

**PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION
REGARDING THE
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ATHLETICS TASK FORCE**

It is recognized that Athletics plays an important role at the University of Cincinnati. Further, it is acknowledged that the Athletic Department and the student athletes contribute to the university in positive ways. However, it is also recognized that the university currently faces a very challenging economic environment. In that the faculty ultimately must give advice and counsel that it believes is in the best interest of the university and supportive of the academic mission of the university,

Be it resolved that the faculty senate makes the following recommendations regarding the recommendations of the Athletics Task Force:

1. Regarding the suggestions related to restructuring scholarships, it is recommended that all four specific suggestions be pursued. These include the suggestions to: a) Consider "waiving" or funding the out-of-state surcharges, b) Explore use and eligibility for other institutional aid, c) Establish a fund to support academically talented student athletes, and d) Encourage student athletes in Olympic sports and early signees who are academically talented to meet the December 1st priority deadlines.
2. Regarding the suggestion to restore the athletic subsidy, it is recommended that the University should NOT allocate more general funds money to subsidize the athletic department.
3. Regarding the suggestion that the University assume all or some portion of the Athletic Department's accumulated deficits, it is recommended that the University should NOT assume any portion of the Athletic Department's accumulated deficit.
4. Regarding recommendations concerning future ticket revenue opportunities, it is recommended that the university strongly pursue negotiations for the use of Paul Brown Stadium for all or some portion of the university's home football games instead of expanding Nippert Stadium.

Rationale for these recommendations follows.

Rationale for Recommendations

Task force findings.

- In its report of January 4, 2010, the Athletics Task Force concluded that athletics investments would be "difficult to afford in the current economic climate".
- The task force recommended that, "the university should work to maintain a 'balance' of priorities for funding athletics, but not at the expense of other important university functions".
- A survey conducted by the task force affirmed the priority of the academic mission of the university. In a ranking of 10 items, "Academic Programs" and "Faculty" were the two categories ranked #1 and #2

General Fiscal Climate

- The University is currently facing a budget cut of up to 15 % with additional budget cuts expected in the next years.
- The university's current financial situation and projections for the next several years and the state of Ohio's current financial situation indicate a need to make hard decisions.

Relative to the first recommendation supporting the four specific suggestions related to restructuring scholarships:

- The faculty is fully supportive of student athletes and the positive contributions of the athletic department.
- UC's student athletes have a very commendable graduation rate when compared to the overall student body at UC and when compared to student athletes at other public universities--notably the BCS schools.
- Implementation of the recommendations would require some resources from general funds.
- There are potential benefits to recruitment of not only student athletes, but perhaps also other high caliber out-of-state students.

Relative to the second recommendation that the University should NOT allocate more general funds money to subsidize the athletic department,

- According to the USA Today article, "USA Today Database: What Universities Spend on Athletics" updated 1/14/2010 ,
 - the subsidy to the athletic department has increased substantially in the past several years. For the most recent fiscal year reported, 2007-2008, the university subsidized the athletic department in the amount of \$10.7 million/33% of the athletic department's revenue. In comparison, the 04-05 data show that the university subsidized the athletic department in the amount of \$5.6 million or 26.7% of that year's revenue; the 05-06 data showing a subsidy of \$5.7 million or 25.9 % of the departments revenue; and the 06-07

data showing a \$10.4 million subsidy amounting to 36.6 % of the 06-07 athletic department revenue.

- the institutional subsidy to the athletic department was the highest percentage of revenue reported for any Big East School whose data appeared in the report
- The university is, already subsidizing the athletic department at a rate of approximately 1/3 the department's revenue.
- Designating additional 'general funds' monies to the athletic department would further reduce the monies going to instruction and thus come at the expense of the primary mission of the university--the academic mission.

Relative to the third recommendation that the University should NOT assume any portion of the Athletic Department's accumulated deficit, in addition to the points made regarding the general fiscal climate and the rationale provided for the second recommendation, using general funds monies to assume the Athletic Department's accumulated deficit:

- would not be fiscally sound,
- would not be beneficial to the academic mission of the university,
- would likely be detrimental to the academic mission of the university, and
- would not be in the best interest of the university

Relative to the fourth recommendation that the university should strongly pursue negotiations for the use of Paul Brown Stadium for all or some portion of the university's home football games instead of expanding Nippert Stadium,

- There are clear physical limitations of the current facilities that consequently limit ticket sales opportunities
- Any renovations to Nippert would be limited by the location of the stadium, current structure of the stadium, and surrounding buildings.
- Renovations to Nippert would be very costly.
- Other universities, most notably the University of Pittsburgh, share facilities with professional sports teams located in the same city or area.
- Paul Brown stadium was financed primarily through taxpayer dollars, thus it is a public facility.