

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

ASUM Senate Documents, 1919-2007

ASUM Student Government

---

9-13-1976

### Documents from the September 13, 1976 meeting of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM)

University of Montana--Missoula. Associated Students

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/asum>

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

University of Montana--Missoula. Associated Students, "Documents from the September 13, 1976 meeting of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM)" (1976). *ASUM Senate Documents, 1919-2007*. 722.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/asum/722>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the ASUM Student Government at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in ASUM Senate Documents, 1919-2007 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).



THE MONTANA UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

TWELVE THIRTY-ONE ELEVENTH AVE.

HELENA, MONTANA

59601

COMMISSIONER OF HIGHER EDUCATION

September 13, 1976

To: Larry Pettit

From: Marshall Cook

Subject: Financial Report in Regard to Intercollegiate Athletics in the Montana University System

Principle: Athletics should be considered an institution within an institution. Its aims, objectives and/or goals are different than those of other programs within an institution. Make no mistake -- athletics in the broad sense is entertainment -- entertainment for the general public, booster groups and, of course, the student body. One may pose the question: Is athletics in the University System a program for the students? The obvious answer based on recent student polls and surveys is NO. The students appear to want athletics but do not wish to support athletics at levels that the general public, booster groups and the alumni wish. In other words, groups external to the institution are more concerned about the level of competition than are the students. If this observation is truly a fact then one must ask the question: How are athletics to be financed?

Problem: By what method(s) are intercollegiate athletics at the six units of the Montana University System to be funded? Before an attempt is made to determine such method(s), one should review actions taken by the Board of Regents for the years 1970-76. I refer to the following actions:

April 13, 1970

Item 214-001, Policy on Activity and Athletic Fees, Montana University System

Student activity fees, including athletic fees, at the several units of the Montana University System, as established by prior action of the Board of Regents, shall not be considered as earmarked funds in Board policy. It is intended that budget allocations shall be established by officers of the respective student government associations with the approval of the unit presidents. No impairment of existing contractual obligations shall occur. Unit presidents shall establish administrative policy and shall file with the Executive Secretary, copies of the policy established.

This policy shall become effective July 1, 1971, or at the time unit policy can be properly established, whichever occurs first. If a student vote is desired or essential because of prior commitments, such vote shall be held at each unit as necessary to achieve conformity to this stated policy.

NOTE: This has been requested by the Student Presidents Association and approved by the Council of Presidents. It is intended to give greater flexibility to the budget planning of these fees. Associated Women's fees are not included in this policy statement.

Comment: As a result of the above action, no earmarked funds are to be established for athletics, thereby requiring the athletic departments to submit and request monies from the student governments to partly fund athletics. This action has placed a burden on the athletic departments as they do not know what to expect from year to year regarding the amount of funding that may be received. Because of this situation, these departments have a difficult time in projecting fiscal matters regarding scheduling, guarantees, admissions and, of course, future levels of competition.

ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD OF REGENTS ON OCTOBER 19, 1973:

The Board of Regents agreed to fully support the presidents and athletic directors of Montana State University and the University of Montana in their attempts to reduce the costs of the Big Sky Conference.

The Board also approved the following statement:

That intercollegiate athletics at Montana State University and the University of Montana be funded in a manner that will provide a budget sufficient to allow both institutions to be competitive in the Big Sky Conference; that the Board consider the budget totals, numbers of scholarships provided and number of intercollegiate sports being supported by the other institutions in the conference; that such funding be derived from the following sources in such percentages as deemed advisable, giving due regard to the sources and percentages of support being received by the other participants in the conference:

1. Fee waivers granted by the Regents for in-state, as well as nonresident students, up to the maximum conference allowable totals.
2. State funding.
3. Other income (defined as gate receipts, guarantees, concessions, programs, TV, radio rentals, etc.)

Comment: The above action by the Regents is rather interesting. The Regents agreed to support the presidents and athletic directors in their attempts to reduce the cost of athletics in the Big Sky Conference. The Regents at the same time approved the statement that Montana institutions in the Big Sky Conference be funded sufficiently to compete in the Big Sky Conference. The question arises: Are athletics to be funded at a level to win or to lose? Regardless of what philosophical differences one may have regarding competitive athletics, one competes to win. This is true if the game is ping-pong or professional football. No one is a good loser. One may be a gracious loser but no one is a good loser. One can be gracious for just so long.

While athletic funding at the other Big Sky Conference schools is increasing, the funding for the Montana members is decreasing. For example, the University of Idaho, Idaho State University and Boise State assess their students \$36.00 per year to fund athletics. It appears at this time that these fees will be raised by \$5.00 to compensate for Title IX requirements. The University of Montana receives NO funds from its students and Montana State University receives approximately \$15.00 per student per year based on the overall allocation to MSU by its student body. It is an historic fact that those institutions that obtain the most monies to support their athletic programs will come out on top of the heap. With this in mind, one must address himself to the following:

1. Are the University of Montana and Montana State University to remain competitive at all sport levels with other members of the Big Sky Conference?
2. If the above is answered in the positive, then additional funding is necessary.
3. If the above is answered in the negative, then the future level of competition of the Montana institutions in the Big Sky Conference becomes questionable.
4. An institution competing in intercollegiate athletics has two choices: they are in to win or they are "out of the league".

July 8, 1974

Item 5-003-R0774, Policy on Activity and Athletic Fees, Montana University System

Student activity fees, including athletic fees, at units of the Montana University System, as established by prior action of the Board of Regents, shall not be considered as earmarked funds in Board policy. It is intended that budget allocations shall be established by officers of the respective student government associations pursuant to the Associated Students Constitution of the units as approved by the presidents of said units. Such

allocations of student activity fee monies shall not be made to any programs for which academic credit may be earned. No impairment of existing contractual obligations shall occur. Unit presidents shall establish administrative policies and copies shall be filed in the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education.

NOTE: This item supercedes Item 3-003-R1273 dated December 10, 1973.

Comment: Refer to Regents' action 214-001.

July 8, 1974

Item 5-004-R0774, Resolution Regarding Athletic Programs, Montana University System

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Regents of Higher Education believes that insofar as an intercollegiate athletic program is maintained at any of the units of the Montana University System, nonspectator sports should be given such emphasis and support as is appropriate to their continuation and to the maintenance of a well-rounded program.

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 1975 BOARD OF REGENTS MEETING:

. . . . . After a brief discussion Mr. Morrison moved that the Board of Regents define intercollegiate athletics as a college or university program. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion . . . The motion carried.

Comment: The above actions by the Regents appear to be clear cut. If intercollegiate athletics are to be maintained at any unit of the System, then appropriate funding should be available to intramural athletic activities. Intramural activities are an integral part of the University System, and it appears at this time that the demand for this type of activity is increasing. If the interest in intramurals continues to increase, the demand for an increase in student funding will increase; therefore, a decrease in student funds for intercollegiate athletics seems apparent unless fees for athletics are increased.

Since the Regents have decided that intercollegiate athletics is a college or university program and not a student activity fee, then a method of funding must be found.

Item 5-006-R0774, Policy Regarding Fee Waivers, Montana University System (Amended June 7, 1976)

14. Fee Waiver - Athletics. Each unit of the Montana University System is hereby authorized to allocate athletic fee waivers which shall be defined for purposes of the Montana University System as the dollar value of registration, incidental and out-of-state fees (where applicable only). In the case of intercollegiate athletics, the total amount of fees waived shall not exceed the dollar value determined by multiplying the value of athletic fee waivers herein defined by the number of Full Grants Equivalent (FGEs) authorized by the National Collegiate Athletic Association, National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women or appropriate affiliated conferences for officially sanctioned or recognized intercollegiate sports.

Comment: One may comment that the above action has committed the Regents to the financial support of athletics. This is true but an institution can have unlimited amounts of athletic fee waivers and be unable to compete at the level of other members within a specific conference. Athletic departments need sufficient funding for operations, equipment, travel, etc.

#### CONCLUSIONS

1. The unit presidents will have no choice but to support any action taken by the Board of Regents on funding of intercollegiate athletics. Some may argue against any mandatory fee assessment leveled against the students but all tend to agree that athletics is a necessary program. Most agree that athletics is not necessarily a program for the students but for the general public, booster groups and alumni. All the presidents tend to agree that since the Regents have established athletics as a program of the University System that athletics should be funded as all "other" programs but not to the point where athletic funding will jeopardize "other" programs. It is apparent that the presidents do not wish to be part of any hassle that may/will arise of a mandatory student athletic fee is assessed.
2. The athletic directors at the six units would like to have some method of guaranteed funding. At present, the athletic directors cannot depend on sufficient funding from year to year from student activity fees. This situation has created difficulty in projecting the level of competition, especially those contests that are classified as non-conference. It has been rather degrading to some athletic directors to go "crawling to the students" each year in order to obtain financial support for their programs.

3. The students do not want a mandatory fee earmarked for athletics. The students appear to want athletics, but do not wish to fund the program with additional monies. They would, however, like to see the "minor" sports and women's athletics funded at appropriate levels. It appears that the students would have no objections to an optional fee earmarked for athletics provided that those students that do opt for this fee will be provided admission passes to sports events and that they will have some type of authority on how/why their monies are being spent. There is one primary drawback to the optional fee -- the athletic directors still do not have a base line budget to work with. Since athletics is now classified as a program of the University System and not a student activity, the students would like to see athletics funded through general fund appropriations provided that line item funding for athletics does not jeopardize other programs of the University System. The students seem to be willing to lobby for general fund appropriations but this is not certain at this time.
4. Title IX is a very timely, important piece of legislation for women's athletics. Because of this legislation, women's athletics will have an opportunity to reach a competitive status in amateur athletics that will be comparable to that which we currently have for men.

The athletic directors have some concerns over the way in which Title IX could be implemented. If no new monies were made available for women's athletics and the amount of money now allocated to the men's athletic program had to be placed in the women's program, the men's program would be seriously effected. All efforts should be made to generate new dollars for the women's program so their program can become as strong and viable as the men's program.

Title IX has the potential for creating some serious problems. One should address himself to the following major problems:

1. Playing and practice facilities
2. Varsity dressing rooms
3. Adequate athletic training room/sports medicine facilities
4. Booster club contributions originally designated for the men's program.

Women's athletics and Title IX requirements have added to the funding dilemma. Athletics for women is excellent and should continue to be developed; this is impossible unless additional funding is provided. Women's athletics, however, should not grow at the expense of men's programs which are already underfunded. To divide current funding between men's and women's programs would seriously limit either program's potential to be competitive.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendations regarding future funding for intercollegiate athletics at the six units of the University System. These recommendations are not necessarily in priority order.

1. Attempt to obtain financing for intercollegiate athletics from general fund appropriations during the 1977 legislative session.

Comment: If one would eliminate existing funds for athletics derived from student fees and exclude fee waivers but include state appropriations, anticipated gate receipts, anticipated booster funds and guarantees, the price tag would be approximately \$1,000,000 per year (based on 76-77 dollars) to support intercollegiate athletics for the six units. (Refer to Attachment A.)

Comment: If the legislature should fail to appropriate monies for intercollegiate athletics during the 1977 session then the Regents would appear to have some "lag time" for implementation of other funding methods before the 1977-78 school year.

2. Student fees for athletics are to be optional.

Comment: If a student opts for the athletic fee then these funds are automatically transferred to the athletic department. It may be wise to establish a Board of Athletics at each unit to include students for the purpose of advise and/or consent on how their monies are being spent. This type of funding still does not establish a "base line" budget for the athletic directors.

3. Increase the existing student activity fee and earmark a certain percentage or amount for athletics.

Comment: The above is, of course, a mandatory fee for athletics. Again, it would be wise to establish a Board of Athletics as I mentioned above.

4. Increase the fees and earmark a certain amount for athletics.

Comment: This may be accomplished by raising the fees and at the same time decreasing the student activity fee providing the students elect this line of approach. In reality, one would be "robbing Peter to pay Paul".

5. Increase fees with no earmark for athletics, thereby placing the responsibility of funding athletics at the office of the unit presidents.

Comment: In whatever manner one approaches this recommendation, it is still a mandatory fee for athletics.

6. Eliminate student fee monies that are at present allocated to intercollegiate athletics.

Comment: By so doing, the units will stand and/or fall on gate receipts and other income, i.e., booster funds, guarantees, etc. There is no question that if this recommendation is adopted, the various units will "find" their level of competition. This could be a disaster for the U of M and MSU in regard to the competition in the Big Sky Conference, as well as for Tech, Western and Northern in the Frontier Conference.

7. Eliminate football from the units that are at present competing in this sport (Northern does not participate in football.)

Comment: Granted -- football is an expensive sport, but it is doubtful that the state and/or a unit will save in the long run. When one considers the amount of monies this sport generates in booster monies, gifts, alumni funds, and monies collected by the business community during home games, one wonders if, indeed, the state and the units may not lose money.

8. Eliminate intercollegiate athletics from the units of the University System.

9. Various combinations of 1 through 6.

10. Establish a Montana Conference of Intercollegiate athletics.

Comment: The conference will be completely dominated by the U of M and MSU and in the not too distant future, Eastern. NO conference can exist entirely on a five or six team schedule. This being the case, the majority of the athletic schedule (football and basketball) will be with out-of-state teams -- hence the travel budget will increase, the home guarantees will increase, scheduling will be difficult, and the level of competition will decrease. It is doubtful that any monies will be saved.

11. Withdraw all the units from a conference and have them go independent.

Comment: The scheduling of competition will be difficult and the price tag on travel will in all probability double. It is doubtful that any monies would be saved.

12. P U N T

#### POINTS TO PONDER

1. There appears to be no clear cut answer regarding student enrollment and athletic programs.
2. The athletic directors at the U of M and MSU believe that success in athletics directly relates to alumni and booster club contributions.
3. In a recent article, William R. Petrowski, Associate Professor of History, University of Nebraska, stated: "Although there is little or no evidence that big-time college football contributes to academic excellence, there is none which demonstrates that such programs are incompatible or detrimental to academic excellence. A more appropriate manner of describing the relationship would be: Successful college football programs are found at every level of academic excellence, but there are more of them at the better universities." (Emphasis added)

Professor Petrowski also stated in his article "that although it would be hard to demonstrate that the football program makes any direct contribution to any university's educational efforts, the result of this survey show that football prowess is quite compatible with academic prestige." (Emphasis added)

MC:wm