

Research article

Are Division I NCAA WAC sports profitable?

Dr. James I. Schaap

College of Business, Department of Managerial Sciences

Ansari Building, Mail Stop 0028, 1664 N. Virginia Street

University of Nevada, Reno

Reno, NV 89557-0206

(T) 775-827-5709

E-mail: jjschaap@charter.net

Abstract

Intercollegiate athletics has been a subject of great debate in recent years. More interestingly, the study of profitability or financial success of colleges that participate in the Western Athletic Conference (WAC) and classified as NCAA Division I has been minimal over recent years. The colleges that participated in WAC and were classified as NCAA division I from 2005-2010 had, on average, only two departments that showed profitability: men's basketball and football. The remaining athletic programs showed consistent deficits from 2005-2010. In general, during this period of time the costs of the athletic programs also increased. Overall, a WAC athletic department runs at a shortfall each year because the average profit cannot cover the deficit. Suggestions are provided in order to improve this situation. **Copyright © IJEBF, all rights reserved.**

Keywords: WAC, NCAA, Division I, profitability, financial, University of Nevada, Reno (UNR)

Background Information

The role that intercollegiate athletics play in an academic institution has been a subject of great debate in recent years. While this article does not cover theory, research and practice of sport psychology, it is, according to this researcher, truly a sports social issue.

In these times of economic concern, some people are objecting to the large sums of money required to fund intercollegiate athletic programs. In response, a number of recent studies have been performed in order to examine how intercollegiate athletics affect a university (Fulks, 2010; Kirwan & Turner (2010, September/October); Lovaglia, 2010; Sawyer, 2010; Weaver, 2011; Zimbalist, 2007).

These studies covered many aspects of collegiate athletic programs, including: the increased number of applicants to the program; prestige of the program; academic and social/communal experiences of athletes, donations and endowments; and the program's overall cost and profitability or financial success. The word *profitability*, however, is a contentious term. As such, this researcher mentions the word profitability loosely, because the overall structure of these athletic programs are, in fact, non-profit in scope.

Because of the current economy, colleges that are part of the NCAA Division I are reevaluating their current status as Division I programs and deciding whether their current financial positions are positively contributing to the academic mission.

There is minimal research regarding the financial affect of athletic programs on the "bottom line" of colleges. Unfortunately, a successful Division I program not only includes winning teams and popularity among students, alumnae, and local residents, but their financial stability. Some colleges have begun to invest more money in their athletic programs in the hope of a return on their investment that partially, if not fully, reduces the financial drain of their athletic departments. Others are cutting athletic programs, and risk or intentionally dropping from Division I to Division II or Division III. The effect divesting or investing in athletic programs has had on academic and social experiences, donations and endowments, and future applicants have been mixed. Some results show that athletic programs increase endowments and donations, applicants, and have a positive affect on students while other results are the opposite.

Thus, colleges and universities have many decisions to make when deciding whether to invest further in their athletic programs, or to severely cut or eliminate them. Many colleges are currently increasing tuition to cover the overall deficits in their budgets. Some schools have been asking students if they would contribute additional fees to certain programs, such as athletic programs. The common response to an additional student fee for an athletic program has been negative. Nevertheless, some universities have overridden student preferences and increased or added such fees.

The other option, when investing in an athletic program, would be to borrow the money. However, borrowing money can be complicated because of what a college would need in order to sustain a successful Division I athletic program: a low-interest rate on a loan, or even grants. Because most college Division I athletic programs are not profitable certainly does not help their interest rate when borrowing money.

Divesting themselves of all or parts of athletic programs involves more than just stopping the financial outflow. Colleges must take into consideration future applicants, maintaining prestige, academic and social experiences of their students, and donations and endowments. Some colleges have decided to cut some of their athletics programs while keeping their status as a Division I athletic program. Although cutting just some of an athletics program might seem like an easy solution, some colleges do not have enough programs that they can cut to keep the Division I status.

A college or university athletic department, when opting to cut programs to save money, must remain in compliance with Title IX, the federal requirement that requires colleges to offer equal opportunities for male and female athletes. Therefore, when cutting athletic programs, colleges must be careful not to cut only male or only female programs in order to avoid accusations of sex discrimination.

The author of this article is concerned with the overall cost and profitability or financial success of Division I NCAA WAC athletic programs. Division I along with WAC have shown the highest costs compared to Division II, Division III, and other conferences in which Divisions I, II, and III can participate. The current financial situation of these athletic programs must be evaluated before making any decision whether to invest in the program, divest certain aspects of the program, or simply to maintain the status quo.

According to a NCAA-commissioned report performed by Litan, Orszag, J., and Orszag, P. (2003, p. 2), "Operating athletic expenditures are a relatively small share of overall academic spending." While the spending may be relatively low, it has been consistently growing in recent years. According to Zimbalist (2007, p. 26), "In any given year fewer than 10 athletic departments out of more than 1,000 colleges generate a true surplus." In 2006, the NCAA Presidential Task Force warned that the increase of expenses (10.9%) and the decrease in generated revenue

(5.8%) from ticket sales and media contracts will not be sustainable over time. Many Division I institutions are finding that they need increased allocations from the institution to maintain a balanced budget (Brown, 2010). This increase in the allocation of University funds to athletics is cause for concern. “The dramatic increases in IA’s budget must also be viewed in the context of the severe reductions of campus expenditures to its core academic mission, with resources for teaching a research greatly stripped away over the last several years,” (Chancellor’s Committee, 2010, p. 4). Athletic programs cannot expect to receive increases in university funding while other departments are cutting costs and closing down entire programs. The athletic department must pull their weight and tighten their belts along with the rest of the university.

Successful athletic performance has been proven to increase the number of applicants to a university. A study published in the *United States Sports Academy Journal* concluded that there is evidence to support the theory that “high visibility athletic programs can enhance the prestige of a university’s graduates,” (Lovaglia & Lucas, 2010, p. 1) In a similar study, McEvoy (2006) found that the performance of individual athletes at a university also has a significant positive effect on the prestige of a university. “Using a pretest-posttest control group design, a statistically significant time-by-group interaction effect was found, with institutions realizing a 6.59% increase in undergraduate applicants for admission in the year following having a football player finish among the top five vote getters for the Heisman Trophy.” (McEvoy, 2006, p. 1) Thus, the prestige of a university is enhanced due to the increase in the number and quality of students who apply, enabling the university to accept only the best applicants.

In 2010, a Council for the University of California, Berkeley reported on the benefits and costs of an intercollegiate athletic program. “The Council agrees that a robust IA program is compatible with the values of an elite American research university, that it adds a valuable dimension to students’ academic and social experiences, and that it is part of Berkeley’s specific traditions and histories...” (Chancellor’s Committee, 2010, p. 2). Intercollegiate Athletic programs also “Serve as a unique and irreplaceable point of contact with the University’s alumni and friends and facilitate cultivation for philanthropic purposes. It thereby promotes loyalty and school spirit on the part of selected donors,” (Chancellor’s Committee, 2010, p. 2). Though many schools have found their endowments and donations falling, the former NCAA Interim President, Jim Isch, expects that schools with large benefactions and large donor bases will recuperate as the economy picks-up. These charitable donations are the key to funding an athletic program. Several studies have been done to examine what causes donors to give, as well as whether increased giving to athletics interferes with donations to the rest of the university. A study done by Stinson and Howard (2008) found empirical evidence to show that on-field athletic success had a significant and positive influence on donations and gifts given to athletic departments. However, this only pertains to Division I programs. The same study also found that athletic success had no influence on academic giving. It was found that winning percentages, post-season appearances, and athletic traditions had the largest overall effect on the amount of donations given to athletic programs. It was also found that football tradition and the winning percentage of the football team had the largest effect on giving (Stinson & Howard, 2008). People often view athletic donations as competition to potential academic donors; however, the research suggests that institutions may be more successful in gathering academic donations if they use the athletic program to bring in new donors and cultivate these donors to make donations to both athletic and academic programs.

Research Question

While certainly not compelling, but in an attempt to better understand the profitability or financial success status of Division I NCAA WAC intercollegiate sports, this researcher asked and analyzed the following basic question: *Are Division I NCAA WAC sports profitable?* Is this not a social issue?

Method

The author began this research by only contacting the athletic departments of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR); Boise State University; California State University, Fresno; and Louisiana Tech University. At each institution, an administrative assistant forwarded a spreadsheet with Equity Act data pertaining to the institution. However, the data the institutions provided differed from one another, with different formatting, different sports teams, etc. Still, the data could be compared because each institution also inserts data into a predetermined system that enables the U.S. Department of Education (2008) to compile the information, reformat it, and make it available via the Internet on the Office of Post Secondary Education website. Therefore, the author downloaded the raw data

pertaining to revenues and expenses for all teams in the WAC from <http://ope.ed.gov/athletics> in order to more effectively compare the schools, apples to apples.

Cleaning Up the Data

Even though the data and the results of those figures is really not new to the overall contribution effort—college sport programs do *not* make money or even breakeven, which has been well-established in the NCAA annual reports of revenues and expenses, this researcher then cleaned up the data and created tables that made the data more understandable, and more important, comparable to data from other institutions. The first task was to separate the raw data from all schools in the WAC and remove any information that was unnecessary for the current study. This process eliminated redundant and needless information, and made the data easier to manage and analyze. Examples of information removed included classification codes such as NCAA division since only Division I schools were being studied in the WAC conference.

Drilling Down the Data

A spreadsheet was created to separate the data by school, by sport, and by year; and each school was separated into a different sheet. Next, a table was created for each school categorized by sport; quantified per year for the last six years, 2004-05 through 2009-10; with a total column created to sum the six years. Furthermore, the totals per gender and grand totals were separated into a different table. Although additional costs were found, they were not broken down and thus could not be analyzed.

Each sport was separated into a table, yearly revenues and expenses were analyzed and the differences computed. This difference was called Net Income, in order to make it clear that these values were the difference between revenues and expenses, and to differentiate these values from the difference between years.

Lastly, a table was designed to compare the total Revenues and Expenses for the last six years and the Net Income derived from them. The Net Income from all the sports was summed and a total for all sports was derived. Next, a table was designed to present the value of revenues and expenses not allocated by gender/sport, which included, “but are not limited to, alumni contributions to the athletic department not targeted to a particular sport or gender, investment interest income, student activity fees, and the athletics director’s salary” (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2008, p. 44). The Total of all sports was added to difference between revenues and expenses not allocated by gender/sport, and the grand total for the athletic department at each school was derived (refer to Appendices 1-9).

Discussion

After researching each of the athletic program’s financial performance, it is evident, as a whole, that each Division I NCAA WAC program is *not* profitable or financially successful. While some of the division sports, such as basketball and football, might be profitable—showing some financial usefulness, they do not cover the deficit to create overall profitability or even a breakeven point. This brings up some interesting points regarding the costs, revenue, and financial worth of these athletic programs – all of which are social-related issues. Is it necessary to continue to have these athletic programs if they do not cover their own cost or even contribute to the college’s overall breakeven point? Are the costs of these athletic programs getting out of control? Do athletic programs add more intangible benefits that outweigh the deficit?

This research only provided information about the profitability or financial success of Division I NCAA WAC athletic programs. It would be interesting to see whether or not other divisions, across the country, have the same issue. Another point is whether or not the restrictions of division levels actually work against athletic programs and essentially force them to be unprofitable. In other words, when colleges want higher prestige, admissions, and donations, they often move from a lower-division athletic program to a Division I program. As mentioned earlier, a Division I program has requirements that must be met to keep a Division I standing and must also comply with Title IX. If the Division I requirements were not as high, would member colleges be able to create higher prestige, admission, and donations and be profitable? This research could be (partially) helpful because of the current state of the economy and the current economic condition of Division I NCAA WAC athletic programs.

Are the costs of running these programs getting out of control? Are expenditures for coaching salaries, new stadiums, and travel reasonable when compared to those of the other aspects of the programs? Every Division I NCAA WAC sports program studied had increased their total costs from 2004-2005 and 2009-2010. Even though these costs have been increasing, additional research needs to be done to explain why. Furthermore, they need justification to convince administrators to maintain, increase, or decrease them for the future.

Do athletic programs contribute tangible and intangible benefits, such as social experiences, prestige, and donations, to colleges and universities? Intangible benefits such as social experiences of athletes or prestige are abstract ideas that take time and measurement to support the hypothesis that these benefits are either positive or negative. The research by McEvoy, Lovaglia, and Lucas (2006) (e.g., The impact of elite individual athletic performance on university applicants for admission in NCAA Division I-A football.) is just a start. With additional research, Division I NCAA WAC athletic programs can cite these benefits to substantiate their purpose for being.

Additional research needs to be done not only for Division I NCAA WAC programs but also for Division II and Division III in order to see what their overall contribution to a college is as a whole, including all intangible and tangible benefits. This would give colleges a better idea of the real cost versus revenue and an abstract view of total financial viability. Administrators of athletic and academic programs should examine the entire institution as well as its athletic programs as a whole and strategize for the future. Colleges could then see the financial value and make informed decisions to invest, divest, or maintain their athletic programs.

Conclusion

The data supports, at least in part, the literature detailing the financial status of the vast majority of athletic departments, and it supports the data from the analysis of the financial statements of UNR's Athletic Department. First, the data shows that the only athletic programs that consistently make money are the men's basketball and football programs. However, although these programs perform better than most, the numbers do not elicit hope for them. Specifically, only five of the nine football programs reported a positive net income during the 2009-10 season, and only four men's basketball programs carried a surplus that year. Secondly, the data shows that the remaining programs in the athletic departments operate under deficits on a consistent basis, and that instead of reining in costs, universities continually spend more money each subsequent year. In general, the costs of the athletic programs have escalated in the past six years, and the deficits are only lessened by using contributions from alumni, student fees, and government/institutional support (refer to Appendices 1-9).

Observation of the data shows that the athletic programs that reported positive incomes for their schools generally reported a substantial profit margin/financial success even though these are non-profit academic institutions. For example, Fresno State reported a positive income of \$2,558,270 out of \$9,051,902 in revenue for the football program, which is approximately a 28% profit margin. UNR reported a modest net income of \$668,169.00, and Boise State's football program reported a surplus of \$7,665,217 from \$14, 515,613 in revenue, which is an incredible 53% profit margin. However, it is important to keep in mind that Fresno State, Boise State, and UNR have the most competitive football programs in the conference, and their revenues are a direct correlation of their successes on the field. If any of these teams have an off-season, perhaps after the loss of important senior players, their revenues will undoubtedly shrink while their expenses increase or stagnate.

In regard to the remaining sports programs in the athletic departments, it is clear from the data that the costs for maintaining these social programs have been escalating. For example, in the case of New Mexico State, the expenses for every sport have increased and are trending upward over the last six years, yet revenues have not kept pace (refer to Appendix 4). Observation of the data of Hawaii shows that the expenses are also on an upward trend, only slowing during the 2007-08 and 2009-10 school years, perhaps as an effect of the economic recession. However, during this same period of economic distress, revenues decreased sharply for every sport in Hawaii's athletic department (refer to Appendix 6).

At the same time, revenues derived from alumni contributions, student fees, and government/ institutional support have also been decreasing, as students, alumni, governments, and colleges are hurt by the economy they have less income to allocate to sports. In fact, in most athletic departments revenues Not Allocated by Gender/Sport were increasing up to 2007-08 at which point they have been cut dramatically.

Recommendations

The solution to the rising cost of college athletic programs is as complex as institutions that operate them. Unfortunately, colleges and universities have become caught up in the arms race of escalating athletic costs. The current system seems to be a no-sum game where there are no winners. Even in colleges that have successful programs, such as Boise State with football, in the end they barely manage to break even on a yearly basis. This is because the football program subsidizes all remaining sports, which are deficit-driving endeavors. Moreover, what will happen when such programs falter is, at best, a risky proposition.

There is no doubt that the quality of student life is greatly enhanced, from a social perspective, by the availability of opportunities to partake in college sports, both as competitors and fans. Successful college programs gain national attention, and create prestige for universities and the cities that house them. If truth be told, college sports has become an American tradition. However, the economic concept of scarcity of resources forces us to consider the nature and goals of higher education. In this regard, administrators must carefully consider the consequences of closing educational colleges and programs while allowing sports that consistently operate under deficits to continue in operation. In fact, some colleges have reversed course and have begun cutting sports programs dramatically. While many of the most successful and prestigious academic institutions, such as Harvard University, Princeton University, and Yale University spend much lower amounts on sports than most Division I schools (PBS, 2011), it is the responsibility of administrators to carefully consider the “vision” for the universities as they march into the future.

Instead of cutting entire teams, this author recommends, using the Athletic Department of University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) as an example, that the Athletic Department for UNR gradually cut roughly 10% (around \$460,000.00) from the Athletic Student Aid. This potential cut would have significant negative effects on athletic teams; however, these effects would be minimal compared to the effects of cutting an entire team. It would allow the UNR’s Athletic Program to cut costs while continuing to compete at the Division 1 level, which requires that a University spend at least \$4 million dollars on Athletic Student Aid. As the Chancellor’s Committee for the University of California, Berkeley stated, “Very few organizations shrink their way to greatness.” (Chancellor’s Committee, 2010, p. 13) However, the University is facing unprecedented times, and these difficult times force programs to make difficult decisions. The Athletic Department administration and staff at Berkeley is already understaffed and is reportedly taking a 5% pay cut. This is a large sacrifice for the department, but will have a significant benefit for the program. The best thing the Athletic Department can do is to make the negative effects of budget cuts as minimal as possible. The best way to do this is to cut a portion of scholarship money.

The second recommendation is to create programs and incentives that help increase donations to the UNR’s Athletic Department. While the amount of giving is down due to the economic recession, the vision of UNR’s Athletic Program is to “foster an environment in which ‘the team’ can be successful through competitive and equitable programs driven by core values.” In order to successfully cultivate as many donors as possible, UNR’s Athletic Program must prove the value of its vision. Athletes must become more involved in the retention of donors and ticket holders. We, as the supporters of student athletes, must become more involved in the community and help to gain support for the Athletic Program. As UNR reaches out to the community, and continues to become more successful on the national stage, it will find itself in a better position to reach potential contributors. The burden of creating revenue falls on the shoulders of both the Administration and the athletes equally. In these times of financial difficulty, it becomes imperative for everyone involved to pull together to create a program that is truly special.

Limitations of the Study

While this (observational only) study answered the straightforward and simple research question that was proposed, there were many limitations to the research that needs to be addressed. First, the research question was very narrowly defined. Second, the literature review was also limited in scope, and the conclusions made by this researcher, about the other studies, may be interpreted by the reader as being overstated. Third, the amount of athletic programs that were researched was limited in scope—only schools in the WAC conference were reviewed. As such, there is a lack of substantial empirical data. Fourth, since this study only involved Division 1 NCAA

WAC athletic programs, this certainly limits the research for (national) use. Athletic programs that are Division 1 NCAA WAC athletic programs can use this information; but, overall, the research is not completely generalizable. As such, the study needs to be broadened to include more athletic programs because the profitability of all athletic programs should be researched. The fifth limitation is that most Division 1 NCAA WAC athletic programs are not profitable/not financially successful, but it is unclear what the total benefits of these programs are. Based on the empirical data of cost versus revenue, these athletic programs do not add any financial value to their colleges. Are there other advantages than empirical financial data? The financial aspect is a limited scope when thinking about a school or college. It only covers a portion of the overall athletic program and its total value. The fifth and last limitation would be any new conferences or athletic program initiatives to create more financial value. For example, new conferences that emerge can create a new revenue stream for some athletic programs. In addition, any upcoming changes to Division I rules, laws, or opportunities in the future should be considered. These changes could alter the financial data and change the way these athletic programs are managed.

Authors' Note

The research assistance of Leah Abe, Daniel Anguiano, Zach Sudfield (student athlete), and Ray Kraemer (student athlete) – former students at the University of Nevada, Reno – in the preparation of this article is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- [1] Agthe, D., & Billings, R. B. (2000). The role of football profits in meeting Title IX gender equity requirements. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 28-40.
- [2] Brown, G. (2010, August). Latest revenues and expense data reveal effects of slumping economy. NCAA Publications. Retrieved February 17, 2012, from: <http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/Resources/Latest+News/2010>.
- [3] Chancellor's Committee, UC Berkeley. (2010). Report of the Chancellor's Committee on intercollegiate athletics. Informally published manuscript, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.
- [4] Fulks, D. (2010, August). NCAA revenues / expenses Division I report • 2004 – 2009. NCAA Publications.
- [5] Kirwan, W., & Turner, R. G. (2010, September/October). Changing the game: Athletics spending in an academic context, *Trusteeship Magazine*.
- [6] Litan, R., Orszag, J., & Orszag, P. (2003). The empirical effects of collegiate athletics. An interim report prepared by Sebago Associates, 1-58.
- [7] Lovaglia, L. (2010). High-visibility athletic programs and the prestige of public universities. *The Sport Journal*, ISSN: 1543-9518.
- [8] McEvoy, C. (2006). The impact of elite individual athletic performance on university applicants for admission in NCAA Division I-A football. *The Sport Journal*, 1543(9518),1-15. United States Sports Academy.
- [9] "NCAA Gender Equity/Title IX Important Facts." [ncaa.org](http://www.ncaa.org). 2010. Web. 24 April. 2010. <http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/ncaa/about+the+ncaa/diversity+and+inclusion/gender+equity+and+title+ix/facts.html>.
- [10] Sawyer, T. H. (2010). Title IX and budgets in athletics. *JOPERD: The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 81(3), 9-10.
- [11] Stafford, S. (2004). Progress toward Title IX compliance: The effect of formal and informal enforcement mechanisms. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(5), 1469-1486.

[12] Stinson, J, & Howard, D. (2007). Athletic success and private giving to athletic and academic programs at NCAA institutions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21, 235-264.

[13] Stinson, J, & Howard, D. (2008). Winning does matter: Patterns in private giving to athletic and academic programs at NCAA Division I-AA and I-AAA institutions. *Sport Management Review*, 11, 1-20.

[14] U.S. Department of Education. (2008). *User's Guide For The Equity in Athletics Act*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Post Secondary Education.

[15] U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *The Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool*. Retrieved October 05, 2011, from Office of Post Secondary Education: <http://ope.ed.gov/athletics>.

[16] Weaver, K. (2011). A Game Change: Paying for big-time college sports. *Change*, 43(1), 14-21. doi:10.1080/00091383.2011.533099

[17] Wolf Pack athletics contributes \$18.5 million to northern Nevada economy. (2011, February 21). Retrieved from http://www.nevadawolfpack.com/ViewArticle.dbml?DB_LANG=C&B_OEM_ID=10000&ATCLID=205100703&SPID=4100&SPSID=4583.

[18] Zimbalist, A. (2007). College athletic budgets are bulging but their profits are slim to none. *Street and Smith's Sports Business Journal*, 26-27.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Boise State Totals

Grand Totals

Totals:	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Total Men's Team Expenses	5,488,298	6,774,474	11,208,568	9,612,457	7,929,548	9,905,505	50,918,850
Total Men's Team Revenue	5,105,723	11,351,017	14,381,807	11,045,798	9,906,247	16,197,018	67,987,610
Total Women's Team Expenses	2,856,445	3,245,021	3,102,205	3,759,684	4,124,395	4,403,385	21,491,135
Total Women's Team Revenue	461,438	3,965,022	686,618	1,793,049	2,215,467	1,301,789	10,423,383
Yearly Totals	(2,777,582)	5,296,544	757,652	(533,294)	67,771	3,189,917	6,001,008
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Expenses	6,571,667	9,233,894	7,454,732	8,236,527	8,438,875	10,783,921	50,719,616
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Revenue	9,409,864	3,937,350	7,245,794	8,938,155	8,461,294	7,600,348	45,592,805
Grand Total Expenses	14,916,410	19,253,389	21,765,505	21,608,668	20,492,818	25,092,811	123,129,601
Grand Total Revenue	14,977,025	19,253,389	22,314,219	21,777,002	20,583,008	25,099,155	124,003,798
Grand Total Per Year	60,615	0	548,714	168,334	90,190	6,344	874,197

Six-Year Running Totals

Sport	Revenue	Expenses	Net Income
Men's Basketball	1,606,418	4,923,237	(\$3,316,819)
Women's Basketball	9,532,521	7,679,866	\$1,852,655
Men's Football	56,186,175	35,747,523	\$20,438,652
Men's Golf	388,012	940,007	(\$551,995)
Women's Golf	756,240	1,162,253	(\$406,013)
Women's Gymnastics	1,246,160	2,850,085	(\$1,603,925)
Women's Skiing	203,242	321,051	(\$117,809)
Women's Soccer	1,170,073	2,517,242	(\$1,347,169)
Women's Swimming & Diving	463,249	1,486,181	(\$1,022,932)
Men's Tennis	503,830	1,898,858	(\$1,395,028)
Women's Tennis	895,527	1,717,938	(\$822,411)
Men's Track	787,800	2,378,201	(\$1,590,401)
Women's Track	2,628,652	2,753,515	(\$124,863)
Women's Volleyball	1,186,217	2,951,714	(\$1,765,497)
Men's Wrestling	589,272	2,274,395	(\$1,685,123)
Total	78,143,388	71,602,066	\$6,541,322
Not Allocated by Sport/Gender	45,592,805	50,719,616	(\$5,126,811)
Grand Total			\$1,414,511

Appendix 2: Fresno State Totals

Grand Totals

Totals:	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Total Men's Team Expenses	10,281,712	10,791,565	10,032,838	11,599,518	11,387,015	10,606,842	64,699,490
Total Men's Team Revenue	14,968,746	11,625,572	10,845,569	13,374,901	14,092,029	12,538,210	77,445,027
Total Women's Team Expenses	4,944,089	4,846,905	4,961,607	5,694,385	7,035,435	6,991,978	34,474,399
Total Women's Team Revenue	2,186,636	509,141	279,831	1,967,022	2,201,994	2,530,798	9,675,422
Yearly Totals	1,929,581	(3,503,757)	(3,869,045)	(1,951,980)	(2,128,427)	(2,529,812)	(12,053,440)
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Expenses	8,874,611	8,573,019	9,384,858	8,979,502	8,235,622	7,620,958	51,668,570
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Revenue	8,285,820	13,539,214	14,028,497	10,931,482	12,512,325	10,986,722	70,284,060
Grand Total Expenses	24,100,412	24,211,489	24,379,303	26,273,405	26,658,072	25,219,778	150,842,459
Grand Total Revenue	25,441,202	25,673,927	25,153,897	26,273,405	28,806,348	26,055,730	157,404,509
Grand Total Per Year	1,340,790	1,462,438	774,594	0	2,148,276	835,952	6,562,050

Six-Year Running Totals

Sport	Revenue	Expenses	Net Income
Men's Baseball	2,953,361	6,038,365	(\$3,085,004)
Men's Basketball	18,322,025	13,031,222	\$5,290,803
Women's Basketball	8,431,885	2,224,069	\$6,207,816
Women's Equestrian	810,875	3,848,143	(\$3,037,268)
Men's Football	54,458,997	39,126,891	\$15,332,106
Men's Golf	328,062	1,581,426	(\$1,253,364)
Women's Golf	448,726	1,502,892	(\$1,054,166)
Women's Lacrosse	244,023	1,130,701	(\$886,678)
Women's Soccer	1,006,086	3,321,058	(\$2,314,972)
Women's Softball	2,023,159	5,468,678	(\$3,445,519)
Women's Swimming & Diving	280,065	1,063,149	(\$783,084)
Men's Tennis	464,907	1,883,859	(\$1,418,952)
Women's Tennis	792,207	2,483,583	(\$1,691,376)
Men's Track	612,871	2,227,405	(\$1,614,534)
Women's Track	887,117	2,778,843	(\$1,891,726)
Women's Volleyball	959,095	4,445,467	(\$3,486,372)
Men's Wrestling	304,804	810,322	(\$505,518)
Total	93,328,265	92,966,073	\$362,192
Not Allocated by Sport/Gender	70,284,060	51,668,570	\$18,615,490
Grand Total			\$18,977,682

Appendix 3: Louisiana Tech Totals

Grand Totals

Totals:	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Total Men's Team Expenses	4,744,115	5,060,801	5,857,347	6,705,449	7,418,982	7,440,994	37,227,688
Total Men's Team Revenue	3,498,464	2,882,564	3,810,774	3,578,461	3,385,970	7,741,460	24,897,693
Total Women's Team Expenses	2,214,272	2,673,303	2,909,826	2,920,713	3,234,859	3,370,230	17,323,203
Total Women's Team Revenue	847,613	1,006,292	995,401	886,651	858,066	3,493,163	8,087,186
Yearly Totals	(2,612,310)	(3,845,248)	(3,960,998)	(5,161,050)	(6,409,805)	423,399	(21,566,012)
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Expenses	2,825,013	2,341,212	3,673,342	2,814,643	3,243,613	3,620,206	18,518,029
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Revenue	5,450,420	6,186,460	7,634,340	8,000,753	9,657,313	3,302,461	40,231,747
Grand Total Expenses	9,783,400	10,075,316	12,440,515	12,440,805	13,897,454	14,431,430	73,068,920
Grand Total Revenue	9,796,497	10,075,316	12,440,515	12,465,865	13,901,349	14,537,084	73,216,626
Grand Total Per Year	13,097	0	0	25,060	3,895	105,654	147,706

Six-Year Running Totals

Sport	Revenue	Expenses	Net Income
Men's Baseball	1,626,820	3,657,354	(\$2,030,534)
Men's Basketball	3,173,775	6,518,318	(\$3,344,543)
Women's Basketball	2,868,192	6,361,962	(\$3,493,770)
Women's Bowling	541,167	541,167	\$0
Men's Football	18,899,904	24,134,735	(\$5,234,831)
Men's Golf	508,765	881,010	(\$372,245)
Women's Soccer	1,033,643	2,072,093	(\$1,038,450)
Women's Softball	1,087,578	2,508,341	(\$1,420,763)
Women's Tennis	439,726	804,511	(\$364,785)
Men's Track	688,429	2,036,271	(\$1,347,842)
Women's Track	1,285,841	2,611,751	(\$1,325,910)
Women's Volleyball	1,118,149	2,423,378	(\$1,305,229)
Total	33,271,989	54,550,891	(\$21,278,902)
Not Allocated by Sport/Gender	40,231,747	18,518,029	\$21,713,718
Grand Total			\$434,816

Appendix 4: New Mexico State Totals

Grand Totals

Totals	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Total Men's Team Expenses	5,835,312	6,386,015	8,623,696	11,336,841	11,454,830	9,678,095	53,314,789
Total Men's Team Revenue	3,103,489	5,302,600	2,377,931	9,858,329	10,905,915	9,014,510	40,562,774
Total Women's Team Expenses	2,826,480	2,614,667	3,560,753	5,394,607	5,793,049	6,151,789	26,341,345
Total Women's Team Revenue	1,119,347	2,237,000	893,824	5,279,173	5,684,065	5,790,260	21,003,669
Yearly Totals	(4,438,956)	(1,461,082)	(8,912,694)	(1,593,946)	(657,899)	(1,025,114)	(18,089,691)
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Expenses	3,981,242	3,190,643	7,249,613	8,334,054	8,368,306	7,884,782	39,008,640
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Revenue	8,633,880	5,245,396	16,162,307	9,928,000	9,026,205	8,909,896	57,905,684
Grand Total Expenses	12,643,034	12,191,325	19,434,062	25,065,502	25,616,185	23,714,666	118,664,774
Grand Total Revenue	12,856,716	12,784,996	19,434,062	25,065,502	25,616,185	23,714,666	119,472,127
Grand Total Per Year	213,682	593,671	0	0	0	0	807,353

Six-Year Running Totals

Sport	Revenue	Expenses	Net Income
Men's Baseball	3,049,337	4,249,240	(\$1,199,903)
Men's Basketball	10,846,741	14,090,824	(\$3,244,083)
Women's Basketball	4,371,587	6,146,227	(\$1,774,640)
Women's Equestrian	3,209,058	2,657,111	\$551,947
Men's Football	24,203,483	32,091,412	(\$7,887,929)
Men's Golf	1,109,555	1,251,169	(\$141,614)
Women's Golf	1,459,718	1,663,240	(\$203,522)
Women's Soccer	510,518	587,748	(\$77,230)
Women's Softball	2,711,922	3,881,474	(\$1,169,552)
Women's Swimming & Diving	2,101,602	2,346,043	(\$244,441)
Men's Tennis	866,665	1,135,451	(\$268,786)
Women's Tennis	1,027,476	1,364,480	(\$337,004)
Men's Track & X Country	486,993	496,693	(\$9,700)
Women's Track	2,391,429	3,191,946	(\$800,517)
Women's Volleyball	3,220,359	4,503,076	(\$1,282,717)
Total	61,566,443	79,656,134	(\$18,089,691)
Not Allocated by Sport/Gender	57,905,684	39,008,640	\$18,897,044
Grand Total			\$807,353

Appendix 5: San Jose State Totals

Grand Totals

Totals:	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Total Men's Team Expenses	6,255,118	6,861,048	7,140,470	6,679,929	7,206,473	7,716,415	41,859,453
Total Men's Team Revenue	1,364,922	1,301,747	6,526,957	6,300,000	6,773,466	8,299,913	30,567,005
Total Women's Team Expenses	3,245,878	3,710,700	3,691,711	3,916,906	4,044,131	4,091,061	22,700,387
Total Women's Team Revenue	46,752	104,692	3,601,692	3,816,953	3,862,377	3,771,100	15,203,566
Yearly Totals	(8,089,322)	(9,165,309)	(703,532)	(479,882)	(614,761)	263,537	(18,789,269)
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Expenses	3,770,449	6,575,117	6,116,638	6,301,410	5,747,185	8,802,076	37,312,875
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Revenue	11,859,771	15,782,081	6,841,799	8,201,372	7,250,602	8,538,539	58,474,164
Grand Total Expenses	13,271,445	17,146,865	16,948,819	16,898,245	16,997,789	20,609,552	101,872,715
Grand Total Revenue	13,271,445	17,188,520	16,970,448	18,318,325	17,886,445	20,609,552	104,244,735
Grand Total Per Year	0	41,655	21,629	1,420,080	888,656	0	2,372,020

Six-Year Running Totals

Sport	Revenue	Expenses	Net Income
Men's Baseball	2,771,399	3,958,012	(1,186,613)
Men's Basketball	4,010,415	5,983,526	(1,973,111)
Women's Basketball	3,423,869	5,284,931	(1,861,062)
Men's Football	20,986,689	27,916,660	(6,929,971)
Men's Golf	1,000,028	1,437,430	(437,402)
Women's Golf	926,275	1,401,837	(475,562)
Women's Gymnastics	1,565,168	2,298,498	(733,330)
Men's Soccer	1,503,992	2,159,344	(655,352)
Women's Soccer	1,521,528	2,117,364	(595,836)
Women's Softball	1,570,073	2,364,364	(794,291)
Women's Swimming & Diving	1,515,557	2,238,448	(722,891)
Men's Track & X Country	294,482	404,481	(109,999)
Women's Track & X Country	619,631	912,202	(292,571)
Women's Tennis	936,962	1,330,060	(393,098)
Women's Volleyball	1,934,608	2,959,718	(1,025,110)
Women's Waterpolo	1,189,895	1,792,965	(603,070)
Total	45,770,571	64,559,840	(18,789,269)
Not Allocated by Sport/Gender	58,474,164	37,312,875	21,161,289
Grand Total			2,372,020

Appendix 6: Hawaii Totals

Grand Totals

Totals:	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Total Men's Team Expenses	8,229,479	10,102,925	11,765,390	14,293,576	14,285,795	13,415,861	72,093,026
Total Men's Team Revenue	7,552,202	8,320,860	10,280,611	14,901,014	10,241,440	9,224,740	60,520,867
Total Women's Team Expenses	4,187,316	4,912,985	5,308,612	5,941,320	6,654,512	7,073,096	34,077,841
Total Women's Team Revenue	1,257,229	2,085,041	2,298,579	2,230,128	2,530,075	2,988,801	13,389,853
Total Coed Team Expenses	50,771	53,672	63,861	60,022	89,108	80,581	398,015
Total Coed Team Revenue	8	1,126	1,679	4,968	69,691	5,727	83,199
Yearly Totals	(3,658,127)	(4,662,555)	(4,556,994)	(3,158,808)	(8,188,209)	(8,350,270)	(32,574,963)
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Expenses	7,048,318	8,350,188	9,278,880	10,424,483	9,485,993	8,834,190	53,422,052
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Revenue	11,482,516	13,357,684	13,925,557	15,876,755	17,674,202	18,864,430	91,181,144
Grand Total Expenses	19,515,884	23,419,770	26,416,743	30,719,401	30,515,408	29,403,728	159,990,934
Grand Total Revenue	20,291,955	23,764,711	26,506,426	33,012,865	30,515,408	31,083,698	165,175,063
Grand Total Per Year	776,071	344,941	89,683	2,293,464	0	1,679,970	5,184,129

Six-Year Running Totals

Sport	Revenue	Expenses	Net Income
Men's Baseball	3,355,496	6,746,585	(\$3,391,089)
Men's Basketball	8,453,114	11,157,386	(\$2,704,272)
Women's Basketball	882,901	5,804,119	(\$4,921,218)
Men's Football	44,332,510	44,533,197	(\$200,687)
Men's Golf	618,831	1,589,958	(\$971,127)
Women's Golf	504,742	1,530,257	(\$1,025,515)
Coed Sailing	83,199	398,015	(\$314,816)
Women's Sailing	162,952	403,459	(\$240,507)
Women's Soccer	875,364	3,649,229	(\$2,773,865)
Women's Softball	853,871	4,222,718	(\$3,368,847)
Women's Swimming & Diving	1,274,311	3,853,292	(\$2,578,981)
Men's Swimming & Diving	919,754	2,874,410	(\$1,954,656)
Men's Tennis	340,961	1,688,018	(\$1,347,057)
Women's Tennis	381,271	1,749,287	(\$1,368,016)
Women's Track & X Country	699,863	3,373,841	(\$2,673,978)
Men's Volleyball	2,500,201	3,503,472	(\$1,003,271)
Women's Volleyball	6,837,032	5,374,767	\$1,462,265
Women's Waterpolo	675,119	2,859,469	(\$2,184,350)
Total	73,076,373	102,452,010	(\$29,375,637)
Not Allocated by Sport/Gender	91,181,144	53,422,052	\$37,759,092
Grand Total			\$8,383,455

Appendix 7: Idaho Totals

Grand Totals

Totals:	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Total Men's Team Expenses	4,512,388	4,361,767	5,478,600	5,458,630	7,275,843	6,613,925	33,701,153
Total Men's Team Revenue	2,612,862	3,187,316	6,256,259	5,932,316	8,544,615	8,636,607	35,169,975
Total Women's Team Expenses	2,557,868	2,757,252	2,876,027	3,077,693	3,740,343	3,927,019	18,936,202
Total Women's Team Revenue	753,216	877,323	2,355,847	2,604,008	3,418,737	3,848,630	13,857,761
Yearly Totals	(3,704,178)	(3,054,380)	257,479	1	947,166	1,944,293	(3,609,619)
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Expenses	2,455,036	3,346,729	4,091,942	4,360,164	4,039,785	4,495,446	22,789,102
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Revenue	6,187,936	6,829,822	4,118,114	4,360,164	3,092,619	2,575,809	27,164,464
Grand Total Expenses	9,525,292	10,465,748	12,446,569	12,896,487	15,055,971	15,036,390	75,426,457
Grand Total Revenue	9,554,014	10,894,461	12,730,220	12,896,488	15,055,971	15,061,046	76,192,200
Grand Total Per Year	28,722	428,713	283,651	1	0	24,656	765,743

Six-Year Running Totals

Sport	Revenue	Expenses	Net Income
Men's Basketball	4,010,415	5,983,526	(\$1,973,111)
Women's Basketball	3,423,869	5,284,931	(\$1,861,062)
Men's Football	44,332,510	44,533,197	(\$200,687)
Men's Golf	1,589,958	1,589,958	\$0
Women's Golf	504,742	1,530,257	(\$1,025,515)
Women's Soccer	875,364	3,649,229	(\$2,773,865)
Women's Swimming & Diving	1,274,311	3,853,292	(\$2,578,981)
Men's Tennis	340,961	1,688,018	(\$1,347,057)
Women's Tennis	381,271	1,749,287	(\$1,368,016)
Men's Track & X Country	294,482	404,481	(\$109,999)
Women's Track & X Country	619,631	912,202	(\$292,571)
Women's Volleyball	6,837,032	5,374,767	\$1,462,265
Total	64,484,546	76,553,145	(\$12,068,599)
Not Allocated by Sport/Gender	27,164,464	22,789,102	\$4,375,362
Grand Total			(\$7,693,237)

Appendix 8: Nevada Totals

Grand Totals

Totals:	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Total Men's Team Expenses	7,087,515	7,851,640	8,864,013	8,638,130	9,531,071	8,947,176	50,919,545
Total Men's Team Revenue	5,948,630	7,608,571	9,327,538	10,147,712	9,391,921	10,998,911	53,423,283
Total Women's Team Expenses	4,285,905	4,843,130	5,169,379	5,327,695	5,124,771	5,693,841	30,444,721
Total Women's Team Revenue	155,957	335,383	1,114,942	1,193,835	1,020,586	5,693,841	9,514,544
Total Coed Team Expenses		93,600	135,547	145,143	110,616	121,219	606,125
Total Coed Team Revenue		390	17,355	27,340	33,422	121,219	199,726
Yearly Totals	(5,268,833)	(4,844,026)	(3,709,104)	(2,742,081)	(4,320,529)	2,051,735	(18,832,838)
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Expenses	6,762,850	6,644,625	5,709,254	6,802,999	6,677,696	6,826,834	39,424,258
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Revenue	12,193,388	11,966,422	9,418,359	9,689,085	10,998,225	4,775,099	59,040,578
Grand Total Expenses	18,136,270	19,432,995	19,878,193	20,913,967	21,444,154	21,589,070	121,394,649
Grand Total Revenue	18,297,975	19,910,766	19,878,194	21,057,972	21,444,154	21,589,070	122,178,131
Grand Total Per Year	161,705	477,771	1	144,005	0	0	783,482

Six-Year Running Totals

Sport	Revenue	Expenses	Net Income
Men's Baseball	1,740,663	4,974,313	(\$3,233,650)
Men's Basketball	24,072,535	11,434,533	\$12,638,002
Women's Basketball	1,547,314	6,310,385	(\$4,763,071)
Men's Football	26,465,354	30,091,588	(\$3,626,234)
Men's Golf	335,769	1,440,906	(\$1,105,137)
Women's Golf	494,779	1,489,603	(\$994,824)
Coed Rifle	201,956	694,315	(\$492,359)
Men's Ski	363,119	1,607,779	(\$1,244,660)
Women's Ski	418,780	1,604,668	(\$1,185,888)
Women's Soccer	1,757,737	3,240,270	(\$1,482,533)
Women's Softball	1,823,645	3,603,046	(\$1,779,401)
Women's Swimming & Diving	1,106,373	4,019,142	(\$2,912,769)
Men's Tennis	444,728	1,326,331	(\$881,603)
Women's Tennis	671,639	1,985,661	(\$1,314,022)
Women's Track	827,837	4,397,686	(\$3,569,849)
Women's Volleyball	865,325	3,750,165	(\$2,884,840)
Total	63,137,553	81,970,391	(\$18,832,838)
Not Allocated by Sport/Gender	59,040,578	39,424,258	\$19,616,320
Grand Total			\$783,482

Appendix 9: Utah State Totals

Grand Totals

Totals:	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Total Men's Team Expenses	4,952,259	4,825,655	3,620,509	6,379,360	7,901,201	9,299,345	36,978,329
Total Men's Team Revenue	2,702,333	1,986,193	2,229,758	7,427,544	8,802,442	9,740,667	32,888,937
Total Women's Team Expenses	2,483,201	2,766,849	2,266,076	3,686,364	3,608,125	4,003,910	18,814,525
Total Women's Team Revenue	126,578	99,183	56,111	2,893,918	1,844,843	3,537,258	8,557,891
Yearly Totals	(4,606,549)	(5,507,128)	(3,600,716)	255,738	(862,041)	(25,330)	(14,346,026)
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Expenses	2,954,584	3,143,885	6,803,750	3,139,613	4,988,934	5,929,745	26,960,511
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport Revenue	7,561,635	9,700,706	10,536,276	2,883,875	5,850,975	5,955,075	42,488,542
Grand Total Expenses	10,390,044	10,736,389	12,690,335	13,205,337	16,498,260	19,233,000	82,753,365
Grand Total Revenue	10,390,546	11,786,082	12,822,145	13,205,337	16,498,260	19,233,000	83,935,370
Grand Total Per Year	502	1,049,693	131,810	0	0	0	1,182,005

Six-Year Running Totals

Sport	Revenue	Expenses	Net Income
Men's Basketball	11,938,171	11,017,894	\$920,277
Women's Basketball	1,491,300	4,459,206	(\$2,967,906)
Men's Football	17,962,050	21,860,914	(\$3,898,864)
Men's Golf	491,634	771,495	(\$279,861)
Women's Gymnastics	1,079,488	2,611,497	(\$1,532,009)
Women's Soccer	2,426,539	2,426,539	\$0
Women's Softball	1,048,345	2,374,997	(\$1,326,652)
Men's Tennis	382,044	711,073	(\$329,029)
Women's Tennis	419,145	949,036	(\$529,891)
Men's Track	2,115,038	2,616,953	(\$501,915)
Women's Track	2,344,042	3,354,679	(\$1,010,637)
Women's Volleyball	1,064,272	2,638,571	(\$1,574,299)
Total	42,762,068	55,792,854	(\$13,030,786)
Not Allocated by Sport/Gender	82,753,365	42,488,542	\$40,264,823
Grand Total			\$27,234,037