculty set admission requirements and consideration of the implications of enhancing access and diversity through the expansion of sports programs.

BUCKET FOUR: VISION FOR COACHES

1. All coaches are full-time (Accessible coaches yield successful programs).

UC Santa Cruz Athletic Task Force Summary Report June 2010

2. We have a sufficient coaching staff, including at least 1 assistant coach for each team.
3. We display gender and ethnic diversity within our coaching staff.
4. Coaches are partners in outreach and are involved on campus in general student life activities as well in the community through service projects.
5. All coaches have the philosophical approach that student academic success is their first priority.
6. All head coaches have demonstrated success in their sport and emphasize holistic student development.
7. All head coaches have demonstrated competence and administrative stewardship of their program.
8. All head coaches are experienced in recruiting and retaining academically and athletically successful student athletes.

BUCKET FIVE: VISION FOR FINANCE

1. Athletics has a fully-funded and sustainable financial model that allows for growth and is fair and equitable with commitment from the administration and the model is transparent and accountable.
2. The Athletic program has a two-pronged financial model that includes operational and long-term (capital) components.
3. There are no financial barriers to student participation in the Athletic program.

BUCKET SIX: VISION FOR COMMUNITY OUTREACH/SCHOOL SPIRIT/ MARKETING AND DEVELOPMENT

1. We focus on three “populations” or audiences:
 - a. Campus (current students, staff & faculty)
 - i. There is a sense of “slug spirit” and identity

UC Santa Cruz Athletic Task Force Summary Report June 2010

- ii. We have established a “slug sports” brand that encompasses NCAA Athletic teams, sports clubs, intramural sports and all other OPERS programs.
 - b. Local Santa Cruz Community
 - i. There is a sense of “slug spirit” and identity.
 - ii. We have partnerships and contribute to local sports programs.
 - c. Parents, Alumni and Affiliates
 - i. There is a sense of “slug spirit” and identity.
- 2. We have built a culture of continuing interest, involvement and support (financial and otherwise).
- 3. We have raised the profile of Athletics within the current campus development fundraising framework.
- 4. Working in collaboration with University Relations, we have active and successful fundraising campaigns within the local community and among our parents, alumni and affiliates.
- 5. We have a great relationship with local media that results in regular promotion of the athletic program that include game schedules and regular dissemination of information on program news, team success, and individual student academic and athletic achievements.

Current Reality (July 2009)

BUCKET ONE: INFRASTRUCTURE

Current Reality

Facilities:

All facilities used by Athletics are also shared with:

- a. Physical Education
- b. Recreation
- c. Sports Clubs
- d. intramural Sports
- e. General drop-in use from students and Wellness Card holders.

Shared Athletic Facilities Include:

1. West Field House:

- a. Hosts the Men's and Women's Basketball and Men's and Women's Volleyball teams.
- b. This facility includes one regulation court, two locker rooms and a small Athletic Training room.
- c. The capacity for spectators is 350.
- d. Both the men's and women's basketball coaches share an office in the West Field House.
- e. The Volleyball Coaches share office space in the East Field House along with the men's and women's soccer coaches.

2. Tennis Courts:

- a. We have 6 courts within the East Field House complex and 6 courts located on the west side of campus.
- b. The east courts have lights, a scoreboard and are in close proximity to locker rooms and Athletic Training Room.
- c. Limited bleacher space is available for the east courts for spectators. The west courts have no amenities within close proximity.
- d. Both tennis coaches have offices in the East Field House.

3. Fields:

- a. OPERS has two main fields: 9-acre field (upper field) & 4 acre field (lower field).
- b. The men's and women's soccer teams utilize both fields for practice and hold all competitions on the lower field as that is the better quality field.
- c. There are no other permanent amenities located near the lower field.
- d. For competitions, we set up a generator to power the mobile scoreboard and public address system.

- e. There is one porta-potty near the lower field.
 - f. There are two small bleachers that can accommodate up to 200 spectators as well as ample grass area for spectators wishing to sit on the grass or set up lawn chairs.
 - g. Due to damage caused by unauthorized use of the field, we recently installed a fence around the field.
 - h. Both soccer coaches share an office in the East Field House along with the men's and women's volleyball coaches.
4. **50 Meter Pool:**
- a. Hosts the men's and women's swimming and diving teams.
 - b. The pool has a moveable bulkhead which allows the configuration to be changed to accommodate multiple activities at one time.
 - c. As one of the more impacted facilities within OPERS, it is not uncommon to have swim practice, PE classes and drop-in use all occurring at the same time.
 - d. The facility includes a scoreboard, locker rooms, a coach's office and bleacher space for up to 200 spectators.
5. **½ Mile Track:**
- a. Is used often by our women's cross country team for their speed workouts.
 - b. The track has only one lane, is not oval like most tracks and is not completely flat.
 - c. It is always open for general use, hence the team must always share the track with recreational runners/walkers.

2009-2010 Athletics Administrative Personnel include:

- 1.0 FTE Linda Spradley - *Athletic Director/Compliance/HR/Oversee and Assist in all Operations*
- 1.0 FTE Julie Roth - *Administrative Assistant/Sports Information/Eligibility/Game Management.*
- .92 FTE Primrose Pisares - *Athletic Trainer*
- .5 FTE Open Position - *Assistant Athletic Trainer*
- *-Faculty Athletic Representative: Gene Switkes (Volunteer)*

In addition to those mentioned above, Athletics receives support from other staff positions, including:

- OPERS Facility Manager - Rachel Neuman
- OPERS Event Coordinator - Kathryn Hutchings
- OPERS Administrative Analyst – Cori Houston (special events/volunteer administration, foundation tracking, etc.)
- OPERS Business Manager – Robert Irons
- Student Affairs Development Officer – Kathleen Hughes

BUCKET TWO: STUDENT ATHLETES

Current Reality

1. For the 2009 – 2010 year, there will be opportunities for students to participate in one of twelve teams, including:
 - a. Men's and Women's Basketball
 - b. Men's and Women's Soccer
 - c. Men's and Women's Tennis
 - d. Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving
 - e. Men's and Women's Volleyball
 - f. Women's Golf
 - g. Women's Cross Country.

(Average sport sponsorship for DIII Institutions is sixteen sports)

2. Gender participation ratio's between general student body and student-athletes is in keeping with Title IX compliance.
 - a. Both populations are approximately 54% female and 46% male.

Student-Athlete Academic and Athletic Success:

1. Student-Athletes (SA's) have a higher grade point average, retention rate and graduation rates than the general student body at UCSC.
 - a. The vast majority of sports have a team GPA above 3.0.
 - b. Several SA's receive Academic All-Independent and Academic All-American honors each year.
2. SA's have won Individual National Championships and the vast majority of UCSC sports have competed in post-season play, with several Team National Championships.
3. Scholar-Athletes (above a 3.25 at UCSC) receive recognition and certificates from the Athletic Department with additional honors to the highest male and female GPA and highest male and female team GPA (includes an award to the teams head coach).
4. This year (2008-09) the Chancellor hosted a scholar-athlete reception for those student-athletes with a GPA of 3.5 and above. Additionally, the Chancellor hosted a luncheon to honor our men's tennis team following their NCAA national championship.

5. The Athletic Department does not have any letter winner awards, nor any special banquets or appreciation events for the student-athletes that excel in their academic and athletic endeavors.

Faculty and Staff Support:

1. Support for student-athletes from the faculty, as a general rule, is tenuous.
 - a. SA's inform Professors at the beginning of each quarter of their team schedule and arrange in advance with their professor on turning in assignments early, taking tests and doing any extra work to make up for missed class time.
 - b. SA's only miss class for competitions, and not for practices.
2. Many faculty and staff, as well as the general student body, do not know which intercollegiate sports teams we sponsor and often confuse athletics with sports clubs.
 - a. There is not a full understanding of the challenges that student-athletes face in terms of the time commitment required, nor an understanding or appreciation for the positive impact student-athletes have on our institution.

BUCKET THREE: DIVERSITY/ACCESS

Current Reality

1. Student-athletes, coaches and administrators support the campus diversity goals, however, these goals are challenging to attain at the present time for the following reasons:
 - a. The cost to participate on an Athletic team (\$500 - \$1,000) makes it challenging for students with financial need. Lower income students may find that they do not have time to practice and compete because they need to work part-time to support their education.
 - b. Recruiting funds are non-existent, which impacts the ability of coaches to travel to areas with more diverse populations.

BUCKET FOUR: COACHES

Current Reality

UCSC's coaching staff consists of the following:

1. Head Coaches (no coaches are full-time)
 - .44 FTE – Bob Hansen – *Men's Tennis Coach*
 - .32 FTE - Kim Musch – *Men's & Women's Swim Coach*
 - .30 FTE – Michael Runeare – *Men's Soccer Coach*
 - All other head coach positions (8) are By-Agreements positions.
2. Assistant Coaches
 - Stipend Range = \$500 - \$2,500 depending on fund raising from team.
3. Head Coach Gender and Ethnic Diversity: (12 sports)
 - Male Coaches = 9
 - Caucasian = 8
 - African-American = 1
 - Female Coaches = 3
 - Caucasian = 3
4. Assistant Coach Gender and Ethnic Diversity: (7)
 - Male Coaches = 3
 - Caucasian = 2
 - African-American = 1
 - Female Coaches = 4
 - Caucasian = 3
 - Chicana/Latina = 1

Head Coach Experience:

1. All coaches have experience in their sport as a player and coach; specifically, experience in recruiting, budget management, fundraising, community service and skill development.
2. Coaches understand that the term “student” comes before “athlete” and place importance on academics over athletics.
3. Coaches recruit and retain excellent students and athletes.
 - a. Out of 265 SA's from 2008-2009, only one student-athlete requested permission to speak with another university about the possibility of a transfer.

Fiscal Management:

1. Although coaches are fiscally responsible and fund raise as much as possible, teams routinely go over budget.
2. Starting budgets for each team are not even close to meeting the basic needs related to team travel (and this includes keeping games to the minimum allowed by the NCAA and with keeping rosters to a minimum – see finance bucket below).

Community Service:

1. All coaches and teams participate in a number of community service activities.
 - a. Coaches secure these opportunities and also encourage and support the community service projects developed by the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

BUCKET FIVE: FINANCE

Current Reality

1. Athletics is not fully funded and does not meet the goal of fair and equitable funding in support of an intercollegiate athletics program.
 - a. Team budgets are based more on the ability of each coach to raise money and the ability of parents/student-athletes to provide funds.
 - b. The general department operating budget (non-team expenses) is also extremely inadequate.
2. Lack of financial support from the Institution places a burden on student-athletes and can serve as a barrier to SA participation.
 - a. The opportunity to participate and even meet the future NCAA sport sponsorship requirements is affected by a lack of institutional financial support.
 - b. Athletics has a current financial model that is in “survival” mode.
 - i. There is no budget for the most basic needs, nor is there a plan for long term needs including facilities and equipment.

1. Permanent Budget:

- a. Reg Fees: \$196,503
- b. Measure 7: \$40,402
- c. Measure 31: \$157,092
- Total: \$393,997

2. Other:

- a. Income & Fundraising: \$200,000/year approx
- b. Matching Funds: Chancellor \$100,000
- c. Student Affairs \$40,000

**BUCKET SIX: COMMUNITY OUTREACH/SCHOOL SPIRIT/
MARKETING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Current Reality

Campus: (Current students, staff and faculty)

1. The brand that best describes any type of sporting activity at UCSC is Sammy the Slug.
2. There is no specific branding and no appreciable identity between athletics and the rest of the campus.

Local Santa Cruz Community:

1. Connection with the community is limited mostly to community service, which is required for all teams. Most teams do several throughout the academic year.
2. Student-Athletic Advisory Committee (SAAC) team representatives also coordinate community service projects for teams to participate in. Examples include: Beach clean up campaigns, staffing local triathlons, wharf-to-wharf and other run/swim activities, Bay Area Sports Initiative (working with local at-risk youth) and Special Olympics, etc.
3. Additionally, the Athletic program is involved in the community in the following ways:
 - a) Athletic Director works at several charitable golf tournaments and umpires local softball leagues for middle and high schools. A.D. also works with Comcast as a color commentator to present televised high school sports programming.
 - b) Sammy the Slug Suit is on loan for free to local charity group events.
 - c) Local companies sponsor our program and receive publicity at games through public announcements, banners and recognition at our annual golf fundraiser.
 - d) Many local business relationships provide discounted products and services to our teams and student-athletes.

Parents, Alumni and Affiliates:

1. “Slug Spirit” is limited to current parents of student-athletes and former intercollegiate players that are now alums.
2. Participation in alumni games is very high for most of our sports and the majority of consistent donor funds come from these same alums.
3. Former student-athletes are involved donors (generally higher in number than most groups on University campuses, including UCSC).
 - a) Our challenge is that without a staff position to provide donor outreach and communication, our ability to see growth in this area is limited.

Development and Media:

1. The profile of athletics in the development framework has received some attention in the past 2 years.
 - a) Administrators are more acutely aware of the current “survival mode” of athletics and the tremendous passion and commitment of student-athletes, coaches and athletic administration.
 - b) The passing of the first ever stand alone athletic referendum and the outcry from the community when the men’s and women’s water polo program was dropped for financial reasons brought attention to the athletic department.
2. Media coverage has also greatly improved in the past two years as a result of greater effort to communicate with local media.
 - a) Additionally, on-campus media (City on the Hill Press) now has a regular sports column and there is a weekly sports talk radio show on KZSC.

Division III Data Comparisons

For data collection purposes, we not only reviewed the Division III averages made up of the participating 447 member institutions, but also selected two other institutions for more in-depth comparisons. Our in-depth comparisons looked beyond just financial data and reviewed organizational structure, facilities, conference affiliation as well as phone interviews. Emory University served as the ideal role model in terms of both academic and athletics excellence. The University of Texas, Dallas served as a model for how most successful Division III institutions are structured. Both schools have similar academic requirements for admissions and both have a similar size student population as compared to UC Santa Cruz. Additionally, both schools demonstrate excellence in the athletic programs based upon post season appearances by their sponsored teams. In addition to the above, we also researched CSU East Bay as this is an institution that is currently transitioning from NCAA Division III to NCAA Division II and also shares our geographical location on the west coast.

Note about comparison institutions: When choosing comparison institutions, it became very apparent that there was no easy comparison. Division III is mostly made up of small, private institutions. Finding a public institution with a similar size student-body and similar academic admissions requirements was not easy.

Athletic Gap Analysis Summary
(Data from 2007-2008)

	Average for Div. III Institutions w/o Football	University of California, Santa Cruz
Total Student Body	2248	16,087
# of Student Athletes	338 (Men 234, Women 154)	271 Men 116, Women 155
# Teams	Men 8.6, Women 8.9	Men 6, Women 8
Operating Expenses	\$1,872,000 (\$833 per student or \$4837 per student athlete)	\$1,108,557 (\$69 per student or \$4091 per student athlete)
Coach Salaries (includes head and assistant coaches)	\$331,693 \$148 per student or \$981 per student athlete)	\$200,219 (\$13 per student or \$739 per student athlete)
Administrative Salaries	\$341,696 (\$152 per student or \$1011 per student athlete)	\$221,114 (\$14 per student or \$816 per student athlete)
Fund Raising	\$100,000 - \$120,000	\$180,000 - \$200,000

See Appendix B for other comparative data and EADA spreadsheets (Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act).

Options considered for UC Santa Cruz Athletics

In reviewing the current Intercollegiate Athletics program at UCSC, the Task Force did discuss and consider other sport options or possibilities available to a university. Below is a summary of pros and cons for each option considered.

Option 1: No Athletics – Club Sports Only

Pros:

1. No financial obligation by the university.
2. Places many of the administrative duties on the student leadership and requires minimal oversight by the university.
3. Minimal eligibility requirements for student participation.

Cons:

1. Continuity of programming from year to year would cease and be directly dependent upon the abilities of the student leaders.
2. The opportunity for highly skilled athletes to compete on a level in keeping with their ability will be limited.
3. The opportunity for highly skilled athletes to continue to improve and excel will be limited by less competitive teams and limited coaching.
4. Governing bodies with sports clubs are sport-specific, unlike the NCAA that oversees all intercollegiate sports. This would create discrepancies in terms of team policies, expectations, conduct, safety, etc.
5. The quality of experience would vary from club to club as each is completely separate from the other and there is no unifying governing body.
6. The University would not receive any public praise or recognition for athletic successes as sport clubs rarely gain recognition by media and do not have national awards for sporting or academic accomplishments.
7. Intercollegiate Athletics affiliated through the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is considered the “gold” standard for athletics and students strive to compete at this level. Not having an NCAA affiliated program will negatively impact recruitment and retention of prospective students who aim to continue competing in their sport while gaining their undergraduate degree.
8. There are no organized club sports for men’s and women’s swimming, men’s and women’s basketball, men’s and women’s tennis and women’s golf. This would mean the elimination of these sports programs for UCSC and over 120 current student athletes without the opportunity to participate.

Overall the task force felt the cons outweighed the pros and that any program we do administer should meet the needs of our students. Our current student-athletes are very clear that they want to remain an NCAA affiliated program. Additionally, the current sport club participants strive to see their club elevated to NCAA status. Additionally, from an administrative stand-point, it is much easier to manage a program where all teams are held to the same standards. The NCAA provides consistency in governing all

teams, whereas, within sport clubs, policies, procedures and even eligibility vary greatly due to each sport having a different governing body.

Option 2: Move from NCAA to NAIA

Pros:

1. There are more NAIA teams in our local region, thus travel expenses would decrease.
2. The NAIA does not require a minimum number of sports that an institution must sponsor.
3. As an NAIA institution, we would gain membership into a conference - the California Pacific Conference (Cal Pac).
4. The NAIA holds post season conference championship tournament in most sports.
5. There are automatic qualifiers to nationals for many sports through Cal Pac membership, hence our chances of qualifying for nationals will increase.
6. UCSC would be highly competitive in the Conference (increasing success in wins and National Championship opportunities)
7. UCSC would earn more conference awards for student-athlete successes and coaching successes.
8. The NAIA has fewer off-season practice restrictions.

Cons:

1. The California Pacific Conference (Cal Pac) is a very weak competitive conference.
2. The NAIA does not reimburse institutions for National Championship travel like the NCAA does.
3. The West Coast is limited in the number of NAIA schools.
4. The trend in athletics is movement away from NAIA to the NCAA, thus the number of NAIA schools is decreasing and will most likely continue to decrease in the coming years.
5. The NAIA is less known, less visible and less credible than the NCAA.
6. The NAIA is limited in its research and data collection; information which is important to its member institutions on several levels
7. It is more challenging to fund raise for an NAIA school vs. an NCAA school because of the positive perception and credibility of the NCAA.
8. The NAIA provides little opportunity for career development programming. The NCAA is exceptional with career development opportunities.
9. The NAIA does not reimburse institutions for attendance at mandatory meetings. The NCAA provides grant monies to ensure participation at regional and national meetings.
10. The NAIA does not provide Grants and has no diversity assistance programming.
11. The NAIA does not have divisions; schools with no scholarships are lumped in with schools that award the maximum number of scholarships allowed in any particular sport (exceptions in Men's & Women's Basketball for NAIA I and II).
12. As an NAIA member, the talent pool of both coaches and student-athletes at UCSC will diminish.
13. The quality of the student-athlete experience will diminish.

Option 3: Remain Division III

Pros:

1. The division III philosophy matches the philosophy of our current athletic coaches and administrators. This philosophy states that the highest priority is on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. Division III seeks to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletic activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experiences. Division III also seeks to establish and maintain an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among student-athletes and athletics staff.
2. Student-athletes do not receive any financial aid related to athletic talent. All student-athletes are treated in the same manner as the general student body.
3. The cost to administer Division III Athletics is much cheaper than Division II and on par with NAIA.
4. The prestige of competing for an NCAA school is important to current and prospective student-athletes and helps with recruitment and retention.
5. UCSC has achieved great success in individual and team awards and post-season play opportunities in DIII.
6. The ability to be successful academically is considered equally with athletic ability when student athletes are recruited to Division III institutions.

Cons:

1. UCSC is the only division III institution in Northern California, hence our travel expenses are very high.
2. Because of our "remote" location in division III, many schools will not travel to compete against us.
3. The average Division III institution has a student-body of only 2,248 and most are private schools, hence we are not competing against like institutions.
4. Division III has less prestige than Division II (see below for pro statements for Division II).
5. There is a strong trend toward NAIA schools becoming NCAA DII members, affecting the growth of DIII membership in the West (8 States).
6. There is a strong trend toward NCAA DIII schools moving to DII membership, affecting the number of schools within states west of the Mississippi.
7. Future pressure may come to bare from other DIII institutions, the NCAA, the community, UCSC alumni and perhaps student-athletes, students and coaches to move from DIII to DII, as school size, location and program success may contribute to that end (examples: UC San Diego and CSU East Bay).

Option 4: Move to Division II

Pros:

1. Greater local competition means less travel expense and fewer missed classes
2. UCSC would likely gain membership in the best DII conference in the country - California Collegiate Athletic Conference (CCAA).
3. The California Collegiate Athletic Conference (CCAA) has automatic post-season qualifiers to all the UCSC sports except women's golf, swimming and men's volleyball (women's golf and swimming may be added in the near future). As a strong conference, the CCAA typically sends 2-3 teams to Nationals for each sport.
4. Competition in division II is against institutions that are more recognizable to the general public.
5. Offers competition with more "like" institutions (public, student body size).
6. Because of the locations of other division II schools, we will have the ability to have a balanced number of home and away contests.
7. Greater opportunity for friends and parents to attend home and away games, as the huge majority of our student-athletes are from California.
8. Opportunity for student-athletes to receive athletic scholarships toward the cost of a college education.
9. Greater visibility in the community, region, State and nationally.
10. Greater media coverage.
11. Greater opportunity for community involvement (fans, financial support, etc)
12. Greater student-athlete experience
13. More liberal practice dates in the off-season provide opportunity for student-athletes to significantly improve on their athletic skills, in particular cross-country and golf.
14. Greater donor and alumni financial support as well as possibility for corporate sponsorships.
15. Greater school spirit, pride and fan attendance as Athletics would have a higher profile in day to day activities on campus.
16. Less dependent on fundraisers to meet basic needs (equipment, travel).
17. Full-time coaches, which positively impacts recruiting, donations, mentoring student-athletes and program success both academically and athletically.

Requirements:

The ability to move from Division III to division II does require a strong commitment by the university. Additionally, before making this step, UCSC would have to prove it can not only remain competitive at division III, but would need to show financial stability at division III. Additionally, there would need to be commitments for additional administrative positions, full-time coaches for each sport and both new and improved sport venues. The new and improved sport facilities would also benefit other programs, including, intramural sports, sport clubs, recreation and physical education activities and special events.

Other considerations:

According to Dr. Cedric Dempsey and Dr. Edward Leland, both consultants who evaluate athletic programs as well as create feasibility studies for universities, the move from NCAA Division III membership to Division II membership requires a minimum of \$1M in new operational funding. This has been the experience of other California institutions that have made a similar move. Additionally, NCAA Division II members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association are required to have athletic merit-based aid awarded to student-athletes. Presently the level of aid required is at least \$250K in athletic financial aid.

Other Questions Included in the Charge Letter Not Specifically Addressed in the Recommendations

1. What are the current and future NCAA requirements that impact the viability of the athletics department, and our ability to maintain a high quality, competitive athletic program?

NCAA minimum sport sponsorship: The NCAA will require a minimum of 12 teams (6 men's and 6 women's) beginning in 2010-11. Currently in 2009-10 UCSC sponsors 5 men's teams and 7 women's teams. Due to the financial challenges, UCSC has applied for and received a one-year waiver allowing us to continue without meeting this minimum. We will need to address this during the 2010-11 academic year and add one men's team for the 2011-12 academic year.

Along with this, we must consider the implications of adding one men's team with maintaining our compliance with Title IX. The addition of one men's team will necessitate either the addition of one women's team or severe roster management with the men's teams in order to maintain our correct ratio of athletic opportunities for female students based upon the campus population.

2. What is the campus commitment to the athletic program?

The opinion of the Athletic Task Force, which is made up of individuals representing students, staff, faculty and alumni, is that the Athletics program is a highly valuable program that should be continued and given the base infrastructure and funding to succeed. Additionally, such a program should be available to all students possessing the interest and talent to participate regardless of financial means. Despite the on-going funding challenges, the Athletic program has proven to bring positive attention to the campus and proven to produce positive outcomes athletically and academically. The full benefits of a successful program have not been realized yet due to the funding challenges

which limits participation to those with financial means as the current funding model requires all student-athletes to pay a substantial amount in order to participate. One of the values for the future of Athletics established within a Task Force meeting is to ensure that all financial barriers to participation are removed.

3. What level of financial responsibility should be expected of students in the support of the athletic program?

This is a difficult question to answer as each institution that we researched had a different funding model. It is apparent from the data, however, that each institution had a separate fee established that specifically supported the Athletic program in addition to fees provided from general university or registration fees. The range of annual fees assessed to students was from \$94 per year to \$264 per year. In comparison, UCSC does have an established fee for Athletics that amounts to \$15 per year. It is very evident from these comparisons that UCSC will need to consider moving forward with proposing an increase to the current fee in the very near future.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Task Force Charge Letter

Appendix B: Comparative Data

Appendix C: 3-year Strategic Plan

SANTA CRUZ: VICE CHANCELLOR STUDENT AFFAIRS

December 15, 2008

Associate Vice Chancellor Alma Sifuentes (Co-Chair)
OPERS Executive Director Ryan Andrews, OPERS (Co-Chair)
Associate Vice Chancellor Michelle Wittingham,
Director Dave Keller, Residential and Family Services
Undergraduate Student, Malia Nanbara, Student Athletic Advisory Council
Special Projects Manager Lucy Rojas (Staff to the Committee)
Undergraduate Student Matt Payne, Student Fee Advisory Council
Paul Simpson, Alumni Representative
Coordinator Adam Snook, Staff Advisory Board
Athletic Director Linda Spradley
Undergraduate Student Brad Sullivan, Student Athletic Advisory Council
Assistant Chancellor Ashish Sahni, Chancellor's Office
Faculty Athletic Representative Gene Switkes, Chemistry Dept.
Associate Vice Chacellor Jennifer Svihus, University Relations/Development
Athletic Coach, Bob Hansen
Principle Budget Analyst Jessica Gallione, Planning & Budget
Student Representative Tiffany Loftin, SUA

Re: NCAA Division III Athletics Taskforce Charge Letter

Dear Colleagues,

I write to invite your participation in the NCAA Division III Athletics Task Force. I am charging this task force to advise me on the future of NCAA Division III Athletics at UC Santa Cruz.

As you may know, the past year has been difficult for the Athletics Department as well as the Office of Physical Education Recreation and Sports (OPERS), given budgetary and programmatic challenges. As a result of these challenges, the Athletics Department and OPERS made the difficult and controversial decision to cancel teams (water polo), reduce services and adjust programs. The analysis and assessment that helped to inform the water polo decision, has left the Division of Student Affairs with concerns regarding the long term viability of NCAA Division III Athletics at UC Santa Cruz. Given the data that was collected during this analysis, I have assessed that the timing is appropriate to review athletics further.

The primary function of this task force will be to review UCSC Athletics, and the feasibility of continuing Division III athletics without encumbering future financial deficits.

Under the leadership of task force co-chairs, Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students Alma Sifuentes and Executive Director Ryan Andrews, I ask that the committee explore the following:

- What is the future of athletics on the UCSC campus?
- What financial, administrative and operational infrastructure is required to secure our future and maintain a healthy, debt-free athletic program?
- What are the current and future NCAA requirements that impact the viability of the athletics department, and our ability to maintain a high quality, competitive athletic program?
- What is the campus commitment to the athletic program?
- What level of financial responsibility should be expected of students in the support of the athletic program?
- What is our community's philosophical approach to athletics versus club sports?
- How does the current funding structure and deficits for the athletic department impact our ability to maintain quality?

I ask that you explore these questions in the coming months, meet with appropriate constituents and investigate and research best practices. Please prepare a report of your findings, along with recommendations by June 30, 2009. The task force meetings will be scheduled by Co-Chair Alma Sifuentes' office; please expect to meet every two weeks during Winter Quarter and monthly during spring quarter.

I thank you in advance for your time and service to the Division of Student Affairs and the Athletics Department through the work of this task force. I look forward to receiving your recommendations, and encourage you to connect with me as you have questions.

Sincerely,

Felicia E. McGinty, Ed.D
Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs

CC: Director Sayo Fujioka
Associate Director Ebony Lewis
SUA Chair Kalwis Lo

Assistant Vice Chancellor Sue Matthews
Vice Chancellor Meredith Michaels
Assistant Chancellor Ashish Sahn
Associate Vice Chancellor Jean Marie Scott
Associate Vice Chancellor Jennifer Svihus
Associate Vice Chancellor Michelle Whittingham
Assistant to SFAC Ellen Ziff
Staff Advisory Board
Student Athletic Advisory Council

Comparison Data For Division III Schools
EADA Comparison
2008

		UCSC		
Linda Spadley		Men's	Women's	Total
Varsity Teams		0		0
Baseball		16		13
Basketball		0		8
Golf		25		26
Soccer		0		0
Softball		20		35
Swimming & Diving		16		6
Tennis		0		20
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined		16		23
Volleyball		24		24
Water Polo		117		155
Total Participants		117		155
Unduplicated Count of Participants		116		155

		Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
Head Coaches				
Baseball		N/A	N/A	
Basketball		1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	1 PT, FT Emp	
Golf		N/A	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Soccer		1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Softball		N/A	N/A	
Swimming & Diving		1 PT, FT Empl	1 PT, FT Empl	
Tennis		1 PT, FT Empl	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined		N/A	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Volleyball		1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Water Polo		1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
TOTAL		6 PT	8 PT	
Average Salary Per Coach Position		\$ 11,321	\$ 10,969	
Average Salary Per Coach FTE		\$ 54,341	\$ 50,144	

		UCSC			
		Men's Teams	Women's Teams		Total
Assistant Coaches					
Baseball					
Basketball			2 PT, PT Emp or Volunt		
Golf			2 PT, 1 FT Empl, 1 PT or Volun		
Soccer			4 PT, 3 PT Emp, 1 FT Emp		
Softball			1 PT, PT Empl or Volunt		
Swimming & Diving			2 PT, PT Empl or Volunt		
Tennis			3 PT, 3PT or Volun		
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined					
Volleyball					
Water Polo					
TOTAL					
Average Salary Per Assistant Coach Position		\$ 2,667		\$ 3,290	
Average Salary Per Assistant Coach FTE		\$ 21,336		\$ 25,703	
Recruiting Expenses		\$ -		\$ 179	\$ 179
Operating Expenses By Varsity Team					
		Men's		Women's	
		Operating Expenses per Participant	By Team	Operating Expenses per Participant	By Team
Baseball		\$ -	\$ 42,796	\$ 3,336	\$ 43,367
Basketball		\$ 2,675	\$ -	\$ 3,313	\$ 26,504
Golf		\$ -	\$ 44,054	\$ 1,628	\$ 42,321
Soccer		\$ 1,762	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Softball		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Swimming & Diving		\$ 1,039	\$ 20,788	\$ 891	\$ 31,183
Tennis		\$ 2,287	\$ 36,587	\$ 2,156	\$ 12,937
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 892	\$ 17,849
Volleyball		\$ 2,501	\$ 32,055	\$ 1,380	\$ 33,123
TOTAL			\$ 216,288		\$ 226,441
Expenses by Varsity Team					
Basketball		\$ 60,396		\$ 68,143	\$ 128,539
Total Expenses of All Sports Except Football & Basketball		\$ 247,605		\$ 280,879	\$ 528,484
Not Allocated by Gender					\$ 451,534
TOTAL					\$ 1,108,557
Revenues By Team					
Basketball		\$ 52,102		\$ 69,786	\$ 121,888
Total Revenues of All Sports Except Football & Basketball		\$ 250,167		\$ 270,883	\$ 521,050
Not Allocated by Gender					\$ 465,619
TOTAL					\$ 1,108,557

Comparison Data For Division III Schools
EADA Comparison
2008

Tim Downes Emory University

	Men's	Women's	Total
Varsity Teams			
Baseball	28	0	
Basketball	20	20	
Golf	12	0	
Soccer	26	28	
Softball	0	17	
Swimming & Diving	33	33	
Tennis	23	12	
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined	50	28	
Volleyball	0	16	
Water Polo	0	0	
Total Participants	192	154	
Unduplicated Count of Participants	177	141	

	Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
Head Coaches			
Baseball	1 FTE	N/A	
Basketball	1 FTE	1 FTE	
Golf	1 FTE	N/A	
Soccer	1 FTE	1 FTE	
Softball	N/A	1 FTE	
Swimming & Diving	1 PT, Full-Time Emp	1 PT, Full-Time Emp	1 FTE
Tennis	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined	1 PT, Full-Time Emp	1 PT, Full-Time Emp	1 FTE
Volleyball	1 FTE	1 FTE	
Water Polo	N/A		
TOTAL	5 Full-Time, 2 Part-Time	5 Full-Time, 2 Part-Time	10 FT, 4 PT

Average Salary Per Coach Position	\$ 52,701	\$ 54,551	
Average Salary Per Coach FTE	\$ 61,485	\$ 63,643	

	Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
Assistant Coaches			
Baseball	1 FTE	1 FTE	
Basketball	1 FTE		
Golf	N/A		
Soccer	N/A	1 FTE	
Softball	N/A		
Swimming & Diving	3 Part-Time, PT Empl or Volunt	3 Part-Time, PT Empl or Volunt	
Tennis	1 FTE	1 FTE	
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined	3 Part-Time, PT Empl or Volunt	3 Part-Time, PT Empl or Volunt	
Volleyball	N/A	1 FTE	
Water Polo			
TOTAL	3 FTE, 6 Part-Time	4 FTE, 6 Part-Time	

Average Salary Per Assistant Coach Position	\$ 15,439	\$ 15,055	
Average Salary Per Assistant Coach FTE	\$ 18,283	\$ 18,030	
Recruiting Expenses	\$ 30,141	\$ 41,467	\$ 71,608

Comparison Data For Division III Schools
EADA Comparison
2008

Emory University						
Operating Expenses By Varsity Team	Men's			Women's		Total
	Operating Expenses per Participant	By Team	Operating Expenses per Participant	By Team	By Team	
Baseball	\$ 2,353	\$ 65,876				\$ 65,876
Basketball	\$ 3,562	\$ 71,234	\$	\$ 64,540	\$	\$ 135,774
Golf	\$ 2,183	\$ 26,192	\$	\$	\$	\$ 26,192
Soccer	\$ 2,164	\$ 56,251	\$	\$	\$	\$ 107,289
Softball	\$ -	\$ -	\$	\$	\$	\$ 36,045
Swimming & Diving	\$ 1,440	\$ 47,527	\$	\$	\$	\$ 95,054
Tennis	\$ 1,341	\$ 30,842	\$	\$	\$	\$ 67,505
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined	\$ 2,051	\$ 102,564	\$	\$	\$	\$ 160,000
Volleyball	\$ -	\$ -	\$	\$	\$	\$ 69,030
TOTAL	\$ -	\$ 400,486	\$	\$ 362,279	\$	\$ 762,765
Expenses by Varsity Team						
Basketball	\$ 235,211	\$	Men's	215,039	Women's	Total
Total Expenses of All Sports Except Football & Basketball Not Allocated by Gender	\$ 1,050,232	\$		1,021,336		\$ 450,250
TOTAL						\$ 2,071,568
Revenues By Team						
Basketball	\$ 254,418	\$		223,758		\$ 478,176
Total Revenues of All Sports Except Football & Basketball Not Allocated by Gender	\$ 1,225,543	\$		1,135,517		\$ 2,361,060
TOTAL						\$ 1,963,026
						\$ 4,802,262

Comparison Data For Division III Schools
EADA Comparison
2008

The University of Texas at Dallas			
	Men's	Women's	Total
Athletic Director			
Varsity Teams			
Baseball	48	0	
Basketball	17	17	
Golf	9	6	
Soccer	32	24	
Softball	0	19	
Swimming & Diving	0	0	
Tennis	9	7	
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined	11	8	
Volleyball	0	13	
Water Polo	0	0	
Total Participants	126	94	
Unduplicated Count of Participants	126	94	

Chris Gage

	Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
Head Coaches			
Baseball	1 FTE		
Basketball	1 FTE	1 FTE	
Golf	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Soccer	1 FTE	1 FTE	
Softball	N/A	1 FTE	
Swimming & Diving	N/A		
Tennis	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Volleyball	N/A	1 FTE	
Water Polo	N/A		
TOTAL	3 FTE, 3 Part-Time	3 FTE, 3 Part Time	
Average Salary Per Coach Position	\$ 25,050	\$ 26,050	
Average Salary Per Coach FTE	\$ 27,833	\$ 28,418	

	Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
Assistant Coaches			
Baseball	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun		
Basketball	1 FTE	1 FTE	
Golf			
Soccer			
Softball	1 FTE	1 FTE	
Swimming & Diving		1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Tennis			

Comparison Data For Division III Schools
EADA Comparison
2008

The University of Texas at Dallas

Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined
Volleyball
Water Polo
TOTAL

1 FTE

3 FTE, 1 PT

Average Salary Per Assistant Coach Position
Average Salary Per Assistant Coach FTE

\$ 19,250
\$ 25,667

Recruiting Expenses

\$ 7,200
\$ 8,450
\$ 15,650

Total

Operating Expenses By Varsity Team

Baseball
Basketball
Golf
Soccer
Softball
Swimming & Diving
Tennis
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined
Volleyball
TOTAL

Operating Expenses per Participant

\$ 781
\$ 2,388
\$ 1,646
\$ 1,202
\$ -
\$ -
\$ 1,686
\$ 1,437
\$ -
\$ 162,340

Operating Expenses per Participant

\$ -
\$ 2,224
\$ 2,468
\$ 1,644
\$ 1,855
\$ -
\$ 2,310
\$ 1,976
\$ 2,526
\$ 192,130

By Team

\$ 37,500
\$ 40,600
\$ 14,810
\$ 38,450
\$ -
\$ -
\$ 15,170
\$ 15,810
\$ -
\$ 162,340

Expenses by Varsity Team

Basketball
Total Expenses of All Sports Except Football & Basketball
Not Allocated by Gender
TOTAL

Men's

\$ 104,825
\$ 262,225

Women's

\$ 107,800
\$ 363,096

Total

\$ 212,625
\$ 625,321
\$ 1,085,447
\$ 1,923,393

Revenues By Team

Basketball
Total Revenues of All Sports Except Football & Basketball
Not Allocated by Gender
TOTAL

\$ 54,560
\$ 176,512

\$ 1,546,841
\$ 2,044,483

**Comparison Data For Division III Schools
Organizational Structure
2008**

	UCSC	Emory	UT Dallas
Total Enrollment	16,087	12,930	14,987
What campus division does Athletics reside within?	Student Affairs	Campus Life (like Student Affairs)	Student Affairs
Is the Athletics department structured as an independent unit, or is paired with other campus programs (PE, Rec)?	Part of larger unit	Athletics and Recreation (PE at Emory is an academic department)	Independent
If yes, what other programs is Athletics paired with?	Paired with Physical Education, Recreation, Intramural Sports, Sport Clubs and Wellness	Recreation	NA
What is the reporting chain from the Athletic Director up to the University President/Chancellor?	Athletic Director ▶ Executive Director, OPERS ▶ Associate VC of Student Affairs ▶ VC Student Affairs	Campus Life VP, he to the president	Through VP of Student Affairs

UT Dallas Coaching Staff

Comparison Data For Division III Schools
Coaching Staff
2008

The University of Texas at Dallas

	Men's Teams		Women's Teams	
	Coaching FTE	Total FTE	Coaching FTE	Total FTE
Head Coaches				
Baseball	1 FTE			
Basketball	1 FTE	Also does event set up	Polly Thompson	1 FTE
Golf	1 PT, PT Emp		Rone Robinson	1 PT, PT Emp
Soccer	1 PT, PT Emp		Eddie Bull	1 PT, PT Emp
Softball	1 FTE	also does facility superv.	John Antonisse	1 FTE
Swimming & Diving	N/A		Kim Sotomayor	1 FTE
Tennis	1 PT, PT Emp		Brian Whitt	1 PT, PT Emp
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined	N/A		Marci Sanders	1 FTE
Volleyball	3 FTE, 3 Part-Time			3 FTE, 3 Part Time
TOTAL				

	Men's Teams		Women's Teams	
	Coaching FTE	Total FTE	Coaching FTE	Total FTE
Assistant Coaches (Paid & Volunteer)				
Baseball	1 PT, PT Emp or Volunt	- also head cross country coach		
Basketball	1 FTE		Tierney Hughes	1 FTE
Cross Country			Tierney Hughes	
Golf			Katie Johnson	1 FTE
Soccer	1 FTE		Rone Robinson	1 PT, PT Emp or Volunt
Softball			Katie Johnson	
Swimming & Diving				
Tennis				
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined			Zach Vallarreal	1 FTE
Volleyball	2 FTE, 1 PT			3 FTE, 1 PT
TOTAL				also asst. SID

Emory Coaching Staff

Comparison Data For Division III Schools
Coaching Staff
2008

Emory University

	Men's Teams				Women's Teams			
	Coach Name	Coaching FTE	Total FTE	Other Duties	Coach Name	Coaching FTE	Total FTE	Other Duties
Head Coaches								
Baseball	Mike Iwardoski	1 FTE		teach 1 class		N/A		
Basketball	Jason Zimmerman	1 FTE			Christy Thomaskutty	1 FTE		
Golf	Mike Phillips	1 FTE						
Soccer	Sonny Travis	1 FTE			Sue Patberg	1 FTE		
Softball		N/A			Penny Siqueiros	1 FTE		
Swimming & Diving	Jon Howell, Alex Kossenkov	1 Part-Time Coach, Full-Time Emp			Jon Howell, Alex Kossenkov	1 Part-Time Coach, Full-Time Emp		
Tennis	John Browning	1 FTE		teach 1 class	Amy Bryant	1 FTE		
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined	John Curtin	1 Part-Time Coach, Full-Time			John Curtin	1 Part-Time Coach, Full-Time Emp		
Volleyball		N/A			Jenny McDowell	1 FTE		
TOTAL		5 Full-Time, 2 Part-Time				5 Full-Time, 2 Part-Time		

	Men's Teams				Women's Teams			
	Coach Name	Coaching FTE	Total FTE	Other Duties	Coach Name	Coaching FTE	Total FTE	Other Duties
Assistant Coaches (Paid & Volunteer)								
Baseball	Bobby Perez	1 FTE						
Basketball	Chris Murphy, Ben Wright	1 FTE			Nora Jabbour, Kim Coleman	1 FTE		
Cross Country	John Sioberg	N/A						
Golf	Ben Buerger, Glen Fox	N/A			Rachel Moreland, Emily Fedeles	1 FTE		
Soccer	Erin Detwiler, Cindy Fontana, Chris Marshall	3 Part-Time			Roger Fannon			
Softball	Mark Odgers	1 FTE		teach classes	Erin Detwiler, Cindy Fontana, Chris Marshall	3 Part-Time		manages life guards
Swimming & Diving	Carl Leivers, Kevin Semanick, Ross Smithy, Pedro Vasquez	3 Part-Time			Meredith Vincent	1 FTE		
Tennis					Carl Leivers, Kevin Semanick, Ross Smithy, Pedro Vasquez	3 Part-Time		facilities responsibilities
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined					Justin Hart, Eric Hawes, Amanda Welter	1 FTE		
Volleyball		N/A						
TOTAL		3 FTE, 6 Part-Time				4 FTE, 6 Part-Time		

UCSC Coaching Staff

Comparison Data For Division III Schools
Coaching Staff
2008

UCSC

Head Coaches	Men's Teams			Women's Teams		
	Coach Name	Coaching FTE	Total FTE	Coach Name	Coaching FTE	Total FTE
Baseball	N/A					
Basketball	Gordon Johnson	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun		Todd Kent	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Golf	N/A			Paully Pera	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Soccer	Michael Runeare	1 PT, PT Emp	0.3	Josh Schelhorse	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Softball	N/A					
Swimming & Diving	Kim Musch	1 PT, FT Empl	0.32	Kim Musch	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Tennis	Bob Hansen	1 PT, FT Empl	0.44	Erin Ness	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined	N/A			Adam Booth	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Volleyball	Jonah Carson	1 PT, PT Emp		Selene Teitelbaum	1 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
TOTAL		6 PT			7 PT	

Assistant Coaches (Paid & Volunteer)	Men's Teams			Women's Teams		
	Coach Name	Coaching FTE	Total FTE	Coach Name	Coaching FTE	Total FTE
Baseball						
Basketball						
Cross Country		2 Part-Time, PT Empl or Volun			2 PT, PT Emp or Volun	
Golf						
Soccer		2 Part-Time, PT Empl or Volun			2 PT, 1 FT Empl, 1 PT or Volun	
Softball						
Swimming & Diving		4 PT, 3 PT Emp, 1 FT Emp				
Tennis		1 PT, PT Empl or Volun				
Track & Field, x-country or All Track Combined		1 PT, PT Empl or Volun			2 PT, 1 FT Emp, 1 PT Emp or volun	
Volleyball						
TOTAL						

Comparison Data For Division III Schools
Administrative Personnel
2008

Position	UC Santa Cruz			Emory University			The University of Texas at Dallas		
	Name	FTE	Department (if funded from other than Athletics)	Name	FTE	Department (if funded from other than Athletics)	Name	FTE	Department (if funded from other than Athletics)
Athletic Director	Linda Spradley	1		Tim Downes	1	All positions strictly athletics other than development officer who works with campus life.	Chris Gage	1	
Associate Athletic Director(s)				Myra Sims	1		Larry Gardner - Student Services, Bill Pettit - External Relations, Bruce Unrue - Media Relations	3	
Assistant Athletic Director(s)				Joyce Jaleel	1				
Sports Information Director(s)				John Farina	1				
Administrative Assistant(s)	Julie Roth	1		Omar Cole	1		Bruce Unrue, Chaz Amidon Kelli Jackson, Liz Ramirez	2	
Development Officer	Kathleen Hughes		Student Affairs Development Officer	Rich Porter		Development for Campus Life and Athletics- does not report to AD	Athletics has own development officer	1	
Booster Club Officer									
Game Management Staff									
Facility Manager	Rachel Neuman		Supports all OPERS programs	Michael Toce, Meg Ahrens	1		Athletics has own facility mgr.	1	
Equipment Manager				Jamie McDermott	1				
Academic Advisor(s)									
Academic Tutor(s)									
Athletic Trainers	Primrose Pisares	1		Joan Reed	1				
Athletic Trainers	Tim Baldwin	0.5		John Dunham	1		Tom Monagan	1	
Athletic Trainers	Grad Student		Grad Asst. SJSU Grad Student	Chip Hewgley	1		Yukari Kagayama-Miyagi	1	
Compliance Officer				Meg Ahrens	1		Kurt Kammerer	1	
Faculty Athletic Rep	Gene Switkes	Volunteer	Volunteer Faculty Athletic Rep				Faculty Athletic Rep		From academic dept but does receive pay
Eligibility Officer / Senior Women's Administrator				Joyce Jaleel academics, Elijah Ajayi	2		Athletics	1	
Strength/Conditioning Coaches				Steve Lewis, Ron Dickson	2				
Business Manager	Robert Irons		Supports all OPERS Programs	Blair Vickery	1				
Other									
Total Administrative Personnel		3.5 FTE			11 FTE			13 FTE	

NCAA DIVISION III AVERAGES 2006-2007

Expense Category	Average for Division III Institutions w/o Football	UCSC Expenses 2007-2008
Number of Head Coaching Positions	14	12
Head Coaching FTEs	5.8	3
Head Coaching Salaries	\$266,724	\$189,748
Number of Assistant Coaching Positions	17	11
Assistant Coaching FTEs	5.9	1.39
Assistant Coaching Salaries	\$64,969	\$17,471
Guarantees Paid	\$3,128	0
Administrative Salaries	\$341,379	\$221,114
Severance	\$11,938	0
Recruiting	\$18,263	\$179
Team Travel	\$201,316	\$268,149
Equipment, Uniforms, Supplies	\$81,282	\$98,069
Game Expenses	\$56,983	\$22,703
Fund Raising, Marketing and Promotion	\$20,255	\$8,030
Sports Camp Expenses	\$42,204	\$0
Direct Facilities, Maintenance and Rental	\$53,332	\$0
Spirit Groups	\$9,715	\$0
Medical Expenses and Insurance	\$25,658	\$15,006
Membership and Dues	\$15,055	\$2,750
Other Operating Expenses	\$70,266	\$54,265
Indirect Facilities and Admin Support	\$970,480	\$230,030
Total Expenses	\$1,850,216	\$1,122,774

**Comparison Data For Division III Schools
Budget
2008**

	UCSC	Emory	UT Dallas
Total Athletics Expenses: (from 2008 EADA)	\$ 1,108,557	\$ 4,802,262	\$ 2,044,483
REVENUES (include Amounts and the % of total budget that each source makes up)			
Fund Source: Registration Fees	\$ 194,891.00		\$ 119,000.00
Fund Source:	0		
Referenda or Fee Measures: include fee per student per year and amount Athletics receives annually	\$40,402 from Measure 7 & \$157,092 from Measure 31	2.5 million from student athletic fee, 1.8 million from general university funds. Two specific fees, mental health fee and athletic fee. Undergrad fee is \$132 a semester and grad \$ 102	\$1,648,900 \$47 per student per semester
Booster Club:		not significant, just add ons, University cover essentials	\$132,500
Total from Department Fund Raisers:	\$180,000 - \$200,000	under 100,000 new program	\$161,300
Types of Fund Raisers Used: General Campus Funds:	Mail-a-thons, tournaments, clinics, phone-a-thons, car washes, pizza nights, etc.	two or three mailings, e-solicitations to parents and alums, coaches more on thank you end	Tournaments, booster campaigns, corporate sponsorship, auctions
Other Sources of Funding:	Matching Funds: \$150,000; OPERS general income: 55,000; Program Income: \$72,000		Facility Rentals, Major Gifts
What is the average amount a student-athlete pays to participate in Athletics?	Varies by sport - \$300 - \$1,000	depends on the program, swimmers \$400, soccer \$100 these count in fundraising, some teams none	0
What does this contribution cover (travel, food, equipment)?	Practice and game uniforms, food for road trips	special suits in swimming, extra travel bags	N/A
Do you require coaches to fundraise?	YES	no, have a development officer, coaches help maintain relationships	Not required, but encouraged
	UCSC	Emory	UT Dallas
If so, how much do you expect coaches to fundraise?	Enough to cover the expected budget - varies by sport, number of student-athletes, number of away competitions, etc.		Depends on needs
What % is this compared to the total team budget?	Varies by sport - anywhere from 50% - 75%		NA
Is the Athletics Program required to Fundraise? If so, what is the fundraising goal?	meeting or surpassing the match each year - \$150K	Relatively new program, left up to each program, focus on facility development generally	\$100 K In 2009-10
What is the consequence of not reaching the fundraising goal?	Deficit		NA
What is the source of funds that built your facilities?	State funds and referendum	all existing facilities build with university funds except baseball, new facilities and will need to be fundraised for and U will maintain	Student fee/ Athletic Fee; external partnership
What is the source of funds used to maintain your facilities?	State funds and referendum		Athletic Fee, external partnership
Do you have any athletic endowments? If so, how much?	No	Women's soccer 500,000, would like to with more programs, all these are simply enhancement funds	NO

**Comparison Data For Division III Schools
Budget
2008**

How do you determine whether donations should be used for endowment or operations?

UCSC

Emory

UT Dallas

NA

University philosophy that operations covered by them, that could change

NA

EXPENSE CATEGORIES

(Please input the annual expense for each category for entire Athletics Program)

Uniforms
Practice Clothes
Equipment
Referee/Umpire Fees
Recruiting
Team Awards
Banquets

127,000 18 programs includes practice clothes and equip

38,000

31,000

10,000

included in home events

100,000

24,000

built in to Misc.

6,000

12,000

UCSC

Emory

UT Dallas

Letter Awards
Orientation
Pre-Camp Housing
Quarter Break Meals
Travel
Assistant Coach Stipend

5,000

1,000

0

1,200

370,000 away home 55,000

140,000

25,000 average for 7 Assistants

100 pper head and 500 for assistant coaches

4,500

21,000

29,000

55,000 misc

uaa travel 316,000

subsistance- student housing
68,000

310,000 facilities budget, student workers and facility related

22,000 for training room

16,000 sports Information not for personel operating

16,000 for marketing and promotions game day promotions
10,000 strength and conditioning equipment replacement
non team specific banquet and awards 25,000

above is supplimental budget information from AD

CAMPUS		Division III Facility Comparisons		UT Dallas
		UCSC	Emory	
Indoor Facilities Arena / Gymnasium?	1 Gym	1 large gym, extra court in indoor tennis facility	Yes, UTD Activity Center	
On or off campus location?	On campus	on campus	On Campus	
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	Shared with PE, Rec, IM, Drop in Use	shared	Shared with Recreation, IM's, summer camps, major campus events, etc.	
Seating Capacity	300	1000	3200	
How many basketball courts	2 short, 1 regulation	4 full courts	3 full courts in main gym/arena with 1 court aux. gym.	
How many volleyball courts	2 short, 1 regulation	4 full	4 full	
# and type of locker rooms	1 men's and 1 women's	general men and women, faculty men and women, team men and women	1 men's, 1 women's for Athletics, 1 men's, 1 women's for general use	
Soccer/Hockey Arena?	No		NA	
On or off campus location?			NA	

CAMPUS		Division III Facility Comparisons		UT Dallas
		UCSC	Emory	
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	NA			NA
Spectator Seating Capacity	NA			NA
# and type of locker rooms	NA			NA
Strength Training Facility (for student athletes only)	No	dedicated space for varsity athletics with full time strenght coach, one of the best things they have going, he has a grad assittant as well		Yes, within Activity Center/Arena
Square Footage?	NA	?		4,000
Indoor Track?	No	indoor track above the gym		
On or off campus location?	NA	on		
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	NA	general use		shared
Size?	NA	size of four full courts not regulation		

Division III Facility Comparisons		Emory	UT Dallas
CAMPUS	UCSC		
Indoor Pool?	No	yes olympic size	25 yard indoor pool
On or off campus location?	NA	on	located on campus within Activity Center
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	NA	shared space	Shared
Size?	NA	olympic	25 yard
Spectator Seating capacity	NA	500	
# and type of locker rooms	NA	teams have dedicated locker rooms	
Team Locker Rooms (not shared with public)	No		1 set in main Activity Center
List sports that have their own permanent locker room space.	NA	they all do	
# of Athletics/Team Meeting Rooms	No	5 meeting spaces all non dedicated	
# of Athletic Training rooms (Sports Medicine)	2	1 training room	1 main Athletic Training Room within Activity Center

CAMPUS		Division III Facility Comparisons		UT Dallas
UCSC		Emory		
Square Footage?	350 & 150	1330 (small, looking to expand 3,000 more Square feet)		
<u>Outdoor Facilities</u>	13 acres	Soccer field, baseball and softball, large rec space (4 soccer fields)		
Total acreage of all outdoor fields Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	All shared with PE, Sports clubs, IM and general student and community use	all shared		
Soccer Arena/Stadium	No	Yes	Yes	
On or off campus location?	NA	On	On	
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	fields shared - see above	Primarily used for soccer and other special events	Shared, although primarily for soccer teams as there are other fields available for other IM's and Recreation	
Does it have lights?	No lights on any fields	has lights	Lights	
Spectator seating capacity	Bleachers for 250 on field	1,000		
# and type of locker rooms (visitor, home team, officials, coaches, etc.)	No Locker Rooms			

CAMPUS		Division III Facility Comparisons	
UCSC		Emory	UT Dallas
Baseball/Softball Stadiums	No	1 of each	1 of each
On or off campus location?	NA	on	On
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	NA	athletics use only	Athletics Use only
Is it lighted?	NA	not lighted	Lighted
Spectator seating capacity	NA	Baseball 500 softball 250	
# and type of locker rooms (visitor, home team, officials, coaches, etc.)	NA	both have lockers and restrooms	
Athletics or shared space?	NA	not shared	
Track & Field Stadium	No	around the soccer field	
On or off campus location?	NA	on	
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	NA	shared	

CAMPUS		Division III Facility Comparisons	
	UCSC	Emory	UT Dallas
Is it lighted?	NA	lights	
Spectator seating capacity	NA	1,000	
# and type of locker rooms (visitor, home team, officials, coaches, etc.)	NA	dedicated inside building	
Tennis Arena/Stadium/Complex	No		
# of Tennis Courts	6 East, 6 West	six outdoor, working on a stadium, 6 at another residential complex managed by residential live, 4 indoor courts	
On or off campus location?	On campus	on	
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	shared with PE and General Rec use.	Shared	
Lighted?	6 on east are lit, 2 on west are lit.	all courts are lighted	
Spectator seating capacity	Movable Bleachers for 500 for east courts	100	
# and type of locker rooms (visitor, home team, officials, coaches, etc.)	1 men's/1 women's -both shared w/ public	lockers are inside and dedicated	

CAMPUS		Division III Facility Comparisons	
UCSC		Emory	UT Dallas
Aquatics Complex	No	indoor olympic size	
# of outdoor Pools	1	at residential complex two pools one olympic size	
On or off campus location?	on-campus	on campus	
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	shared with PE, IM's, Sports Clubs and general rec use	shared	
Size of Pools	50-M	50-M	
Lights?	Yes	indoor yes outdoor yes	
Spectator seating capacity	movable bleachers to seat 250	indoors 500, outdoors ?	
# and type of locker rooms (visitor, home team, officials, coaches, etc.)	1 men's & 1 women's - both shared w/ public	dedicated	
Athletics or shared space?	Shared	shared	
Other Outdoor Arena/Stadium:	NA	Field next to courts, host field track events and multi use	

CAMPUS	Division III Facility Comparisons		UT Dallas
	UCSC	Emory	
Purpose of use:	NA	general use	
On or off campus location?	NA	on	
Athletics or Shared space? If shared, with which departments?	NA	shared	
Lights?	NA	does	
# and type of locker rooms (visitor, home team, officials, coaches, etc.)	NA		

Athletics Strategic Plan

Goals and Objectives 2010 -2011				
Target Date	Goal Category "bucket"	Objectives	Who	Notes
9/1/10	Finance: Matching Funds	Renew Matching Funds Agreement with increases of \$120K over 3 years. Current agreement provides \$75K from Chancellor's Office and \$45K from Student Affairs. New agreement will call for an increase of \$20K annually by both Student Affairs and Chancellor's Office beginning Fall 2010 for 3 years.	Student Affairs/ Chancellor's Office	Year 1 increase will be used to add one men's athletic team (requirement by the NCAA in 2011-12)
10/1/10	Community Building: Athletics and Faculty	Enhance relationship between Athletics and Faculty	Athletic Director	Inform faculty of presence of student athletes in their classrooms and the expectations of academic excellence for all student athletes. Invite all faculty to participate in Athletics program by attending a competition.
10/1/10	Community Building: Students	Assign SAAC with charge of improving school spirit and the image of USC Athletics.	Athletic Director / SAAC	encourages student leadership and involvement in the success of the program.
11/1/10	Organizational Structure & Advisory	Establish a minimum of 1 meeting annually for the Student Athletic Advisory Council (SAAC) to meet with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs	Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs	
1/1/11	Finance: Future Donor Development	Create database with contact information for all past and present student athletes/athletic.	Athletic Director	Utilize for annual mailings, invites to events, phone nights, etc.
1/1/11	Advisory to Athletics	Establish a broad based Athletic Advisory Committee	Athletic Director	The board should include representation from the following: Academic Senate, Student Affairs, Admissions, Foundation, Planning & Budget and Alumni Relations with purpose to advise the Athletic Director on policy, program growth and other issues/concerns of faculty or administration.
1/1/11	Other: Student Proposal to Committee of Admissions & Financial Aid - CAFA	Review Committee on the CAFA proposal. Review the training students are challenged to in the CAFA program. Review the CAFA program in the context of potential student athletes because they are training to other universities which attract top level athletes for internships.	OPENING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR / Athletic Director / Athletic Form VISA	
5/1/11	Finance: Future Donor Development	Apply for NCAA Diversity Award	Finance Director	
6/30/11	Finance: Future Donor Development	Use the lessons learned from the Tennis endowment pilot project as a model for other athletic teams	Athletic Director / Development Officer	
6/30/11	Finance: Future Donor Development	Use the lessons learned from the Tennis endowment pilot project as a model for other athletic teams	Athletic Director / Development Officer	

Athletics Strategic Plan

Goals and Objectives 2011 -2012			
Target Date	Goal Category "bucket"	Objectives	Notes
7/1/11	Organizational Structure & Advisory	Change reporting structure to have Intercollegiate Athletics report directly to Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs.	Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs Improves flow of information required by senior management regarding reporting, compliance, etc.
9/1/11	Finance: Matching Funds	Year two increase of \$40K (\$20K by Chancellor's Office, \$20K by Student Affairs)	Year 2 increase will be used to improve medical support of student athletes.
9/1/11	Community Development: Alumni & Future Donor Development	Coordinate our Athletic Alumni Events with larger University Relations Alumni events.	Will give alumni more reasons to attend events and continue to develop a bond between UR and Athletics
10/1/11	Community Building: Image / School Spirit / Marketing	Create intern position to support Sports Information to increase reporting of Athletic successes in both on-campus media and off-campus media	Perhaps utilize CUIP Intern program; coordinate with University Relations and with Student Media about possible internship possibilities/opportunities
10/1/11	Community Building: UCSC Students	Engage general student body by creating incentives to attend competitions and support UCSC Student-Athletes	Building ownership and belonging to Athletics by general student body necessary to pass fee measure
1/1/12	Finance: Fund Raising	Establish fund raising plan/strategy with the goal of minimizing fund raising by our student-athletes	Development Officer, Athletic Director, Coaches
4/1/12	Finance: Student Fee Measure	Organize a campaign to increase to the current fee measure from \$5 per student per quarter to a minimum of \$15 per student per quarter.	Student Athlete Advisory Council / Athletic Director If passed, funds would support team budgets, coach salaries and the addition of an Assistant A.D. and place the Athletic program on "stable" ground.

Athletics Strategic Plan

Goals and Objectives 2012 -2013			
Target Date	Goal Category "bucket"	Objectives	Notes
9/1/12	Finance: Matching Funds	Year three increase of \$40K (\$20K by Chancellor's Office, \$20K by Student Affairs)	Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Year 3 increase will go toward hiring full-time Sports Information Director.
9/1/12	Finance: Donor Development	Establish Donor Appreciation through invites to receptions associated with specific team competitions as well as with unweaving of donor walls in specific facilities (pool, tennis courts, west gym)	Athletic Director / Development Officer / University Relations
4/1/13	Finance: Fund Raising	Establish endowment or fund raising campaign to allow movement toward career coaching positions for all sports.	Athletic Director / University Relations This will result in an improved experience for student athletes as the coaches will be on-campus more and actively involved in the full array of campus life. It will also improve retention of coaches and establish program continuity from year to year.
6/30/13	Other: Facilities Master Plan	Create facilities master plan with priorities for facilities and strategies for donor development.	Development Officer / Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs / Athletic Director / OPR's Exec Dir

UCSC Athletics Revenue & Expenses

	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Revenue			
Institutional Funding	\$ 760,716.76	\$ 1,497,220.34	\$ 1,470,011.61
<i>Student Funding</i>	\$ 425,716.76	\$ 497,220.34	\$ 470,011.61
13676 MEN'S TENNIS PROG ENDW FUND AT UCSC	\$ 943.14	\$ 991.96	\$ 1,020.55
20000 University Student Services Fee	\$ 215,259.86	\$ 277,653.83	\$ 258,350.71
20360 Student Programs Fee M7	\$ 45,103.57	\$ 45,449.98	\$ 34,217.32
20370 Intercol Athletics Sports Team Fee	\$ 164,410.19	\$ 173,124.57	\$ 176,423.03
Chancellor's Supplemental Funding	\$ 335,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00
Fundraising	\$ 276,088.39	\$ 267,820.54	\$ 209,395.68
Ticket Sales	\$ 7,265.90	\$ 7,128.87	\$ 7,761.57
NCAA/Conference Distributions (include. All Tourn. Rev.)	\$ 22,461.84	\$ 7,825.84	\$ 33,288.48
Game Guarantees	\$ 24,585.00	\$ 10,600.00	\$ 12,250.00
Royalties, Licensing, Advertisements and Sponsorships	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Sports Camps	\$ -	\$ 19,197.75	\$ 27,572.95
Misc. Expense Error	\$ -	\$ (2,899.45)	\$ (972.76)
Total Revenue	\$ 1,091,117.89	\$ 1,806,893.89	\$ 1,759,307.53
Expenses			
Earnings & Wages (W2 &1099)	\$ 429,647.94	\$ 731,845.49	\$ 887,404.18
Benefits (Paid by the University & Related Entities)	\$ 134,775.03	\$ 396,491.00	\$ 460,249.79
<i>Subtotal Earnings, Wages and Benefits</i>	\$ 564,422.97	\$ 1,128,336.49	\$ 1,347,653.97
NCAA Assoc. Costs	\$ 80,709.45	\$ 69,331.02	\$ 73,836.16
<i>Membership & Dues</i>	\$ 11,538.50	\$ 11,310.00	\$ 12,991.15
<i>Game Expenses</i>	\$ 69,170.95	\$ 58,021.02	\$ 60,845.01
Equipment, Uniforms and Supplies	\$ 71,468.11	\$ 107,186.65	\$ 84,015.33
Team Travel	\$ 386,304.42	\$ 311,306.47	\$ 361,398.89
Recruiting	\$ 3,112.07	\$ 9,983.47	\$ 13,930.07
Medical Expenses/Medical Insurance	\$ 13,558.40	\$ 16,097.00	\$ 12,234.21
Misc. Operating Expenses	\$ 19,677.90	\$ 84,736.70	\$ 70,224.12
<i>Office Supplies(Printer, paper, pens, etc.)</i>	\$ 4,904.16	\$ 6,775.94	\$ 7,540.26
<i>IT (InfoUser, Computers, Phones, Software)</i>	\$ 8,491.27	\$ 7,102.14	\$ 31,418.91
<i>Internal Mtgs & Events and non-game travel (awards banquet, campus meetings)</i>	\$ 2,690.78	\$ 22,518.22	\$ 4,982.20
<i>External Mtgs & Events (NCAA mtgs, CE, Prof Dev.)</i>	\$ 324.75	\$ 26,895.35	\$ 3,540.74
<i>Other (anything else that doesn't fit in the other cat's)</i>	\$ 3,266.94	\$ 21,445.05	\$ 22,742.01
Royalties, Licensing, Advertisements and Sponsorships	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Sports Camps	\$ -	\$ 8,206.00	\$ 5,106.30
Total Expenses	\$ 1,139,253.32	\$ 1,735,183.80	\$ 1,968,399.05
 Athletics Annual NET (+ gain/-loss)	 \$ (48,135.43)	 \$ 71,710.09	 \$ (209,091.52)
Prior FY Ending Balance	\$ 82,614.17	\$ 34,478.74	\$ 106,188.83
Total Athletic Dept. Year End Balance	\$ 34,478.74	\$ 106,188.83	\$ (102,902.69)

3014 OPERS UCSC Athletics
Athletics Operating Budget FY 2014-2016 Actuals plus FY 2017 Projections

	2014	2015	2016	2017 Projections
Revenue/Budget				
Permanent Budget	350,624	355,381	363,774	363,774
Budget Adjustments				
Chancellor's Annual Funding	335,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Foundation Donations	156,357	134,087	135,651	135,651
Other				
Endowments	2	8	1	1
Misc. Income	0	(2,899)	(973)	(973)
Rev Adj	8,056	10,862	7,137	7,137
Budget Adj's	67,034	130,970	97,001	97,001
	75,093	138,940	103,166	103,166
Totsl Budget Adjustments	566,450	1,273,027	1,238,817	1,238,817
Revenue				
Misc. Income (Sammy Appearance & Game Ticket Sales)	10,690	12,118	13,598	13,598
Student Contributions and Fundraising	163,356	166,368	96,151	96,151
	174,046	178,486	109,749	109,749
Total Revenue/Budget	1,091,120	1,806,894	1,712,340	1,712,340
Expense				
Salary & Benefits				
Salaries	429,648	710,163	871,584	988,812
Benefits	134,775	384,716	460,250	617,740
Total Salary & Benefits	564,423	1,094,879	1,331,834	1,606,552
Supplies & Expense	0			
010 SUPPLIES	85,530	129,583	94,520	131,183
015 COST OF GOODS SOLD	758	627	142	627
020 COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES	5,897	4,656	2,737	4,656
030 SERVICES	73,795	128,356	97,370	94,898
035 PROFESSIONAL FEES	6,975	21,715	37,556	21,715
040 TRAVEL	368,116	302,413	327,845	302,413
050 MEETINGS, ACTIVITIES, ENTERTAINMENT	10,154	11,485	11,916	11,485
060 FACILITIES	144	2,393	3,028	2,393
070 INTEREST & DEBT SERVICE	584	1,432	1,401	1,432
090 TRANPORTATION, PARKING, MOVING	17,525	27,649	13,328	27,649
100 EQUIPMENT - NON-INVENTORIAL	5,353	9,997	(249)	9,997
Total B03000 Non-Capital Expenditure-Budget	574,830	640,305	589,596	608,448
Total Operating Expense	1,139,253	1,735,184	1,921,430	2,215,000
Net Gain/(Loss)	(48,134)	71,710	(209,090)	(502,660)
Prior Yr CFwrd	82,614	34,479	106,189	(102,901)
FY Ending Balance	34,481	106,189	(102,901)	(605,561)
check	34,479	106,189	(102,903)	
Diff	(2)	0	(2)	
Diff Due to rounding of revenue				

October 31, 2016

MARY KNUDTSON
Interim Associate Vice Chancellor

Dear Mary:

Re: Intercollegiate Athletics Funding Update

To enable the Intercollegiate Athletics program to operate in 2016-17, a one-time subsidy of \$1 million will be provided. While increases in this funding will be considered based on actual expenditures in 2016-17 at the end of the fiscal year, my expectation is that you will work with OPERS to maintain expenditures within this \$1 million subsidy to the greatest extent possible. This funding continues to be a significant expense for our campus and is not, as we have discussed, sustainable on an ongoing basis.

Consistent with my memo of April 2016, and following a Spring 2016 poll showing student support for an Athletics fee, a referendum is being prepared for the coming election cycle. If the students vote to adopt fees in support of Athletics, the program will transition to student fee funding with a significantly reduced central campus contribution at the start of Fall quarter 2017. If the students do not adopt these fees, an additional one-year subsidy of \$1 million will be provided in 2017-18, ending June 30, 2018. Without student fee support, the Intercollegiate Athletics program must terminate its operations prior to July 1, 2018.

In recognition of the importance of this referendum and 1) the need to rapidly develop financial models that will assure a strong and financially-sustainable Athletics program, 2) the necessity of engaging the broader campus community in support of the program, and 3) the need to develop the student fee rate by January, 2017, I will sponsor Executive Director Willer's requests for additional support to shepherd the referendum process, including development of a financial model. My staff will work with Executive Director Willer to contract for services.

The Chancellor and I are both hopeful for a successful referendum outcome, which will allow continuation of the Athletics program for years to come.

Sincerely,



Alison Galloway
Campus Provost and
Executive Vice Chancellor

cc: Chancellor Blumenthal
Vice Chancellor Delaney
Interim Dean of Students Rojas
Executive Director Willer