



CENTER FOR PUBLIC DELIBERATION

CPD Extended Backgrounder for the On- Campus Stadium Proposal

August 6, 2012 Draft
(minor changes made from July 23 and July 27 drafts)

**Completed by Martin Carcasson, Ph.D.
Director, CSU Center for Public Deliberation
Associate Professor, Communication Studies
Colorado State University**

www.cpd.colostate.edu

Responses to this backgrounder can be provided at <http://col.st/MyZnpL> or emailed to cpd@colostate.edu

This report is available online at www.cpd.colostate.edu/cpdbackgrounder.pdf.

It will be updated periodically.

CPD Extended Backgrounder for the On-Campus Stadium Proposal

Explanation of this document:

This document was created by the CPD working as an independent resource. It was released publicly at the same time as it was released to the SAC Committee and CSU administration. It represents a summary of arguments being made concerning the stadium proposal in the public discourse, as well as an initial literature review and analysis of some of the key issues. It was developed from analysis of various forms of public input and comment over the last several months, including comments from over 2,000 responses to the CPD input form that was posted online; articles, letters, and message board comments at the *Coloradoan*; emails and letters sent to the CPD, Fort Collins City Council, President Frank, the CSU student body president, and the athletic department, on-line discussion sites such as the CSU alumni Linked-In site, Facebook, and pro and con petition sites, and information and documents from the athletic department, the Stadium Advisory Committee (SAC), the Save our Stadium, Hughes group (SOSH), and the Be Bold CSU group. Along with all the posted information at the SAC website (www.colostate.edu/stadium), a white paper completed by SOSH Hughes and the Be Bold response, and then Be Bold's response to the initial CPD backgrounder, and SOSH's response to that document have been valuable, especially because the degree to which both organizations have found and cited research. Links for all their documents are available at the end of this report (p. 24). Academic sources were also consulted to provide additional insights to some of the primary arguments. This document *does not* represent an exhaustive analysis of the available research, but does attempt to provide a fair summary of the literature connected to many of the arguments that arose during the public discussion.

The initial backgrounder that was used during the public forums in February and March served as a starting point and a "living document" for participants to react to that sought to fairly lay out the arguments currently being offered. Participants at the forums were asked in the post-forum survey to react to and suggested changes to the backgrounder. The backgrounder was posted on both the CPD and SAC (Stadium Advisory Committee) website, and the document itself requested comments or suggestions to be sent to the CPD email. The results of the responses to the forum surveys are available in the forum report posted at the CPD website, but overall only minimal changes were suggested either at the forums or by email.

This extended version of the backgrounder was developed after the May 30 SAC meeting. The goal of this document is to again gather in one document many of the primary arguments being made in support and opposition to the new stadium, both to help educate interested parties on both sides of the issue, and to assist in the process of moving forward on the issue by highlighting key areas for further research and/or discussion. Some of the issue areas highlight more value-based differences between perspectives, while others are more amenable to research (though, as will be evident, many of the costs and benefits of the proposed stadium are difficult to quantify). In sum, different stakeholders likely both rank the relative importance of the argument areas very differently, and likely react to the data within each differently. Ideally, this document helps lead to an informed decision.

Changes from the initial document: The original document (http://www.cpd.colostate.edu/initial_backgrounder.pdf) was designed for participants to utilize as background information during the forums, so it was purposefully limited to three pages. This document does not have that limitation, so it includes more details. The original backgrounder had 18 “argument areas” labeled A-R. In this document, three pairs of those argument areas were combined, leaving 15 argument areas. The “current state of Hughes” and “Utilizing Hughes to achieve these new goals” were combined, since many of the comments related to these were similar and difficult to separate. For similar reasons, “the Appropriate role of athletics at a university” and “Impact on academics and core mission” and then “The quality of the new facility” and “Multi-function facility” were also combined. To avoid confusion between this version and the initial version, the argument areas are numbered rather than labeled with letters.

Summary of CPD efforts and documents thus far:

An explanation of the CPD role in the process is posted at cpd.colostate.edu/cpdstadiumrole.pdf. The CPD ran 10 initial public forums in February and March. A summary report of those forums is posted (cpd.colostate.edu/forumsummaryreport.pdf), along with all the raw data from those forums. The CPD website also includes the raw data from all the public input forms that have been sent to the CPD from the beginning of the process which serve as the primary basis of our analysis. Eight different updates have been uploaded throughout the year. We also completed focused analyses of the student (www.cpd.colostate.edu/SummaryofstudentInput.pdf) and faculty (www.cpd.colostate.edu/SummaryofFacultyOnlineInput.pdf) input. Each of those showed a strong majority of both students and faculty that responded were opposed to the stadium (all faculty, staff, and students were emailed). It should be noted that these responses were primarily collected in March and April, when information about the new stadium was limited.

Brief overview of arguments for and against the stadium

The primary function of this document is to highlight the 15 argument areas the CPD identified by analyzing the public comment. We fear, however, that the big picture may get lost in the details. It is certainly difficult to briefly and fairly summarize the arguments, but in our opinion one of the major problems with this debate thus far is that the opposing sides have not clearly considered the views of the other side. Too often, there is limited engagement with the opposing view, and when present, that engagement is often framed narrowly. To start us off therefore, we will attempt to make the best brief case for each side.

So if we were to try to summarize **the overall argument made for the stadium by supporters**, it would perhaps go something like this. We have an opportunity here to add a valuable component to our university funded by private outside sources and the extra revenue it will create, that, if done right, could bring several benefits to improve the university overall. While the direct benefits to the football program are most often mentioned (in terms of recruiting, the symbolism of increased commitment, the game day experience, and additional revenues through the use of premium seating and increased attendance), a wide range of other benefits are anticipated, such as increased student and alumni excitement and identification with the university (which could increase alumni donations and athletic department revenues), a broader national profile (which would lead to higher awareness and could increase out of state applications, providing needed funding to the University), the use of the facility for many other campus events and functions (for both academics and athletics, as well as the community), and positive economic impacts for Fort Collins. Bringing alumni to campus is seen as a particularly important issue for supporters and a key problem with Hughes Stadium. In the end, many supporters see many potential benefits to the university without much cost. They do tend to recognize

the potential negative impacts concerning traffic and parking, but feel those could be mitigated somewhat and overall do not outweigh the benefits.

Those opposed to the new on-campus stadium fit into a few different though not necessarily mutually exclusive camps. Many support Hughes Stadium, and don't understand why a new stadium is necessary in the first place. Even if the funding is private, it seems to them like an unnecessary project considering what they see as the lack of a current problem and the major drawbacks tied to cost, the impact on the community, and the use of campus space. Others have significant concerns, in many cases supported by outside sources, that the anticipated benefits are exaggerated and will not be realized. Questions have been raised about the accuracy of the costs and revenues related to the stadium, and the impact of a new stadium on the quality of the team, alumni donations, out of state applications, and university finances. For them, the drawbacks are clear and the benefits are quite hazy, thus they call for at least more study before taking such a significant irrevocable step. Lastly, there are others that are more generally concerned with the role of athletics on university campuses, and what they see as clear tensions between the core functions of the university and the values tied to "big time college sports." These views are part of a broader, ongoing national conversation concerned with the growing influence of and focus on athletics on campuses, and some see the new stadium as CSU moving in the wrong direction on that issue. Faculty, staff, and students in particular raised concerns about the symbolism of spending so much on a stadium that is seen as peripheral to the core functions of the university, especially after years of budget constraints and tuition increases. Whereas supporters see athletics and academics as complementary, others see them more in tension.

Summary of 15 Argument Areas

The fifteen argument areas are organized by how often that area was mentioned in the public input forms analyzed by the CPD using the original background. We do not imply they are in order of importance, simply frequency:

Argument Area	Page
1. Location / Impact on campus	4
2. Impact on football team and national profile	5
3. Utilizing Hughes to achieve these new goals/Current state of Hughes	7
4. Community impacts	8
5. Funding of stadium	9
6. Environmental impact/message	11
7. Appropriate role of athletics at a university/ Impact on academics and core mission	12
8. Quality of new facility / Multi-function facility	15
9. Game day experience	16
10. Impact on alumni connection	16
11. Impact on CSU funding and affordability	17
12. Impact on Fort Collins economy	23
13. Athletic conference issues	24
14. Impact on other CSU sports	25
15. Student Attendance	25

For each of these argument areas, this document includes the comments from the original backgrounder, then provides an update on that area that summarizes the public comment concerning that issue and links to relevant SAC information. If available, some basic relevant facts and sources of data are provided, as well as key questions for further discussion or analysis. We are continuing to gather sources relevant to all these issues and encourage interested parties to provide us with additional information concerning these issues through the public input form tied to this document (<http://col.st/MyZnpL>), by emailing cpd@colostate.edu, or sending information to the CPD at Campus mail 1783, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1783.

1. Location / Impact on campus

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>Ideally, a location will be identified that would minimize these impacts. The building can be designed to include student housing or academic functions, and be visually attractive and a landmark for the school and community.</p>	<p>No suitable location on campus. Support exists for PERC gardens, etc. Space will be needed later for academic buildings or student housing. (Note: concerns exist that the stadium will be built on green space or the intramural fields, but those locations have been removed from consideration)</p>
---	---

July update: At the time of the initial backgrounder, the location was not yet identified. At the April SAC meeting, the Site Selection Subcommittee narrowed the potential location (see maps at www.cpd.colostate.edu/siteselectionmayinfo.pdf). Once the location was identified, the arguments in this category have focused on the positive and negative impacts of adding the stadium to campus. Arguments in this area were the most commonly cited for opponents in the public input forms, and the 6th most common for supporters, and the overall most common combined. The primary argument cited here focused on the lack of parking, which was particularly critical to staff and students, who feel parking is already difficult on campus. Many also express concern about using limited campus space for athletics when the university is set to continue to grow and space is at a premium. Students in particular argued that they prefer the open feel of campus and were concerned that a stadium would crowd campus too much. Others expressed worries that bringing so many people to campus would trash the campus and make it more difficult for students in the nearby resident halls to study. Some faculty expressed similar concerns about being able to access campus on game days. Finally, quite a number of students cited construction fatigue, lamenting CSU becoming “Construction State University.”

Supporters respond somewhat to the parking problems, citing how the number of parking spaces currently on campus match the spots at Hughes, and that many more people will likely walk, bike, or take a bus to the game, reducing the need for parking. At the May SAC meeting, it was revealed that the stadium will require the removal of 1755 surface parking spots, and that a new parking garage will be built adjacent to the stadium that combined with new surface spots will provide a total of 1785 spots, for a net increase of 30 spots (<http://www.cpd.colostate.edu/parkinginfo.pdf>). In response to concerns about using up campus space that may be needed for academics or residence halls, supporters point out that the CSU facilities management has been a part of the process from the beginning, and one purpose of the SAC was to examine whether adding the stadium could fit within the long term campus plan. *August 6 update:* During his forum on July 31, Tony Frank clearly articulated that the stadium would fit within the university’s Master Plan that

anticipates significant increases in student population and that the campus can accommodate the expected growth. Other key pro arguments that fit here are detailed in other argument categories, such as bringing more alumni to campus, increasing walkability, improving the overall game day experience, and making it easier for students to attend.

In sum, this is an argument area that the two sides have completely different points of view. Supporters are excited about the potential of bringing thousands of fans on campus, whereas opponents recoil at that same potential. For supporters Hughes is a problem because it keeps fans away from campus, whereas opponents see Hughes as ideal in part because it keeps all the problems associated with football games safely away from campus.

2. Impact on football team and national profile

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

New on-campus stadium will reinvigorate the program, attract better coaches and players, and ultimately improve the team. An improved team will garner increased national attention, increasing the profile of CSU as a university since athletics are often a window to the university. The new stadium would serve a symbol of a bold new era of CSU athletics that students, fans, and alumni will rally around.	The impact of a new stadium on the quality of the football is unclear. It is seen as only one potential factor among many, and one with significant costs and risks. FC/CSU is not a football community like other big name programs (too many other opportunities/activities in Northern Colorado). Alternatively, these end points could potentially be accomplished without a new stadium.
--	---

July update: Of all the argument areas, this one has garnered the most balanced attention across perspectives. It is the most often cited argument in favor of the stadium, but is also directly engaged by the opposition rather often. The degree to which the new stadium will improve the team, invigorate the campus, and increase CSU's national profile is a difficult cause and effect relationship to examine. Supporters see the stadium as a key component and important symbol for revitalizing CSU athletics, and Be Bold CSU has collected a number of newspaper articles and interviews concerning universities that have added a stadium recently with positive impacts. Opponents argue that good players and coaches lead to improved teams, and the relationship to a new stadium is tenuous, and represents "putting the cart before the horse." Both sides cite examples to support their perspectives, but a more systematic assessment of the impacts of new stadiums is difficult because so many variables exist when trying to compare situations. Some opponents do recognize that the stadium may help the team, but argue that the costs are far too high for these benefits. The argument area was actually one of the only arguments that opponents of the stadium mention as a potential positive.

The Best practices sub-committee of the SAC presented a list of potential research questions related to the impact of on-campus stadiums during the March meeting (see www.cpd.colostate.edu/bestpracticesquestions.pdf), but the literature is limited on that topic. There is a small but inconclusive body of research on the impact of increased spending or facility upgrades on athletic success. Litan, Orszag, Orszag's 2003 review showed that spending leads to revenues, but not success, but in their update of the data in 2009 they reported "a small positive

and statistically significant relationship between greater operating expenditures on football and team success” (Orszag and Israel, 2009, p.8). A Master’s thesis written specifically on the subject of the impact of facility upgrades concluded that “that there was a relationship between national recruiting ranking and facility building as well as national recruiting ranking and overall winning percentage” (McGlaughon, 2007).

An important consideration from the literature is the zero-sum nature of college athletic success. Each game inherently has a winner and a loser, thus any team that improves its record must do so at the expense of others. This fact leads to arguments about “arms races” and concerns that if all institutions increase spending and improve facilities, then the net impact on success is null in the long run, but costs increase for everyone (Getz & Siegfried, 2010; Denhart, Villwock, and Vedder, 2010). Clotfelter (2011) explained this in terms of college athletics having no natural stopping point to spending because “there will always be ways to spend more money that will increase the chance of coming out ahead” (2011, p. 21). As a result, critics of big time sports focus in part on the need to curtail the arms race, often pointing to the growth in coaches’ salaries, increasing costs of facilities and capital construction (Tsitsos & Nixon, 2012; Clotfelter, 2011; Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2010). Despite those increasing numbers, research attempting to quantify the arms race tends not been conclusive (Litan, Orszag, Orszag, 2003).

Whereas the impact of new stadiums on team quality is difficult to ascertain, the research is clearer on the degree to which athletics can serve as an important window to the university. Even resources that primarily question the appropriate role of athletics at universities admit that athletics, for better or worse, tend to garner more attention and media coverage than any other aspects of the university. This “advertising effect” will be examined in more detail in argument area 11 concerning the stadium’s impact on CSU funding.

The following is the list of universities that have added new stadiums since 2000 (not including those who play in new NFL stadiums): SMU (2000), Connecticut (2003), Stanford (2006), Central Florida (2007), Akron (2009), Minnesota (2009), North Texas (2011), and Florida Atlantic (2011). New proposed or under construction stadiums include: North Carolina at Charlotte (to open in 2013), Tulane (2014), Houston (2014), Baylor (2014), and UNLV (no date available). Stadium expansions are also very common, with 72 college stadiums with expansions since 2000: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_NCAA_Division_I_FBS_football_stadiums#Current_stadiums. The CPD is currently gathering additional information concerning the new stadiums.

3. Utilizing Hughes to achieve these new goals/Current state of Hughes

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>The on-main campus nature of the proposal is a critical aspect, particularly for alumni engagement and for getting people on campus for game days. The prospect of a new stadium has energized people, and improving Hughes would not garner nearly as much excitement, support, or donations.</p>	<p>The goals of a revitalized athletic department expressed by supporters can be achieved at Hughes Stadium at much less cost, particularly if resources are used to improve the stadium and the game day experience there. Having 40,000 people on campus for games will cause problems as well.</p>
<p>Hughes is lacking, growing obsolete, disconnected from campus and the business community, and only used for a small number of football games.</p>	<p>Hughes is sufficient, recently renovated, and could be renovated again. Beautiful setting with plenty of space, which allows for tailgating (more difficult and problematic on campus). If a new stadium is built, it is unclear what would happen with Hughes; it could become an abandoned eyesore.</p>

July update: These two issues were separated in the original backgrounder, but it was generally difficult to split comments into the two areas, so they are combined here. The Save our Stadium Hughes group has primarily focused on supporting the argument for revitalizing Hughes Stadium rather than building a new stadium on campus. They believe all the goals outlined by Jack Graham at the February 3rd meeting (see slide 6 at <http://www.colostate.edu/stadium/presentation-3jan12.pdf>) could be achieved through Hughes Stadium at a lower cost and without all the negatives of the on-campus stadium (for more information, see the SOS white paper at http://soshughes.org/?page_id=62). CSU internal staff (not the consultants as initially reported in this document) are currently gathering data concerning the feasibility of making improvements to Hughes Stadium. One of the key questions here will be the degree to which being on campus is central to the potential benefits sought after for the new stadium, as well as to fundraising efforts.

Support for the Hughes Stadium was the most common argument provided by students in their comments. Many students saw Hughes Stadium as a viable stadium in a great location, and therefore questioned the need for a new stadium. Faculty and staff support for Hughes was less common, but nonetheless expressed as well. The location is seen as ideal due to the foothills, the ample parking, the tailgating, the Aggie “A” (it should be noted that the Aggie A pre-dates Hughes Stadium by over 40 years). The fact that it was recently renovated is also mentioned often. For many, a primary reaction to the stadium proposal was simply, “Why do we need a new stadium? We already have a perfectly fine one.” Indeed, the phrase “perfectly fine” was used quite often to describe Hughes. These comments were all collected before the May SAC meeting, however, so the students did not have much information concerning the new stadium and had not seen any renderings.

Supporters of the new stadium, on the other hand, express a number of concerns about Hughes, though the subject was not addressed too often. The Be Bold group’s response to the CPD

backgrounder includes examples of Hughes being ranked in the bottom 10% of Division I stadiums, despite its foothills location. Be Bold also pushed back on the idea of significantly renovating Hughes, arguing that it would require significant costs and donors are much less likely to fund it. Overall, some clarity as to the current state of Hughes Stadium is necessary. This remains a difficult issue because many supporters may be reluctant to criticize Hughes because if a new stadium is not built, Hughes will obviously need to continue to serve as CSU's stadium.

4. Community impacts

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>Traffic and parking issues can be lessened through engineering and design, including the new Mason Street corridor. An improved athletics program and the availability of a high quality multi-use facility may also bring the community together and serve as an important gathering place for FC.</p>	<p>A new stadium will cause many problems in terms of traffic, parking, noise, crime, and trash, which will harm the CSU-community relationship. The neighborhood around Hughes may also be negatively affected by the stadium no longer being used.</p>
--	---

July update: Early on CSU President Tony Frank provided the parameter that “All recommendations from the Advisory Committee must take into serious account any impact on neighbors in areas adjacent or near a new stadium.” This argument area has been the third most commonly discussed area by opponents of the stadium in the public input forms, and was deemed the most important issue in the surveys completed at the end of the initial forums. It was the 2nd most often area mentioned by faculty, 2nd by staff and 5th for the students. Overall, a strong majority of those that have commented currently envision negative community impacts, particularly focused on traffic, noise, parking, and crime. The March SAC survey sent to over 100,000 people connected to CSU showed that respondents that lived close to campus or Hughes were the most strongly opposed to the new stadium (whereas Denver respondents were the strongest in favor). See the Stadium Survey data at <http://www.colostate.edu/stadium/mar29-survey.pdf>. Traffic is a primary concern, and a point of contention. Critics argue that the stadium will cause gridlock on major streets in the middle of town, causing major problems for residents. Stadium supporters argue that traffic will be mitigated in part because unlike Hughes the campus is fed by several major streets, and by being on campus the timeline for the arriving and departing the event will expand, spreading traffic out more.

August 6 update: New information was presented on 7/26 and 7/30 at meetings with neighbors. That information is available on line at <http://www.colostate.edu/stadium/neighborhoods-july.pdf>. At those meetings, consultants presented initial research concerning parking, traffic, noise, and light impacts on the nearby neighborhoods, and took in additional public input. Audiences at both meetings were almost entirely in opposition to the stadium. Similar information will be presented on August 9th at the final SAC meeting. Consultants explained that if the project was to move forward, additional community engagement would occur in order to work with specific neighborhoods to develop plans to minimize negative impacts (examples included the potential of neighborhood streets being closed off to non-residents during game days).

Supporters do not deny the negative impacts, but argue that with good planning they could be mitigated, and that positive impacts will also occur. Supporters have also argued that it is typical for large projects like new stadiums to attract negative attention initially, but once completed

often gain much more support. They believe right now the community may be opposed to the idea of the stadium, but if it is built it will become an important asset for the campus and Fort Collins community. Some supporters believe that only a small minority of non-CSU “naysayers” are complaining about these impacts, but the data shows that these concerns are held by many across the stakeholder groups. Research is available that does show that crime and alcohol related problems tend to increase on game days (Glassman, et al, 2007, 2010; Rees and Schnepel, 2008). Concerns have also been raised about the impact on property values. Thus far, one article on the subject was identified, and it argues that there may be a positive impact (Feng and Humphreys, 2008).

5. Funding of stadium

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>Stadium would be built with donor funds not state funds or student fees. The just completed campaign raised over \$500 million for campus and academics, but this sort of campaign will engage donors in a new way. New donors may be more willing to donate to athletics and not academics, and long-term, athletic success that strongly ties alumni to the school will positively impact the university beyond athletics.</p>	<p>CSU should focus resources on academics not sports. Faculty and students need more support. Even if primarily funded by private donors, time and effort is still spent on raising the funds for athletics; those donors could be convinced to support academics. Ongoing costs or overruns will ultimately fall to the students or university to cover. Spending on sports during an economic downturn seems inappropriate.</p>
--	---

July update: Another of the parameters set forth by President Frank is that “State appropriation, tuition, fees or taxes will not be considered as funding sources for a stadium project.” The committee also explained that academic donors that have not donated to athletics in the past would also not be approached for donations. Little solid information was available for this argument area until the May SAC meeting, but most of the comments analyzed here were made before that data was available. It was clear that before that meeting this was an emotional argument area, particularly for faculty, staff, and students. Coming on the heels of multiple years of budget cutbacks, hiring freezes, the lack of raises, and tuition increases, for many spending \$200 million or more on a stadium struck a very negative chord, both substantively and symbolically. Some opponents seem to assume the money is available and could be spent elsewhere, but in general most seem to understand that the plan is to fund the stadium through private means tapping into current or new athletic donors (though faculty in particular seemed to push back on that assumption, arguing that donors could be convinced to donate to other university needs). Faculty and students each provided lists of more important financial needs for the university, and at times lamented that athletics received such attention. Opponents have also expressed concern about whether the funding will go as planned, arguing that major projects often cost more than expected or optimistic funding sources fall short in the end. At the University of North Texas, for example, initial promises were made to fund the stadium privately, but ultimately a student fee was implemented through a student vote. Funding problems at the University of California Berkley and University of Maryland have also been cited as examples of what could go wrong with stadium funding. *(August 6 addition:* At the community meeting on July 27, participants pressed on the issue of the reliability of the cost estimates, and ICON representative Tim Romani responded

to the assumption that projects such as these are typically over budget and argued ardently that the estimates from his company were legitimate, and offered examples of several recent ICON projects that came in at or under budget). Some have also expressed concern about relying too much on naming rights, and the degree to which the stadium and various components may be too commercialized or corporate. More recently, opponents have pointed out that cost estimates have already shifted from \$100-200 million to \$246 million,¹ that a portion of the funding will be financed rather than raised beforehand, and that popular components of the stadium that have been mentioned such as the Alumni Center are not included in the initial pricing. (*August 6 update:* It should be noted that the Alumni Center has been a separate project mentioned in the Master Plan since 2006, and the fundraising for that was always planned to be separate from the stadium, which is why it is not included in the estimate. The “Ram Athletic Alumni Lounge” and “CSU Faculty/Staff Lounge” that are mentioned as “additional amenities” in the May 30th powerpoint from the Best Practices committee would be located in the Alumni Center, therefore are also not a part of the \$246 million). At the July 27th community meeting, Tim Romani of ICON estimated that the Alumni Center would cost around \$18 million, and the future Phase II walkway improvements around \$10 million.

Supporters maintain that if the stadium is built through private funding, it essentially represents a gift to the university that should not be refused, and they pushed back at suggestions to tell donors how they should spend their money, particularly after the recent completion of the \$500 million campaign that focused on academics. Supporters also point to the fact that the March SAC survey showed that current donors tended to be the most in support of the new stadium, whereas those opposed tended not to have given to the university in the past. Some of the key ongoing questions here revolve around donors, including the degree to which academic and athletic donors can truly be separated, and how many new donors this project can attract that perhaps would not otherwise be given to CSU.

The report from the Market Analysis and Funding Sources committee on May 30 provided significant new information, including data from a survey of potential donors, estimates of the cost of the stadium and what will be included, and explanations of how it will be funded (available at www.colostate.edu/stadium/). Their research did show that many current donors to CSU donate both to athletics and academics, which is an interesting fact that can be used by both sides (supporters can argue that creating new donors through a stadium campaign will also likely increase academic donors, whereas opponents can argue that athletic and academic donors cannot be split, so it could be more likely for the stadium campaign to impact academic giving negatively). The May meeting revealed that the cost of Phase 1 of the stadium was estimated at \$246 million. That figure does not include the cost of the new parking garage now planned just west of the stadium (*August 6 update:* at the July community meeting, the ICON representative explained that the parking garage, like other parking garages, generate their own revenue to cover their cost), the Phase II improvements that would better connect the stadium to the campus, the proposed Alumni Center (*August 6 update:* which again has already been planned separate to the stadium), or any costs associated with addressing Hughes Stadium.

¹ The July 24 version of this backgrounder had the figure at \$242 million, but that was simply a calculation error by the CPD.

It was also announced that the stadium would be funded by a combination of private donations (\$45m-220m), corporate naming rights and sponsorships (\$3.5m to 4.9 annually), premium seating (\$7.2m – 12.4m annually), and event and facility development fees (\$443k-759k annually), with the remainder financed based on the revenue streams (*August 6 update*: The financing would be based on annual contractually-committed revenues from the naming rights, sponsorships, and premium seating contracts, not simply on estimates of future revenues or ticket sales). The final estimate of the total funding sources ranged from \$212m to \$490m. The conclusion from that subcommittee was that the funds could be raised for the stadium while honoring Frank’s parameters.

6. Environmental impact/message

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>Could be built LEED certified and serve as symbol of sustainability. New facilities today are often constructed with significant environmental improvements over older facilities.</p>	<p>A new stadium is not necessary, would have a significant carbon footprint, and sends a bad message about sustainability, particularly for our “Green University.”</p>
---	---

July update: Almost all of the comments in this area were offered by opponents, with numerous specific mentions of CSU potentially violating its moniker of being a Green University. The argument is used both to support “reusing” Hughes and opposing the new stadium. It strongly connects with arguments that Hughes remains an adequate option, thus opponents interpret the proposal for a new stadium as an example of “throwing away” a useful product to build a new one, which is deemed unsustainable and against the very image of CSU. Some specifically mentioned the irony of potentially building the stadium on the last bit of agricultural land on campus (however, recent plans from the SAC have announced that most of the PERC gardens would be incorporated into and highlighted by the stadium).

Supporters do mention the LEED certification listed above, as well as the fact that the on-campus stadium will likely increase the use of multi-modal transportation options to reach the stadium, such as walking and bicycling from the residence halls and nearby residences, as well as the use of public transport, tied both to the Mason Street Corridor and the CSU Transfort hub at the student center.

Based on the information at the May SAC meeting, the new stadium will likely be gold or platinum LEED certified. At the same time the carbon footprint of the new stadium will be larger due to the increased amount of space that will be climate controlled compared to Hughes. At this point if the new stadium is built, it remains unclear what will be done with Hughes (if it will be repurposed, sold, or dismantled).

7. Appropriate role of athletics at a university/ Impact on academics and core mission

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>Athletics are a big part of university identity and how alumni connect. Even if this is not ideal, it is reality for many. CSU is academically excellent, but unknown nationally; athletics is an important window to the university to change that.</p>	<p>Athletics should not be a central aspect of university identity. CSU shouldn't follow inappropriate national trends; CSU should focus on academics and its land grant mission, not entertainment and spectacle.</p>
<p>Success in athletics supports academics. A strong athletic program increases student pride in university, which increases retention. More national exposure can also lead to increased applications and thus student quality. A successful athletic program can bring in funding through multiple sources, helping keep tuition down, and faculty and staff salaries competitive.</p>	<p>Athletics distracts from academics. Athletics is not a core function of the university. Many programs are not financially successful, and critics argue that college sports are out of control, with arms races developing for coaches' salaries and facilities. Sports can adversely impact academic performance, as more athletic events impose on the academic calendar.</p>

July update: These two issues areas were also combined since many of the arguments here tended to incorporate both. This is certainly a very broad issue, but it seems clear that the stadium proposal connects to these broader issues for many of the stakeholders. Supporters tend to argue that athletics is an important part of the university and campus life, and represents an area of emphasis with great potential for CSU since our academics are strong but too often unknown. Research supports the notion that universities are often recognized through their athletics than academics, and stories in the media about athletics dominate stories about other aspects of university life (see Clotfelter, 2011, for example). Supporters thus believe that with an improved athletics program, the natural advantages of Fort Collins and the academic strength of the university will lead to significant positive impacts on the rest of the university. The argument does not necessarily assume CSU needs to become known for its athletics, rather that athletics can help CSU become known for its other fine qualities. Supporters also point to the community building aspect of athletics, which helps build identification with the university and camaraderie among students and alumni. Supporters, in other words, tend not to see a tension between academics and athletics, but rather a symbiotic relationship.

Opponents provide a variety of arguments here, most of which do assume a tension between athletics and academics. For some, therefore, big time athletics are misplaced at a university and not connected to the land grant mission, and CSU should aspire to becoming known for its academic programs, not its athletics. For them, utilizing athletics as a key window to the university is problematic and should be avoided. They cite national research on the problems caused by athletic programs (Sperber's *Beer and Circus* is a favorite of SOSH, cited often in their original position paper), and how the pursuit of athletic glory has often led to ethical problems and embarrassments to the university. This was part of the argument made by Dr. Ridpath in his SOSH sponsored presentation in February (see http://soshughes.org/?page_id=42). The ongoing scandal at Penn State is the most obvious recent example (it should be noted, however, that CSU is one of 17 institutions that has never had a major NCAA violation). Critics decry the fact that football and basketball coaches are more well-known and compensated than university presidents

and award winning faculty, and argue that CSU should differentiate itself from such realities, rather than give in and pursue them. A few opponents were explicitly negative toward athletics, connecting it to consumerism, empty spectacle, brutality, and “rape culture,” but this was certainly a minority opinion.

Comments from faculty, staff, and students expressed concern with athletics becoming more and more important while academics seems to continue to get cut (see the comments concerning the funding of the stadium). Many students and faculty explained that universities should focus on academics not athletics. Some comments here even seem to imply that supporters of athletics and the new stadium think athletics should be more important than academics, which appears to be an unfair characterization. Currently, only 2.7% of the CSU budget goes towards athletics, so clearly no one is arguing for athletics to overtake academics in any serious capacity.

The bottom line is that the university and its students, like many universities, does currently subsidize athletics, so at least on some level there are opportunity costs to having an athletic program. Tony Frank’s letter (2011) and speeches on the role of athletics provides some clarity (both are available on the SAC website). Dr. Frank has explained that he supports Jack Graham’s vision for a more successful athletic program, believing every unit of the university should strive for excellence. He has also explained often that there has to be a middle ground between where CSU currently resides athletically, and the major programs like Ohio State and Alabama. To increase focus on athletics at CSU does not necessarily mean the need to commit to becoming a program with huge athletics budgets. Whether or not a new stadium is an effective means to find that new middle ground is obviously a key question.

A very broad literature exists concerning the role of athletics in universities, with a variety of books (such as Duderstadt, 2000; Sperber, 2001; Yost, 2010; Zimbalist, 1999) and organizations (i.e. the Drake Group, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics) calling for significant reforms in college athletics. Robert Benford’s review of the “College Sports Reform Movement” highlighted five primary area reformers focus on: 1. commercialization, 2. university involvement in the entertainment industry; 3. damage to the integrity of higher education; 4. exploitation of athletes; and 5. harm to nonathletes (2007). A review of all these issues are beyond the scope of this document, but they provide a sense of the broader debate that has gone on for more than a century about the role of sports on campus and its impact on academics.

When participants at the initial forums were asked to prioritize a list of values relevant to the stadium issue, the most important was CSU’s academic quality, thus the question of the impact of athletics to academics is certainly a relevant issue to explore. The academic research has mixed results on the link between athletics and academics. Primarily four links have been explored: (a) the degree to which athletics impacts the quantity and quality of applications (the “selection effect”); (b) the degree to which athletics impacts the academic performance of non-athlete students (“the treatment effect”); (c) the academic performance of athletes themselves; and (d) the degree to which athletics impacts university funding, which in turn can impact academics.

Perhaps the most extensively research link is the question of whether a successful athletics program leads to a higher national profile, which leads to more applications, which can either

mean additional funds for the university (if more students are accepted, particularly if they are out of state students who pay a premium) or could mean improved quality of students as schools can be more selective. This issue is examined in more detail within argument area 11 below.

The impact of athletics on the academics of non-athletes has produced some academic study. Critics such as Sperber argue that athletics is “crippling undergraduate education” (2000). Clotfelter’s research showed that students at universities with big time sports programs tend to spend less time in class or on classwork, and more time engaged in organized extracurricular activities (2011, p. 164-165). His research also showed that students tend to utilize library databases less when teams are in the NCAA basketball tournament or after a loss. Some studies such as Tucker (1993) and Lindo, Swensen, and Waddell (2011) show that athletic success negatively impacts graduation rates and/or GPAs, while others such as Mixon & Trevino, 2005 and Tucker 2004 reveal the opposite (see Trenkamp, 2009 for a review). Overall, two competing theories seem to be at play. Lindo, Swensen, and Waddell (2011), for example, argue that successful seasons negatively impact GPAs of males because they focus on athletics to the detriment of their studies. Others have argued that athletic success increases identification with the school, improves the quality of life on campus, and offers a respite from the psychic costs associated with college life, motivating students to work harder to stay and graduate (Larimore and Chityo, 2007; Mixon & Trevino, 2005; Trenkamp, 2009; Tucker, 2004). Closer examination of this issue may be warranted. Related research has argued that successful football programs can increase the prestige of a university’s graduates (Lovaglia & Lucas, 2005) and increase its ranking on lists such as *U.S. News and World Report* (Mulholland, Tomic, Sholander, 2010 and Trenkamp, 2009; Cox and Roden, 2010, has shown a similar effect for teams winning a national championship, not no relationship beyond the champions).

Research on athletes as students has received considerable attention, and has been an ongoing focus of the reform agenda. Critics argue that some big-time athletics programs “operate with little interest in scholastic matters beyond the narrow issue of individual eligibility” (Knight Commission, 2001, p.14). Favoritism in admission policies, abuses in academic support, negative off the field behavior, and poor graduation rates are among the issues examined in the broader literature. Despite recent negative off-the-field incidents, CSU generally has a strong record concerning student-athletes, particularly concerning academics. CSU has lead the Mountain West Conference in graduation rates for student-athletes overall for the past 5 years (the rate was 83% in 2011, higher than overall student graduate rates for the university). Its 74% graduation rate for football players in 2011 was the 21st highest in the nation (for more information, see <http://www.csurams.com/genrel/110111aaa.html>). As mentioned earlier, CSU has also never had a major NCAA violation.

8. Quality of new facility / Multi-function facility

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>A new stadium can be a centerpiece, jewel, a place for students, community, and alumni to gather.</p>	<p>Stadiums are large, ugly, expensive concrete buildings that sit empty most of the time.</p>
<p>An on-main campus stadium could serve multiple functions to enhance the campus and student experiences, serving as key community gathering place, housing the Alumni Association, including residence halls, stores, classrooms, etc.</p>	<p>More events mean more traffic and related problems. For some in the community, the image of a stadium as a key gathering place was not seen as a positive (seen as image over substance)</p>

July update: These two arguments areas were also combined due to similarities in responses. The public discussion has been limited within these argument areas, primarily because the lack of information until recently. To this point, the pro arguments above have held up in the few comments made in this area. Opponents have generally not mentioned the multi-function aspect of the facility, but comments were made assuming that the stadium would be an “eyesore” or a “monstrosity.” Both the physical nature of the stadium and its symbolism was seen as a negative. Comments have been limited since the May SAC meeting, so the reaction to the renderings and architectural designs has been limited.

The Design and Best Practices committee has been providing new information with each SAC meeting. The March meeting included a list a potential aspects of the stadium, and during the April meeting the committee reported on visits to the new stadiums at Stanford and the University of Minnesota. The May meeting provided architectural designs and renderings (<http://www.colostate.edu/stadium/may30/WATERCOLORS-FINAL.pdf>). With these updates, much fuller information is now available for stakeholders to better consider this aspect of the debate. Perhaps some of the most important aspects of the new stadium to differentiate it from Hughes Stadium—other than being on-campus—is a significant increase in the number of different styles of premium seating, which are critical for the increased revenues the stadium will bring (see the CSL presentation during they May SAC meeting for details). Hughes Stadium has 12 luxury boxes and 427 club seats, whereas the recommended building program for the new stadium suggested 15-25 luxury suites, 15 to 21 club suites, 20 to 30 loge boxes, and 1,100 to 2,000 club seats. For supporters, these premium seats provide significant funding and an improved experience that is more in line with current professional stadiums. For opponents, these premium seats represent over-commercialization of the college game that caters too much to wealthy donors.

In terms of the multi-use aspect of the facility, the April and May meetings provided a sense of how the facility could be used beyond football games. It was mentioned that the University of Minnesota stadium is used for over 200 events a year, though those events only use small portions of the stadium. Events such as banquets, weddings, and other campus meetings could bring in additional revenue, utilizing some unique spaces, including an outside terrace and a 24,000 square foot stadium club with both mountain and stadium views. The facility could also be used for major events such as graduation or important speakers, and will be available for the lacrosse, soccer, and rugby teams. Some concern has been expressed that these meeting facilities could compete with existing Fort Collins businesses.

9. Game day experience

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

A new stadium would provide a better game day experience both inside and around the stadium, and lead to new traditions.	A new stadium would not necessarily lead to a better game day experience, especially if tailgating is limited and alcohol is not allowed. Efforts could be made to significantly improve the game day experience at Hughes.
---	---

July update: The arguments from the initial backgrounder generally have held up. Supporters tend to focus more on the potential for the on-campus stadium to turn a football game into more of an all-day experience, and have provided examples from many other institutions where game days were much more of a major event that ranged beyond football, incorporated academics through pre-game lectures or department showcases, and showed off the campus to visitors. This connects with some of the concerns with the location of Hughes, which, critics argue, tends to limit the available activities before and after the game to tailgating in the parking lot.

Opponents maintain that the game day experience is primarily a function of the quality of the team, which they believe a new stadium will not significantly impact. They also maintain that the existing traditions at Hughes Stadium are already valuable and could be significantly improved at much less cost.

The tailgating issue has garnered attention from both perspectives. Many support the current tailgating scene at Hughes, and are concerned that the tailgating on campus would not compare favorably. Concerns of the negative impact of tailgating on campus have also been expressed by students, staff, and faculty. On the other hand, supporters have expressed excitement of developing new pre-game traditions on campus, such as using the Oval or intramural fields in a manner similar to Ole Miss' well-known "Grove."

10. Impact on alumni connection

The comments from the initial backgrounder:

The new on-campus stadium will more strongly connect alumni to the university by bringing them to campus when they visit for football games. The excitement, increased support, and improved game day experience will strengthen both student and alumni connection with CSU.	Opponents question whether a new stadium could have such impacts. In addition, they question whether it is appropriate that athletics be relied upon as such a critical means of connecting to alumni.
--	--

July update: A key argument area for stadium supporters, many of which are alumni and have expressed great enthusiasm for the stadium proposal. One of the most common comments by alumni in the public input forms were explanations of why they have not visited CSU and campus very often, and that a new on-campus stadium would significantly increase the frequency of their visits. Many, for example, looked forward to bring their families on campus. Many alumni have also expressed excitement about CSU taking athletics more seriously and "no longer accepting mediocrity." Many commented that the stadium issue has reinvigorated the alumni, and created excitement about CSU that hasn't been felt in many years. During the initial SAC meeting in February, Jack Graham's presentation also included relevant information concerning this issue,

including statistics on CSU’s current poor alumni giving rate and testimony from other university officials about the importance of on-campus stadiums for alumni relations. The March SAC survey provided additional data concerning the alumni view, showing that overall they were slightly opposed to the stadium (25% strongly opposed, 14% opposed, 12% needed more info, 9% undecided, 17% in favor, and 23% strongly in support).

Opponents tend not to discuss this issue much, though some question the value of alumni connections based primarily on athletics. They also argue that if the team does not improve, the attraction of the new stadium would be short-lived. SOS Hughes has also cited research reports that question the link between athletic success and increased alumni donations, which will be discussed more in the funding impacts area below.

11. Impact on CSU funding and affordability

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>Increased alumni connections, national profile, attendance, and community support will result in increased funds for CSU, which is a critical need in a time of decreasing public funding for higher education and increasing cost of tuition. The goal is to become more self-sustaining and remain affordable.</p>	<p>The financial impact of a new stadium is unclear and unpredictable (while the costs are much more tangible). Many athletic departments at major institutions are not operating at a profit and chasing athletic success may backfire.</p>
--	--

July update: The CPD has focused on this area the most over the summer, as it involves several key issues where the opposing sides operate from very different fact bases, and research could potentially provide some clarity. In general, supporters did not focus on this argument area to any great extent in the public input forms, though that is likely due in part to the lack of financial information until the May SAC meeting. From the beginning of the process, however, Jack Graham and Tony Frank have mentioned the potential for the new stadium to lead to a higher national profile for the university, which could then have positive impacts on university finances, which is particularly important in light of decreasing state support. During the forums, when participants were asked to rank the most important values related to the stadium, academic quality and affordability were clearly the top two choices.

In general, at least three funding arguments seem to be in play: (a) the new stadium could lead to increased athletic department revenues through ticket sales, concessions, TV contracts, etc., (b) the new stadium and reinvigorated program could increase alumni connections and thus increase donations to the university (both to academics and athletics), and (c) a higher national profile could increase out of state applicants, who pay significantly more for tuition and serve as an important university funding source. Opponents have taken on these claims directly, citing research that questions all three of these assumptions, and at times arguing that the opposite is more likely to occur (see the SOSH white paper). Indeed, one of the reasons many of the opponents are so adamantly opposed is because they have read sources such as those cited by Dr. Ridpath in his presentation that seem to directly refute the financial arguments that are being made by supporters—which have been identified as arguments typically made to support increased spending on athletics—and thus see such arguments as either wishful thinking or

disingenuous. It should also be noted that all three of the funding arguments to some extent rely on the new stadium having a positive impact on the quality of the team, which was examined in argument area 2 (impact on team and national profile) above, which opponents of the stadium have questioned.

The funding of university academics is a complex matter than certainly deserves more attention and clarity in this discussion. We will quickly review some of the basics here. Tony Frank's letter on the role of athletics (2011) and Jack Graham's presentation to faculty council (2012) help provide some of the key data points. Utilizing the numbers reported in Frank's letter, the CSU athletic department has a budget of roughly \$25 million a year. Revenue sources include \$8.9 million from self-generated revenues (ticket sales, game revenues, television, merchandising, etc.), \$2.5 million from direct donor support, \$4.8 million from student fees, and \$9.6 million from the university general fund. Thus currently the university does subsidize the athletic program through both general funds and student fees. The funds from the university, however, include \$1.9 million of in-kind value and utilities, and much of the remainder (around \$6 million) actually goes to paying for student-athlete scholarships, and thus go back to the university. There is perhaps some opportunity cost for paying for an athlete rather than another student that could take that seat, but those funds are essentially a department transfer, not an outside expenditure. The athletic department budget has increased in recent years, which has mostly been covered by the university subsidy and student fees. A significant part of the increase in expenses has been due to increases in tuition and fees for the student-athletes.

CSU students currently pay \$207 a year for a mandatory athletic fee, which includes tickets to any home athletic event, including football games. That athletic fee is controlled by a student committee (in other words, the students respond to requests from the athletic department, but they have the power to set the level of the fee). That fee has doubled in the last 10 years, but still remains lower than the national average ([http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/2010-09-21-athletic-fees-chart N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/2010-09-21-athletic-fees-chart_N.htm)). Such student athletic fees are very common at universities in the United States (Gillum, Upton, Berkowitz, 2010; Berkowitz, et al, 2010; Suggs 2004), but the practice is criticized by some as unfair (Denhart and Vedder, 2010). Some universities combine a general athletic fee with an optional "all sports pass," similar to purchasing season tickets (see Graham's presentation to faculty council, linked above, for more information). Students at those universities could thus choose to not receive tickets and pay a lower fee. Jack Graham has mentioned that over time and with more athletic success, CSU may be able to switch to that fee structure.

CSU's athletic department budget overall is on the lower end of the scale nationally (compare its \$25 million budget to the median in the Pac 12 (\$55.8m), Big 10 (\$78.8m), and Big 12 (\$57.8m) (Smith, 2011). Compared to schools in the Mountain West Conference, CSU's budget is currently \$9.6 million below the average (Graham, 2011). According to the *USA Today* College Athletics Finances database, seventy-eight schools spent more on athletics than CSU from 2006 to 2011. Compared to other universities in the Mountain West Conference, CSU receives a lower percentage of its budget from self-generated revenues and donations, and thus relies on university subsidies and student fees for a higher percentage of its revenues (Graham, 2011). For example, Clotfelter (2011, p. 98) showed that on average ticket sales represents 25% of athletic department revenues (CSU's projected percentage in 2012 is 13%), donations represent 22% (CSU's projected

is 6%), and subsidies are 18% (CSU's projected is 51%). Thus one of the key arguments for the new stadium is that if it provides several new sources of revenue not currently available at Hughes and it can improve the football program and spark more support, the athletic department could become more self-sufficient through both self-generate revenues and donations, and thus rely less on the university and students. Opponents argue that typically any additional revenues are used by the athletic department, thus they may not impact the university subsidies or student fees. In addition, if the stadium does not produce the additional revenues, any increased financial burden could ultimately fall on the university and/or students.

An extensive literature exists concerning the funding of college athletics that attempts to clarify the real costs and benefits. Sources such as Clotfelter's *Big Time Sports in American Universities* provide an extended and in my view fair examination of much of the evidence concerning these issues. It is clear that costs of athletics have been steadily increasing despite cuts elsewhere on campus (Knight Commission, 2009; Pappano, 2012), and have increased from around 3% to 6% of overall spending by academic institutions since 1997 (Orszag and Israel, 2009; Knight Commission, 2010) (note: CSU's athletic budget has increased as well, but remains under 3% of the overall university budget). Revenues have also clearly increased—college football is more popular than ever—but those revenues are not spread evenly. Revenue increases have in particular been tied to television money, which primarily goes to the top conferences (Dosh, 2012).

One important aspect of the literature is the difficulty of gathering clear, comparable information on benefits and costs, particularly for the many intangibles (McCafferty, 2006). Some quantifiable costs and revenues are often split between the university and athletic program, such as parking, merchandising, and utilities. Since athletic programs and universities as a whole tend to work more like non-profits, additional revenues tend to lead to additional expenditures, rather than profit (i.e. surpluses tend to be spent before the end of the fiscal year). The quantification of indirect benefits are perhaps the most difficult to consider, such as the “advertising effect” of athletics, the impact on the quality of student's college experience (often termed “consumption value”), and the degree to which athletics help connect students to the university as alumni or community members as fans and potentially as donors. Numerous studies have taken on these issues, but very few clear conclusions can be reached.

By the most frequently reported calculations, only a handful of universities nationwide are able to profit from their athletics programs (Fulks, 2011; Denhart, Villwock, and Vedder, 2010), and a strong majority must be subsidized by the university and students (Frank, 2004). Most of the schools that profit have much larger budgets, stadiums that hold over 90,000, enjoy lucrative television contracts, and are in one of the top conferences (Big 12, Pac 12, SEC, Big 10, ACC, or Big East). Indeed, the growing divide between the “haves” and the “have nots” is a major point of discussion in the literature (Denhart and Vedder, 2010, for example, shows that schools in the less prestigious conferences like the Mountain West rely much more heavily on subsidies). Others have argued that athletic department finances cannot be compared without digging deeper into how the numbers are calculated and considering the indirect benefits. Borland, Goff, and Pulsinelli (1992) and Goff (2004), for example, argue that when indirect benefits are included in calculations, a much higher percentage of schools technically profit from their athletic programs.

In summary, a key issue in the debate concerning the new stadium is the degree to which it could lead to increasing both the direct and indirect benefits derived from the athletic program, without significantly increasing expenditures and indirect costs. Supporters argue that since the stadium itself would be built through donations and the additional revenues it generates, it will increase department revenues without significant added expenditures. Opponents argue that the new stadium is an example of increased athletic spending which simply does not make sense when only a handful of schools make money from their sports programs, and CSU's circumstances (size of the stadium, conference, television contract, etc.) make it unlikely to be one of those few. Some opponents point to the possibility that the stadium either becomes a financial burden, particularly if the team does not improve and the crowds do not come, or that the need to support the new stadium will lead to increased pressure to win that will justify unethical practices.

In order to further clarify the debate, we will return to the three primary sub-arguments related to financing (a, b, and c in the first paragraph of this section).

(A) *The new stadium could lead to increased athletic department revenues through ticket sales, concessions, TV contracts, etc.* The presentation at the May SAC meeting provided significant information concerning the revenues the new stadium could potentially spark (see slides 17-20 on the CSL presentation online at www.cpd.colostate.edu/CSLmaypresenation.pdf). Their research estimated a 22% increase in attendance, which combined with the additional funds from premium seating, naming rights, and many other revenues streams led to low, base, and high scenarios for the financial impact of the stadium. The low scenario estimated an additional \$10.3 million of income, the base scenario an additional \$16 million, and the high scenario an additional \$22.5 million a year during the first year and increasing after that over the anticipated revenues derived from Hughes Stadium. Depending on how much is raised for the stadium through donations and naming rights, some of these additional revenues may go to covering the building of the stadium. Opponents have questioned the validity of the numbers, arguing they are exaggerated (Patton, 2011).

Research tends to show that in college athletics increased expenditures do tend to be either matched by revenues (Litan, Orszag, Orszag, 2003), or slightly surpassed by revenues (Orszag and Israel, 2009). In other words, a dollar spent tends to lead to a dollar or slightly more earned. Supporters thus highlight that in the case of the new stadium, a bulk of the new capital costs would be covered by the donations and naming rights, whereas the new revenues would go to the athletic department, resulting in the significant surpluses anticipated by CSL.

(b) *The new stadium and reinvigorated program could improve alumni connections and thus increase donations to the university (both to academics and athletics)*

Whether increased athletic success leads to increased donations to the university has a very broad but unfortunately inconclusive body of research. Studies tend to analyze the issue differently and utilize different data sets, leading Goff to conclude that "assessing the indirect effects of intercollegiate athletics is fraught with methodological challenges" (2004, p. 75). Based on the CPD literature review, several studies question the link, many specifically working to debunk what Murray Sperber labeled the "'the big time college sports equals alumni giving myth" (2000). Studies reporting no clear relationship between sports and giving include Harrison, Mitchell, and

Peterson, 1995; Sigelman and Carter, 1979; Shulman and Bowen, 2001; and Turner, Meserve, and Bowen, 2001.

Another set of studies have shown either mixed results, or only a minor positive relationship: Baade and Sundberg, 1996; Goff, 2004; Frey, 1985; Humphreys and Mondello, 2005; Meer and Rosen, 2009; Orszag and Israel, 2009; Stinson, 2005; Stinson & Howard, 2007.

Finally, a third set reports positive relationships: Anderson, 2012; Brooker and Klastorin, 1981; Coughlin and Erikson, 1984; Grimes and Chressanthis, 1994; McEvoy, 2005a; McCormick and Tinsley, 1990; Murphy and Trandel, 1994; Rhoads and Gerking, 2000; Sigelman and Bookheimer, 1983; Tucker 2004.

Another issue examined within the literature is the relationship between academic and athletic giving. Some studies specifically separate the two, must do not. An 2012 *Inside Education* article by Allie Grasgreen cites an unfinished study that is reporting that athletic giving cuts into academic funding, and Denhart, Villwock, and Vedder (2010), Stinson (2005), and Wolverson (2007) presented data showing that trends show a higher percentage of donations from both alumni and non-alumni going directly to athletics rather than academics. They term the loss of academic donations to athletics as the “crowding-out effect” (Denhart, Villwock, and Vedder, 2010, p. 23), whereas Grimes and Chressanthis (1994) argued that athletic success increases both athletic and academic donations, causing a “spillover effect.”

Overall, a more focused analysis of these studies may be warranted to consider the methodologies used and the specific data each explored, and which studies may be more relevant to CSU’s specific situation. At this point, it is difficult to argue there is a well-defined link between athletic success and donations, but it cannot simply be dismissed either. Consider as well that CSU currently has only 8.25% of alumni donating to the university, which is lower than many comparable universities (land grant universities average around 15%).² Another limitation to the research is that it focuses on increased success, not the impact of a new stadium. On one hand, one could argue that the new stadium does not guarantee success, so there is yet another complicated step between the stadium and increased donations. On the other hand one could argue that the fundraising for the new stadium will likely engage donors that have not donated before, and those donors may continue to donate to the university once they are invested.

Update (7/26): CSU Vice-President of University Advancement Brett Anderson explained that the primary link between the stadium and increased donations may be more about getting people on campus, not necessarily a winning football team. The research summarized above focuses the connections between winning percentage or postseason play and donations. Brett explained that getting alumni and their friends and families to campus for events such as a Monfort Lecture leads to spikes in giving, and bringing 40,000 people to campus 6 times every fall could potentially have similar effects. Other universities utilize football games as a primary means of getting alumni on campus, but that ability is very limited at CSU due to the stadium being off campus. In the end, the

² Originally, I reported that 3.9% donate, but that number is the number of people that pay annual dues to the alumni organization. 8.25% is correct for the percentage of alumni that donate overall.

quality of the team may impact the number that come (it may only be 25,000 if the team is not winning), but the most important connection in terms of donations may be to the campus and the university, not necessarily the football team. The football game is simply the catalyst for them coming to campus in the first place. Once on campus, the school will have additional opportunities to highlight other assets (faculty, programs, etc.) and that increased engagement can lead to increased donations for a variety of university purposes outside athletics.

(c) a higher national profile could increase out of state applicants, who pay significantly more for tuition and serve as an important university funding source.

Similar to the impact on donations, a significant literature exists concerning the impact of athletic success on applications. The basic argument is that athletic success has an “advertising effect” that leads to more applicants. The argument is not necessarily that these students would attend because of athletics, but rather that athletics played a role in the student simply knowing about and considering the school. The most famous example of this impact was a major increase in applications for Boston University after Doug Flutie’s famous Hail Mary pass to beat the University of Miami in 1984, which is why it is also known as the “Flutie Effect.”

Increased applications can either result in *additional students and thus funding* (if the institution has room for additional students) or *improved quality of students* due to the institutions being able to be more selective and have a lower acceptance rate. Interestingly, the research tends not to differentiate between in state and out of state students, which is likely a critical distinction for CSU and other state institutions. Getz & Siegfried (2010) provide the most extensive recent summary of the research, and conclude that the results are ambiguous, but that better studies suggest that winning or participating in post-season competition does not generate much additional student interest. Clotfelter’s recent review concluded that the effect is “indeed at work in American higher education. Very successful seasons in either of the big-time sports [football or men’s basketball] results in application spikes. But the effect is fleeting” (2011, p. 146).

Studies that have found a relationship either to increased applications and/or improved average scores include Anderson, 2012; Borland, Goff, and Pulsinelli, 1992; Goff, 2004; McCormick and Tinsley, 1987; McEvoy, 2005a, 2006; Mixon, 1995; Mixon, Trevino and Minto, 2004; Pope and Pope, 2009; Sandy and Sloane, 2004; Tucker and Amato, 1993; Tucker 2005.

Studies that question the effect or show a weak relationship include Bremmer and Kesselring, 1993; Cox & Roden, 2010; Frank, 2004; Goff, 2004; Litan, Orszag, and Orszag, 2003; Murphy and Trandel, 1994; Shulman and Brown, 2001; Smith, 2008; Toma and Cross, 1998; and Zimbalist, 1999.

Once again, the research is plentiful but hardly conclusive. In addition, the question is not simply if a positive relationship exists, but rather how strong the relationship is and what financial impact would it make on the university. The lack of analysis concerning out of state students is also particularly limiting. Mixon and Hsing (1995) is one exception, and they do conclude that athletic programs are a significant factor for attracting out-of-state students. Another important aspect to consider concerning this issue is whether CSU’s specific situation impacts the potential for a positive relationship based on the fact that both Colorado and Fort Collins are sought after destinations, and, as some argue, CSU is a “hidden gem” academically. Supporters therefore argue that CSU athletics could have a stronger “advertising effect” than most schools because a

prospective student that hears about CSU due to athletics and investigates or visits is likely to find CSU a stronger option than anticipated.

12. Impact on Fort Collins economy

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>The new stadium, renewed excitement, and increased alumni relationships would lead to higher attendance and out of town visitors. In addition, fans will spend additional dollars in Fort Collins due in part to closer proximity to Old Town.</p>	<p>The impact of new stadiums on local economies is unclear, particularly if crowds keep others from downtown on game days. For some, additional growth to Fort Collins is not seen as a positive.</p>
--	--

July update: This argument area has not garnered significant attention in the public comment, and generally the arguments tend to contradict each other at this point. Supporters of the stadium argue that the stadium will positively impact the Fort Collins economy primarily because fans coming to games will be much more likely to visit other Fort Collins businesses during their visit. The argument focuses on the fact that Hughes Stadium is rather isolated, with no retail businesses or restaurants in close proximity. As a result, supporters argue that many fans drive directly to the stadium and tend to drive home after, rather than making a day of it in Fort Collins. Numerous alumni made these very arguments concerning their own behavior in emails and public input forms. Opponents question this impact, and argue that due to the increased traffic and parking problems the new location would cause, businesses would actually be negatively impacted because normal customers would not be able to reach them or would not want to deal with traffic. To this point, the business community has not clearly expressed its own views, but efforts are ongoing to gather that information.

There is a body of research on the impact of stadiums on local economies, though much of the research is focused on professional sports and connected to the question of whether using public funds to support new stadiums is economically beneficial. That research does tend to show that positive economic impact of stadiums are often significantly overemphasized by advocates and overall stadiums tend not to be significant economic drivers (Baade, 1996; Baade, Baumann, and Matheson, 2008; Chapin, 2002; Coates and Humphreys, 2010; Siegfried and Zimbalist, 2000). Chapin (2002) showed that there are numerous economic and noneconomic costs and benefits to new stadiums, but many are not considered during project development, and the noneconomic impacts are obviously difficult to measure.

The research specific to college football has also shown that the economic impacts tend not to be significant, in part due to the “hunker-down effect,” wherein local residents stay home rather than venture out to spend money, and the “skedaddle effect,” which involves local residents leaving town to avoid hectic game days (Coates and Humphreys, 2008; see also Baade, Baumann, and Matheson, 2007; Coates and Depken, 2008). The CPD is in the process of gathering and analyzing additional research in this area.

Two specific aspects of this debate to our situation should be considered. First, supporters argue that the increase in economic impact would occur because visitors from Denver and other locals would be spending more money due to game day becoming more of an all-day event and the

proximity of the new location to other businesses compared to the lack of businesses near Hughes. Much of the stadium research focuses on stadiums in large cities, so the overall economic impact is lessened because spending at the stadium tends to replace spending elsewhere in the city rather than spark new spending. If the spending connected to the stadium represents new spending coming from outside of Fort Collins, however, the impact may be more significant. Second, the new stadium would obviously replace an existing stadium, so only the change in economic impact should be considered. Supporters argue that fans currently do not spend as much in Fort Collins because of the location, whereas opponents argue that downtown businesses are very busy during game days already, thus the difference would be minimal. Better data on the past impact of CSU football on the Fort Collins economy could be helpful.

13. Athletic conference issues

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

<p>CSU may get left behind in conference realignment, and a new conference could translate into a higher profile and more funding, particularly from television revenues. A larger stadium and stronger program may be necessary, however.</p>	<p>Stadium does not guarantee a move up in conference affiliation. Getting left behind is not necessarily bad, and it may be unlikely to be invited to a better conference.</p>
---	---

July update: This issue area was rarely mentioned in the public input forms, and came in at the bottom of the most important issues on the forum surveys. Overall, there seems to simply be too many unknowns here as the college football landscape does seem to be changing rapidly. Some supporters do mention the importance of moving to a more viable conference that would have much higher TV payouts and games against more established opponents that would attract larger crowds and bring more of their fans to Fort Collins. The differences in television money are quite substantial. Schools in the Big 12, Big 10, Pac 12, ACC, and SEC average \$14.6 to 20.8 million a year of revenues from television contracts (Dosh, 2012), whereas last year CSU projected receiving a total of \$2.9 million in revenue from the conference (Graham, 2012). Attendance figures are also very different (the SEC leads conferences with an average attendance of 76,306, with the Big 12 at 57,742, Pac 12 at 52,495, and Mountain West at 27,455. CSU averaged 21,867 in 2011).

Opponents argue that building a new stadium is too much of a gamble for the potential of a conference realignment, plus a new 42,000 seat stadium may not be sufficient for the Big 12 or PAC 12 anyway, where stadiums tend to be much larger (Big 12 stadiums average 61,223 with a low of TCU’s at 43,000, and Pac 12 stadiums average 60,990, with a low of 35,117 at Washington State).

14. Impact on other CSU sports

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

Success in football will lead to increased revenue for and attention to the other sports. At many universities, success in football and basketball provides funding for non-revenue generating sports. Other sports could also utilize the facility.	A new stadium would be too focused on football. CSU has many sports, including successful programs like volleyball. Getting involved in the “arms race” in football may increase costs to the point of not being able to support other sports.
---	---

July update: This was not a frequent topic, and the comments from the original backgrounder tend to stand. Research tends to also support the argument that football and men’s basketball are generally considered the “revenue” sports as they are the only ones to tend to produce more revenues than expenses (not all programs profit, but they tend to be the only sports that do profit). For many schools where football and men’s basketball make a profit, the surplus does help carry the remaining sports (Dosh, 2011). A few students argued that other sports “deserved” additional resources more than the football team, often citing the spring fighting incident that involved football players and the success of programs such as volleyball and men’s basketball. Some opponents of the new stadium have also raised the question of whether spending such amounts on football would raise additional Title IX issues.

15. Student Attendance

Comments from the initial backgrounder:

More students will attend games because they could walk and the game day experience will be enhanced. Increased attendance in turns increases the home field advantage and increases the student connection to CSU.	Student tickets are currently part of student fees, and a new stadium may necessitate an increase in ticket prices. Students are also concerned that an on-campus stadium would bar alcohol. The effort required to go to Hughes is not significant; busses are provided. Moby rarely fills for other sports despite being on campus. Students want a winning program, on campus or not.
--	--

July update: This argument area was also not commented on very often by supporters or opponents, with again the comments above generally capturing those that were offered. Some student supporters argued that getting out to Hughes is difficult, but others disagreed. Several students did argue for the need to improve the shuttle system to Hughes, while others argued that there should be a shuttle system (evidently unaware that there is one already). Some concerns about ticket price increases were expressed, but at this point the athletic department has maintained that student tickets will still be basic part of the athletic fee, which is negotiated by students separately from any price increases. The new stadium will continue to reserve up to 10,000 tickets for students.

Key Links and Resources

The Stadium advisory committee website- www.colostate.edu/stadium

Includes all the powerpoint slides from the monthly meetings from February to May, as well as video of each meeting.

The Center for Public Deliberation website – www.cpd.colostate.edu

Includes the raw data and analysis from the forums and the public input forms.

Save our Stadium, Hughes website - <http://soshughes.org/>

Powerpoint and video from Dr. Ridpath's SOSH talk - http://soshughes.org/?page_id=42

Be Bold CSU website - <http://beboldcsu.org/>

Save Our Stadium, Hughes white paper - http://soshughes.org/?page_id=62

Be Bold response to SOSH white paper –

<http://beboldcsu.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/soschallenge.docx>

Be Bold response to CPD backgrounder – <http://beboldcsu.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/be-bold-backgrounder-position.pdf>

Save Our Stadium Hughes response to Be Bold's CPD backgrounder response -

<http://cpd.colostate.edu/sosh-responsetobb.pdf>

Changes from July 23th document

This document will be updated periodically. On July 27, the only substantive change was the addition of comments to page 20 concerning the link between the stadium and potential donations, as well as the correction concerning the percentage of CSU alumni that donate to the university (see footnote 1 on page 20). The August 6 version included new additional information from the community forums on July 27 and 30th, and Tony Frank's forum on July 31, and corrected a few typos and other errors. Substantive additions are marked with "August 6 update" (see pages 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12).

Works Cited

Anderson, Michael L. "The Benefits of College Athletics Success: An Application of the Propensity Score Design with Instrumental Variables." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 18196, June 2012. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w18196>.

Baade, R. A., and J. O. Sundberg. "Fourth Down and Gold to Go? Assessing the Link between Athletics and Alumni Giving." *Social Science Quarterly*, 77.4 (1996): 789–803.

Baade, Robert A., Robert Baumann, and Victor A. Matheson, "Big Men on Campus: Estimating the Economic Impact of College Sports on Local Economies." College of the Holy Cross, Department of Economic Faculty Research Series, Paper No. 07-04, August 2007.

- Baade, Robert, Robert Baumann, and Victor Matheson. "Down, Set, Hike: The Economic Impact of College Football Games on Local Economies." *Journal of Sports Economics*, Vol. 9:6, December 2008, 628-643
- Benford, Robert D. The College Sports Reform Movement: Reframing the 'Edutainment' Industry." *Sociological Quarterly* 48 (2007), 1-28.
- Berkowitz, Steve, Jodi Upton, Michael McCarthy, and Jack Gillum. "How Students Fees Boost College Sports Amid Rising Budgets." *USA Today*, September 21, 2010.
- Borland, M.V., B.L. Goff, and R.W. Pulsinelli. "College Athletics: Financial Burden or Boon?" In *Advances in the Economics of Sports*, ed. G. Scully, 215-235. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1992.
- Bremmer, D.S. & Kesselring, R.G. "The Advertising Effect of University Athletic Success: A Reappraisal of University Athletic Success." *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 33 (1993): 409-421.
- Brooker, G. W., and T. D. Klastorin. "To the Victors belong the Spoils? College Athletics and Alumni Giving." *Social Science Quarterly*, 62(4):744-50, Dec. 1981.
- Chapin, Tim. "Identifying the Real Costs and Benefits of Sports Facilities." Lincoln Institute of Land Policy Working Paper, 2002.
- Clotfelter, Charles T. *Big-Time Sports in American Universities*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Coates, Dennis and Brad Humphreys. "The Stadium Gambit and Local Economic Development." *Regulation* 23.2 (2000): 15-20.
- Coates, Dennis and Craig A. Depken. "Do College Football Games Pay for Themselves? The Impact of College Football Games on Local Sales Tax Revenue." International Association of Sports Economists & North American Association of Sports Economists in its series Working Papers 802, 2008.
- Coughlin, Cletus C., & Homer O. Erickson. "An Examination of Contributions to Support Intercollegiate Athletics." *Southern Economic Journal*, 51.1 (1984): 180-195.
- Cox, Steven R. and Dianne M. Roden. "Quality perception and the championship effect: Do collegiate sports influence academic rankings?" *Research in Higher Education Journal* 6 (2010): 4-14
- Denhart, Matthew and Richard Vedder. "Intercollegiate Athletic Subsidies: A Regressive Tax," *Center for College Affordability and Productivity*. April, 2010.

- Denhart, Matthew, Robert Villwock, and Richard Vedder. "The Academics Athletics Trade-Off: Universities and Intercollegiate Athletics," *Center for College Affordability and Productivity*. April, 2009.
- Dosh, Kristi. "College TV rights deals undergo makeovers." ESPN.com (May 10, 2012). Available at http://espn.go.com/blog/playbook/dollars/post/_/id/705/college-tv-rights-deals-undergo-makeovers#more .
- Dosh, Kristi. "Does Football Fund Other Sports at College Level?" *Forbes*. May, 2011
- Duderstadt, James J. *Intercollegiate Athletics and the American University*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2000
- Feng, Xia, and Brad R. Humphreys. "Assessing the Economic Impact of Sports Facilities on Residential Property Values: A Spatial Hedonic Approach." IASE/NAASE Working Paper Series, No. 08-12 (August 2008).
- Frank, Robert. "Challenging the Myth: A Review of the Links Among College Athletic Success, Student Quality, and Donations," *Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics*. May, 2004.
- Frank, Tony. "Athletics – Why and At What Cost?" December 2011.
<http://www.president.colostate.edu/speeches/athletics-december-2011.aspx>.
- Fulks, Daniel L. *Revenue and Expenses of Division I and II Intercollegiate Athletics Programs*. 2011. Published by the NCAA at www.ncaa.org.
- Getz, Malcolm, and John J. Siegfried, "What Does Intercollegiate Athletics Do To or For Colleges and Universities?" No 1005, Working Papers from Department of Economics, Vanderbilt University. 2010. <http://ideas.repec.org/p/van/wpaper/1005.html>
- Gillum, Jack, Jodi Upton, and Steve Berkowitz. "Amid Funding Crisis, College Athletics Soak Up Subsidies, Fees." *USA Today*, January 15, 2010.
- Glassman, T., C. Werch, E. Jobli, and H. Bian. "Alcohol-Related Fan Behavior on College Football Game Day." *Journal of American College Health* 56.3 (2007): 255-260.
- Glassman, T., V. Dodd, J. Sheu, B. Rienzo, and A. Wagenaar. "Extreme Ritualistic Alcohol Consumption Among College Students on Game Day." *Journal of American College Health* 58.5 (2010): 413-423.
- Goff, Brian. "Effects of University Athletics on the University: A Review and Extension of Empirical Assessment." *Economics of College Sport*, pp. 65-86. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004.
- Graham, Jack. *Faculty Council: Report from the Athletic Director*. Powerpoint presentation on April 3, 2012. www.cpd.colostate.edu/grahamFacultyCouncilpresentationapril32012.pdf

- Grasgreen, Allie. "Winning Boosts (Athletic) Giving," *Inside Higher Ed*. April, 2012.
- Grimes, P.W. & Chressanthis, G.A.. "Alumni Contributions to Academics: The Role of Intercollegiate Sports and NCAA Sanctions." *Academic Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 53 (1994): 27-40.
- Harrison, William B., Shannon K. Mitchell, and Steven P. Peterson. "Alumni Donations and Colleges' Development Expenditures: Does Spending Matter?" *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 54.4 (1995): 397-412.
- Humphreys, Brad R. and M. Mondello. "Intercollegiate Athletic Success and Donations at NCAA Division I Institutions.: *Journal of Sport Management*, 21(2) (2007): 265-280.
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. "A Call to Action: Reconnecting College Sports and Higher Education." June, 2001.
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. "College Sports 101: A Primer on Money, Athletics, and Higher Education in the 21st Century," October, 2009.
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. "Restoring the Balance: Dollars, Values, and the Future of College Sports." June, 2010.
- Larimore, David, and George Chitiyo. "Non-Economic Societal Impacts of Intercollegiate Athletics." *Sports Journal* 10.2 (2007).
- Lindo, Jason M., Isaac D. Swensen, and Glen R. Waddell. "Are Big-Time Sports a Threat to Student Achievement?" NBER Working Paper No. 17677 Issued in December 2011.
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w17677>,
- Litan, R. E., J. M. Orszag and P. R. Orszag. *The Empirical Effects of Collegiate Athletics: An Interim Report*. National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2003.
- Lovaglia, Michael and Lucas, Jeffrey. "High-Visibility Athletic Programs and the Prestige of Public Universities." *The Sport Journal* 8.1 (2005).
- McCafferty, Joseph. "The Money Bowl: The Real Competition in Big-Time College Sports is Over Who Can Spend the Most." CFO Magazine, August 1, 2006.
- McCormick, Robert E., and Maurice Tinsley. Athletics and Academics: a Model of University Contributions. In *Sportometrics* (Edited by Goff, B.L. and Tollison, R.D.) 193-204. College Station, TX: Texas A & M University Press, 1990.
- McCormick, Robert E., and Maurice Tinsley. "Athletics versus Academics: Evidence from SAT Scores." *Journal of Political Economy* 95.5 (1987), 1103-1116.
- McEvoy, Chad. "Predicting Fund Raising Revenues in NCAA Division I-A Intercollegiate Athletics." *The Sport Journal*, 8.1 (2005a).

- McEvoy, Chad. "The Impact of Elite Individual Athletic Performance on University Applicants for Admission in NCAA Division I-A Football," *The Sport Journal* 15 (Winter 2006).
- McEvoy, Chad. "The Relationship Between dramatic Changes in Team Performance and Undergraduate Admissions Applications," *The SMART Journal*. 2 (2005b).
- McGlaughon, Andrew. "An Examination of the Relationship Between Major Facility Upgrades/Renovations and Select Indicators of Success in Division I-A Football (1997-2006)." Masters Thesis, University of North Carolina, 2007.
- Meer, J. and H. S. Rosen. "The Impact of Athletic Performance on Alumni Giving: An Analysis of Microdata." *Economics of Education Review*, 28.3 (2009):287–294.
- Mixon, Franklin .G. "Athletics v. Academics: Rejoining Evidence from SAT Scores." *Education Economics* 3 (1995): 1103-16.
- Mixon, Franklin G. Jr.; Trevino, L. J. and Minto, T. C. "Touchdowns and Test Scores: Exploring the Relationship between Athletics and Academics." *Applied Economic Letters*, 11.7 (2004), 421-24.
- Mixon, Franklin G., and Y. Hsing, "The Determinants of Out-of-State Enrollments in Higher Education: A Tobit Analysis." *Economics of Education Review*, 13 (1994), 329-335.
- Mixon, Franklin, and L. Trevino. From Kickoff to Commencement: The Positive Role of Intercollegiate Athletics in Higher Education." *Economics of Education Review* 24.1 (2005): 97-102.
- Mulholland, Sean; Tomic, Aleksandar and Sholander, Samuel. "The Faculty Flutie Factor: Does Football Performance Affect a University's US News and World Report Peer Assessment Score?" Unpublished paper, 2010.
- Murphy, R.G., & Trandel, G.A. "The Relation Between a University's Football Record and the Size of its Applicant Pool." *Economics of Education Review*, 13 (1994), 265-270.
- Orszag, Jonathan, & Mark Israel. *The Empirical Effects of Collegiate Athletics: An Update Based on 2004-2007 Data*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2009.
- Pappano, Laura. "How Big-Time Sports Ate College Life," *New York Times*. January, 2012.
- Patton, Carl. "Will an On-campus Football Stadium at CSU Help the School's Academic Mission? No. A False Pitch by CSU Athletics." *Denver Post*, July 1, 2011.
- Pope, Devin G. and Pope, Jaren C. "The Impact of College Sports Success on the Quantity and Quality of Student Applications," *Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*. Working Paper. January, 2008. (set to be published in *Southern Economic Journal*)
- Rees, Daniel I and Schnepel, Kevin T. "College Football Games and Crime," *Working Papers Series*. 08-01. January, 2008.

- Rhoads, Thomas A., and Shelby Gerking. "Educational Contributions, Academic Quality, and Athletic Success." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 18.2 (2000): 248-258.
- Sandy, Robert, and Peter Sloane. "Why Do US Colleges Have Sports Programs?: Intercollegiate Sports as Enrollment Management." *Economics of Collegiate Sports* (John Fizel editor). Pp. 87-109. Praeger: Westport Connecticut, 2005.
- Shulman, James L. and William G. Bowen. 2001. *The Game of Life: College Sports and Educational Values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sigelman, Lee and R. Carter. Win one for the giver? Alumni Giving and Big-Time College Sports. *Social Science Quarterly*, 60(2):284-94, 1979.
- Sigelman, Lee and S. Bookheimer. "Is it whether you win or lose? Monetary contributions to Big-Time college athletic programs." *Social Science Quarterly*, 64.2 (June 1983), 347-59.
- Smith, Randal. Big-Time College Basketball and the Advertising Effect: Does Success Really Matter? *Journal of Sports Economics* 9.4 (August 2008): 387-406.
- Sperber, Murray. *Beer and Circus: How Big-Time College Sports Has Crippled Undergraduate Education*. New York: Holt, 2000.
- Stinson, Jeffrey L., and Dennis R. Howard. "Athletic Success and Private Giving to Athletic and Academic Programs at NCAA Institutions." *Journal of Sport Management* 21.2 (2005): 235-264.
- Suggs, W. "At Some Colleges, Students Tax Themselves to Pay for Sports." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 50 (2004, April 30).
- Toma, J.D., & Cross, M.E. "Intercollegiate Athletics and Student College Choice: Exploring the Impact of Championship Seasons on Undergraduate Applications." *Research in Higher Education*, 39 (1998), 633-661.
- Trenkamp, Brad A. "Does the Advertising Effect of Athletics Impact Academic Rankings?" *Applied Economics Letters*, 16.4 (2009), 373-378.
- Tsitsos, William, and Howard L. Nixon. "The Star Wars Arms Race in College Athletics: Coaches Pay and Athletic Program Status." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 36.1 (2012), 68-88.
- Tucker, I. B. "A Reexamination of the Effect of Big-time Football and Basketball Success on Graduation Rates and Alumni Giving Rates." *Economics of Education Review*, 23.6 (2004): 655-661.
- Tucker, I.B, and L. Amato. "Does Big-time Success in Football or Basketball Affect SAT Scores." *Economics of Education Review* 12 (1993), 177-181.

- Tucker, Ian B. "Big-Time Pigskin Success: Is There an Advertising Effect?" *Journal of Sports Economics* 6.2 (2005): 222-229.
- Turner, S. E., L. A. Meserve, and W. G. Bowen. "Winning and Giving: Football Results and Alumni Giving at Selective Private Colleges and Universities." *Social Science Quarterly*, 82.4 (2001), 812-826.
- Waggoner, Thomas. "Play it up." *American School & University* 76 (May 1, 2004).
- Wolverton, Brad. (October 5, 2007). Growth in Sports Gifts May Mean Fewer Academic Donations. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com> Section: Athletics Volume 54, Issue 6, Page A1
- Yost, Mark. *Varsity Green: A Behind the Scenes Look at Culture and Corruption in College Athletics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Zimbalist, Andrew. *Unpaid Professionals: Commercialism and Conflict in Big-Time College Sports*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.