

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

---

All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)

Colorado Legislative Council Research  
Publications

---

11-1970

## 0163 Intercollegiate Athletics

Colorado Legislative Council

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc\\_all](https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all)

---

### Recommended Citation

Colorado Legislative Council, "0163 Intercollegiate Athletics" (1970). *All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)*. 171.

[https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc\\_all/171](https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all/171)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Colorado Legislative Council Research Publications at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact [jennifer.cox@du.edu](mailto:jennifer.cox@du.edu), [dig-commons@du.edu](mailto:dig-commons@du.edu).

---

## 0163 Intercollegiate Athletics

p. 6  
163

**Report to the Colorado General Assembly**

# **Intercollegiate Athletics**



**COLORADO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

**RESEARCH PUBLICATION NO. 163**

**November, 1970**

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL  
OF THE  
COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Representatives

C. P. (Doc) Lamb,  
Chairman  
Joe Calabrese  
John Fuhr  
Carl Gustafson  
Ben Klein  
Clarence Quinlan  
John Vanderhoof,  
Speaker

Senators

Fay DeBerard,  
Vice Chairman  
John Bermingham  
Frank Kemp  
Vincent Massari  
Ruth Stockton  
Mark Hogan,  
Lt. Governor

\* \* \* \* \*

The Legislative Council, which is composed of five Senators, six Representatives, and the presiding officers of the two houses, serves as a continuing research agency for the legislature through the maintenance of a trained staff. Between sessions, research activities are concentrated on the study of relatively broad problems formally proposed by legislators, and the publication and distribution of factual reports to aid in their solution.

During the sessions, the emphasis is on supplying legislators, on individual request, with personal memoranda, providing them with information needed to handle their own legislative problems. ~~Reports and memoranda~~ both give pertinent data in the form of facts, figures, arguments, and alternatives.

**INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

**Legislative Council**  
Report to the  
**Colorado General Assembly**

Research Publication No. 163  
December, 1970

# COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**OFFICERS**  
REP. C. P. (DOC) LAMB  
*Chairman*  
SEN. FAY DUBERARD  
*Vice Chairman*

**STAFF**  
LYLE C. KYLE  
*Director*  
DAVID F. MORRISSEY  
*Principal Analyst*  
STANLEY ELOFSON  
*Principal Analyst*  
JANET WILSON  
*Senior Analyst*  
DAVID HITE  
*Research Associate*  
RICHARD LEVENGOOD  
*Research Associate*



## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 48 STATE CAPITOL  
DENVER, COLORADO 80203  
892-2285  
AREA CODE 303

**MEMBERS**  
LT. GOV. MARK HOGAN  
SEN. JOHN BIRMINGHAM  
SEN. FRANK KEMP  
SEN. VINCENT MASSARI  
SEN. RUTH STOCKTON  
SPEAKER JOHN D. VANDERHOOF  
REP. JOSEPH CALABRESE  
REP. JOHN FUHR  
REP. CARL GUSTAFSON  
REP. BEN KLEIN  
REP. CLARENCE QUINLAN

December 18, 1970

To Members of the Forty-eighth Colorado General Assembly:

In accordance with the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution No. 34, 1970 Session, the Legislative Council herewith submits the accompanying report and recommendations pertaining to matters of Intercollegiate Athletics.

The report of the Committee appointed to carry out this study was accepted by the Legislative Council with recommendation for favorable consideration by the First Regular Session of the Forty-eighth Colorado General Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Representative C. P. (Doc) Lamb  
Chairman

CPL/mp

**COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY**



**OFFICERS**  
REP. C. P. (DOC) LAMB  
*Chairman*  
SEN. FAY DEBERARD  
*Vice Chairman*

**STAFF**  
LYLE C. KYLE  
*Director*  
DAVID F. MORRISSEY  
*Principal Analyst*  
STANLEY ELOFSON  
*Principal Analyst*  
JANET WILSON  
*Senior Analyst*  
DAVID HITE  
*Research Associate*  
RICHARD LEVENGOOD  
*Research Associate*

**MEMBERS**  
LT. GOV. MARK HOGAN  
SEN. JOHN BIRMINGHAM  
SEN. FRANK KEMP  
SEN. VINCENT MASSARI  
SEN. RUTH STOCKTON  
SPEAKER JOHN D. VANDERHOOF  
REP. JOSEPH CALABRESE  
REP. JOHN FUHR  
REP. CARL GUSTAFSON  
REP. BEN KLEIN  
REP. CLARENCE QUINLAN

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

ROOM 46 STATE CAPITOL  
DENVER, COLORADO 80203  
892-2286  
AREA CODE 303

December 10, 1970

Representative C. P. Lamb  
Chairman  
Colorado Legislative Council  
Room 46, State Capitol  
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution No. 34, 1970 Session, the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics submits the following report for consideration by the Legislative Council.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Representative Clarence Quinlan  
Chairman  
Committee on Intercollegiate  
Athletics

CQ/mp

## FOREWORD

Under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution No. 34, 1970 Session, the Legislative Council was directed to appoint a committee to study the role of intercollegiate athletics in the state-supported colleges and universities in Colorado. Legislators appointed to the committee were:

Rep. Clarence Quinlan,  
Chairman  
Senator Fred E. Anderson,  
Vice-chairman  
Senator Allen Dines  
Senator Leslie R. Fowler  
Senator Carl M. Williams

Rep. Thomas Bastien  
Rep. Forrest G. Burns  
Rep. Thomas T. Grimshaw  
Rep. C. P. (Doc) Lamb  
Rep. Charles E. McCormick  
Rep. Ralph E. Porter  
Rep. Carl E. Showalter  
Rep. Roy E. Wells

During the course of its deliberations, the Committee centered its attention on the intercollegiate athletic programs that are conducted at the following schools: Adams State College, Fort Lewis State College, Southern Colorado State College, Western State College, Colorado School of Mines, the University of Northern Colorado, Colorado State University and the University of Colorado. All of these schools were visited by the Committee during 1970 and their programs were thoroughly reviewed.

The Committee wishes to express its appreciation to the members of the administration and the athletic departments at the aforementioned schools and to staff members of the Commission on Higher Education and the Legislative Auditors Office for their willing cooperation and valuable assistance.

Wallace Pulliam, Research Associate, and Brent Slatten, Research Assistant, Colorado Legislative Council staff, had the principal responsibility for assisting the Committee and the preparation of the final report.

December, 1970

Lyle C. Kyle  
Director



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL.....	iii
FOREWORD.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	1
Metropolitan State College.....	1
Junior and Community Colleges.....	2
Athletic Program Funding.....	2
Program Costs.....	3
Budgeting and Accounting.....	3
Control of Athletic Expenditures.....	4
Colorado State University.....	5
Athletic Policies of Other States.....	7
Self-supported Programs.....	7
State-supported Programs.....	7
Reactions Toward an Athletics Compact.....	8
Continuation of Committee.....	9
Salary Allocations.....	9
Intramural Programs.....	10
Athletic Grants-in-aid.....	10
Conference Regulations on Awards.....	10
Other Awards.....	10

## COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the beginning of the Committee's deliberations, available information indicated that the costs of intercollegiate athletic programs within Colorado's colleges and universities were not uniformly reported. The Committee elected to focus its initial efforts at examining existing programs to determine, as much as possible, the actual amounts being expended, the way programs were administered, and the extent of the over-all program within each institution. To accomplish this objective, the Committee visited each of Colorado's state-supported four-year institutions of higher education to examine existing programs at first-hand.

Schools, in the order visited, included: Fort Lewis College, Western State College, Southern Colorado State College, Adams State College, Colorado School of Mines, the University of Northern Colorado, Colorado State University, and the University of Colorado.

At the outset of this report, the Committee wishes to emphasize that, in general, it believes that intercollegiate athletic programs have a place in higher education; that intercollegiate athletics provide a valuable addition to a student's total educational experience, either as a participant or as a spectator; and that existing programs at the state's four-year colleges and universities should be continued, as long as state finances permit without resulting in a cutback in basic academic programs.

The Committee also wishes to emphasize that generally, upon examination of the actual programs at each institution, no clear indication was found of any excessive emphasis on intercollegiate athletics.

### Metropolitan State College

The Committee did not include Metropolitan State College within its review because it was the Committee's belief that Metropolitan State College was established with the understanding that intercollegiate athletics would not be included within its program. That is, following upon the recommendation of the initial study\* which led to the creation of Metropolitan State

\*The full title to this report is: Individual Opportunity and Economic Growth in the Denver Metropolitan Area THE BASEBOOK of key data and background studies -- and a summary of the findings of the Task Group on Post High School Education in the Denver Metropolitan Area, February, 1963. (See pages 13 and 175.)

College, the Trustee's Report on the Plan of Operation for Metropolitan State College (prepared by the Trustees of State Colleges in Colorado, December 30, 1963), stated on page 5: "... that certain things common to the typical resident college will not exist at Metropolitan State College: among them, varsity athletic teams, stadium, marching bands, baton twirlers,..." (emphasis added). The Committee supports this statement; any comments in this report supporting the existence of intercollegiate athletics at other colleges should not be interpreted as approving the creation of any such programs at Metropolitan State College.

### Junior and Community Colleges

The Committee did not have time to examine the programs at Colorado's junior and community colleges. Any general statements made in this report should not be construed to apply to these schools.

The Committee did encounter some information suggesting that the costs and emphasis at some of the community colleges may be substantial, and funding and accounting practices may be as varied as those of the state's colleges. If this is the case, as more junior colleges join the state community college system, these programs could have a substantial impact on future state budgets. (One community college which is to join the state system in the near future has indicated total athletic expenditures of roughly \$114,000, only about \$2,000 less than the amount reported by Fort Lewis State College.) For this reason, the Committee believes thorough study of these programs is definitely needed.

### Athletic Program Funding

Generally, the athletic programs at Colorado's two major universities -- Colorado State University and the University of Colorado -- are, in a sense, self-supporting. These programs are able to generate sufficient non-tax revenues (through gate receipts, contributions, concession income, and allocated student fees) to remain essentially free from state subsidies, excluding grants-in-aid.

In contrast to the two major universities, the programs at Colorado's smaller university and its four-year colleges are oriented less toward spectator entertainment and more toward student participation. These programs at the smaller colleges are not entirely self-supporting. Their ticket sales, parking, concession, guarantees and other revenues are, because of small student enrollments and their geographic locations (in areas without large concentrations of population), generally small;

thus student fees provide the bulk of non-tax revenues. Appropriated tax funds are currently used to subsidize their athletic programs and if the programs are to be continued tax dollars will have to be used.

In addition, at these smaller schools, the intramural, physical education, and intercollegiate athletic programs are usually combined under one department. That is to say, that facilities, staff, equipment, etc., are used interchangeably. The result is a situation in which individual program costs become hard to identify.

In the above cases, the Committee believes state assistance in the form of pro-rated portions of salaries, administrative overhead, maintenance, etc., for academics and intramurals especially, is justified. The Committee also believes a more thorough examination of program costs and budget allocations is needed before a final determination on methods of allocating shares of financial responsibility are made.

#### Program Costs

There is no doubt that intercollegiate athletic programs are costly. Data gathered by the Committee indicate that total program costs at the eight schools surveyed may approach \$4 million annually. While the exact proportion of the total that is funded from tax revenues has not been clearly identified, estimates suggest that money in excess of \$870,000 (including grants-in-aid) may be involved. Of the \$4 million total, approximately \$3 million represent revenues from non-tax sources at CSU and CU. Thus it appears that the bulk of state subsidies for intercollegiate athletics occur in the smaller schools' programs.

#### Budgeting and Accounting

The above data is stated in general terms because, particularly at the four state colleges and the University of Northern Colorado, the reports provided the Committee did not clearly identify all costs directly attributable to intercollegiate athletics. The School of Mines does try to prorate costs between programs, but the methods used to determine these allocations appear to need improvement. This was the major problem encountered by the Committee -- a lack of detailed, uniform, and well-supported information on intercollegiate athletic costs at the smaller schools. In general, the reports of the two major universities were much more comprehensive; but the Committee believes these could also be improved.

Overall, budget reporting is not consistent as to form or criteria used. This raises the question as to what true costs

are. In addition, budget proposals for intercollegiate athletics, inclusive of non-state funds, have not been adequately reviewed at the state level. The Commission on Higher Education has begun to request such data, but it appears that the lack of adequate staff and other factors have prevented a thorough review of the reports received. In addition it appears that some schools have not been willing to recognize the need for reporting allocations of facility time, overhead expenses, and personnel contributions, between their academic and their athletic programs. Furthermore, a significant part of the athletic funds which are derived directly from state appropriations are in most cases not charged directly to each school's intercollegiate athletic account; instead, they are apparently charged directly to resident instruction. At the same time, if such items are reported, some schools do not prorate the costs between the physical education, intramural and athletic programs at all; some prorate their intercollegiate athletics costs on a 50-50 basis (50 percent to intercollegiate athletics and 50 percent to resident instruction); and others seem to prorate costs somewhat arbitrarily.

The Committee believes that uniform reports which recognize all athletic costs -- salaries, administrative overhead, facility use, maintenance, etc., are an absolute necessity. As noted above, existing agencies have initiated some basic efforts to this end, but increased effort is needed, and particular policy guidelines must be established; a function which this Committee believes should be assumed by the General Assembly.

### Control of Athletic Expenditures

To date, the Committee has discussed a number of suggested methods to improve funding and controls in intercollegiate athletics. One major method discussed is the often-made suggestion that the General Assembly appropriate, as a line item in each school's budget, an amount for intercollegiate athletics. At this point, the Committee believes there is not enough information on the effect of such an action for it to make a definite recommendation. However, the Committee recognizes that the very nature of an athletic program might make such an approach somewhat impractical. It is particularly difficult to predict with any accuracy the amount of revenues which athletic programs will generate in any given year. Gate receipts (a major revenue source at Colorado State University and the University of Colorado) can fluctuate substantially due to a number of uncontrollable factors -- win-loss records and weather, particularly. Conference receipts for televised games, and post-season bowl (and championship) appearances all provide large amounts of revenues at certain times; but these are also unpredictable. On this basis, strict adherence to the appropriation process could add to a school financial problem, or it could prevent a team from appearing in a post-season bowl game or championship event (if the budget did not allow for such an occurrence).

Instead of proposing at this point in time the use of line-item appropriations, the Committee recommends that a uniform chart of accounts be developed based on criteria outlined by the Legislative Auditor, the Executive Budget Office, and the Commission on Higher Education. Once such a chart is established the reports should be reviewed by the Commission on Higher Education and by the Executive Budget Office. The Committee suggests that each school be required to complete a thorough program budget for intercollegiate athletics and submit it along with its total budget request. In the case of all schools any tax dollars, student fees and outside revenues accruing to their athletic program would be identifiable.

The Committee believes that the basic budget request form used by the Commission on Higher Education can serve, with a few specific additions, as an adequate interim form. The Committee also notes that this form as presently used is completed entirely by some schools and parts are ignored at others. The Committee suggests that the Commission and other reviewing agencies be directed not to accept, or act upon, any budget request that is incomplete or lacks sufficient justification for the answers provided.

Once adequate data is available, the Committee believes it would be in a position to develop specific policy guidelines to govern athletic expenditures.

### Colorado State University

The Committee wishes to take special note of the situation at Colorado State University. It recognizes that the principal reason the General Assembly established this study committee on intercollegiate athletics was the deficit which occurred in the athletic program at Colorado State University. An examination of that program has led the Committee, recognizing and not excusing the school's past accounting and administrative problems, to the following observations.

(1) The financing of the athletic program at Colorado State University is rapidly improving and the internal accounting controls for athletics now in effect are probably as good, if not better, than those in use at any other school in Colorado.

(2) The Committee believes that the athletic program at Colorado State University has been asked to finance a large proportion of the school's intramural and physical education program -- two programs which the Committee believes should be funded by resident instruction funds (physical education) and student fees (intramurals).

(3) The Committee found that no state policy exists concerning allocations of costs between multiple-use athletic facilities (facilities used for athletic, physical education, intramurals, and other purposes such as assemblies, concerts, etc.). The Committee is of the opinion that the lack of just such a policy is largely responsible for the athletic deficit at Colorado State University.

This lack of policy has resulted in the development of several different situations statewide: a) there are instances on record where athletic program revenues and student fees have been required to fund the construction or furnishing of multiple-use facilities far out of proportion to their share of ultimate usage; b) there are also instances where such buildings have been funded solely from state appropriations; c) there are instances where the operation and maintenance of such facilities are supported largely from athletic funds; and d) there are other cases where the operation and maintenance is paid entirely by the school's resident instruction budget (tax funds).

Both of the statements in (a) and (c) above apply to Colorado State University. Evidence suggests that Colorado State University was required to provide a disproportionate share of the total costs of its auditorium-gymnasium complex from student fees and athletic revenues. The basic concept that such a facility should be constructed from both state appropriations and athletic revenues is supported by the Committee. This approach to funding assumes that the state recognizes its responsibilities to fund structures for instructional purposes but it also recognizes that non-instructional extra-curricular activities such as athletics should provide the funds for that portion of the construction applicable to its share of the structure's use.

The Committee believes, however, the shared concept of funding such structures was misused in the case of Colorado State University's Auditorium-Gymnasium Complex. The school was asked to fund a disproportionate share of the facility from non-state revenues -- athletic revenues and student fees. In addition, the Committee is of the opinion that the athletic department, until this year, has been required to assume an excessive proportion of the administrative and maintenance costs of that structure; a major factor in the development of the athletic deficit. For example, overhead allocations to the athletic department have been in excess of \$100,000 annually in recent years. Based on estimates of the actual amount of time the intercollegiate program uses facilities, these allocations should have been substantially less -- estimates of approximately \$45,000 seem more reasonable. Similarly, if, during construction, the state had funded that proportion of use applicable to non-athletic functions, its share of the costs would have been in excess of \$1 million more than its original allocation of roughly \$2.9 million. The Committee believes that this situation cannot be corrected until a uniform

state policy concerning allocations of operating costs (and construction costs) is developed. The Committee examined existing data on facility usage, and with one specific exception (Colorado State University), found the data incomplete. The Committee believes, however, that it will be possible to develop definite allocation formulae based on perhaps, either student contact-hour, scheduled-hour, or spectator-hour usage, or a combination of these.

### Athletic Policies of Other States

At the Committee's first meeting it elected to survey various states on their policies toward the funding and operation of intercollegiate athletic programs.

Earlier, on November 21, 1969, at the request of Representative John Vanderhoof, the staff had sent a letter to Mr. John C. Doyle, Western Office, Council of State Governments, to "solicit opinions from the other states in the Western Region on the feasibility of some sort of interstate agreement or compact in the area of intercollegiate athletics."<sup>16</sup>

Self-supported Programs. Replies from Texas, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Arizona indicated that their intercollegiate athletic programs are self-supporting. For example, a reply letter from the Texas Legislative Council stated that intercollegiate athletics in Texas' state schools are "required to be completely self-supporting; no tax funds are used in support of such programs". A reply from the Missouri Council stated that the University of Missouri's athletic program is operated as an "auxiliary enterprise" and "independent audits indicate the program is self-supporting and no other funds, state or otherwise, have been used for this program". The other state colleges and universities in Missouri do not have "big time" programs, and the relatively minor costs of these are financed from student fees and athletic income without the involvement of state funds. In Kansas, intercollegiate athletics apparently are financed by non-profit athletic corporations, and, with the "possible exception" of some coaches' salaries, is self-supporting.

The Oregon reply indicated that the University of Oregon is "on a firm financial basis", but that the University "did have major difficulty with the Associated Student Body over what portion of fees should be assigned to the athletic budget."

State-supported Programs. Replies from Utah, Montana, Wisconsin, New Mexico, and Washington indicate that these states do not have self-supporting intercollegiate athletic programs (even though formal state policy in some of these cases is that intercollegiate athletics programs should be self-supporting). These states, with the exception of New Mexico support their in-



tercollegiate athletics programs from general appropriations to their colleges and universities. The replies from Wisconsin and New Mexico are particularly interesting. According to the Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau,

...during the past three or four years the UW football team has won few games. With lack of success on the field came a severe drop in gate receipts. Since receipts from football provide approximately 81% of athletic department income, the athletic department fund declined to the point where it reached a deficit status.

However, because of the accounting methods used, this does not appear as a deficit in the athletic department records. Steps have been taken to alleviate the problem, but these do not appear to include budgetary reforms including either direct appropriation or line item budgeting to "intercollegiate athletics". To alleviate the problem, the Regents "supported the athletic department's request to release some staff and transfer other tenured staff to other departments of the University ..., where, generally, they will be paid from the Physical Education Department's budget." Also the UW Board of Regents has acted to reduce the budget for minor sports, since football provides more than 80 percent of the athletic department's revenue and subsidizes all but one or two of the other programs.

A reply from the New Mexico Legislative Council stated that "in New Mexico state funds are appropriated to finance intercollegiate athletics. They are included as a line item within each institution's appropriation and they take into account self-generated funds". For example, in this year's (1970) appropriation act, itemized below the name of each university or college having an intercollegiate athletics program is the subtitle "intercollegiate athletics" followed in the first column by the amount appropriated from the state funds and in the second by the self-generated funds which are the projected receipts from gate, concessions, television, etc.

Reactions Toward an Athletics Compact. New Mexico and Nevada replies indicate that there is some interest in the forming of an interstate athletic compact to reduce the financial pressures of intercollegiate athletics, but other replies indicate that these pressures are not very great in their states, that the problems involved would prevent reasonable operation of such a compact, or that the problem should not be handled by state governments. Governor Forest H. Anderson of Montana, for instance, stated that because of the size differences among colleges and universities, it would be extremely difficult to establish effective criteria to limit expenditures. He stated further that limitations should rather be established at the athletic conference level to take advantage of existing similarities among the member institutions.

## Continuation of Committee

In view of the lack of accurate information, the need for the development of a uniform chart of accounts, clarification of the state's policy toward intramurals, etc., the Committee recommends that the General Assembly approve the continuation of the Committee study for another year. Additional items the Committee believes need further study are listed below.

Salary Allocations. At most of the six colleges, coaches' salaries are charged directly to resident instruction. This procedure is justified by emphasizing that these coaches are hired first as faculty members (in most instances they do carry a substantial teaching load) and secondly as coaches. However, one or more of these schools apparently pay a coach a base salary out of their resident instruction budget for his duties as an instructor, and, using other revenues (usually student fees), give him additional money for his coaching duties. These schools also indicated a policy of granting a "reduced teaching load" for a coach during the time his team is participating in regular competition.

At the two universities, coaches, and most members of the intercollegiate staff, are generally funded from athletic revenues. In a few instances, some personnel may be paid from both athletic revenues and resident instruction funds, but these instances are carefully documented and prorated according to time allocations. In a few instances, however, the Committee believes that the athletic program at Colorado State University has actually provided funds for physical education or intramural program personnel; resulting in a situation where intercollegiate athletics is supporting staff which should be supported by resident instruction funds.

The Committee believes that a definite cost-allocation formula should be developed to accurately allocate the costs of such staff people between athletic and academic programs. The Committee has examined several suggestions in this area but believes additional data is needed before any decision is made.

Intramural Programs. Comprehensive data on intramural programs at all schools is generally lacking. Available information does suggest, however, that these programs should receive more attention and support. All of the schools visited by the Committee operate on-going intramural programs. However, physical education and intercollegiate athletics seem to receive the greater emphasis. Generally, intramural programs emphasize organized team (club) activities such as touch football, basketball, volleyball, etc. Small group activities receive the least attention. The Committee believes very strongly that greater emphasis should be placed upon intramural programs, particularly in individual and small group activities (the so-called "life-time activities"). The Committee believes more money should be applied

toward the development and operation of these programs. The Committee also believes that if any additional program funding is forthcoming -- from the state or from the institution -- the additional funds should be applied toward intramural programs. The Committee has discussed, briefly, several funding recommendations but believes further study on the various possibilities is needed.

Athletic Grants-in-Aid. While data on actual totals expended for athletic grants-in-aid are still incomplete, the Committee did not find any specific instance where a school was using an excessive amount of its total state-allocation for tuition-waivers in its athletic program. The Committee did find considerable differences (some definitional) in the amounts reported as total expenditures for grants-in-aid. Some schools listed only the amounts allocated for tuition waivers as the total amount allocated to grants-in-aid. Such additional parts of a grant as room and board, jobs, books, etc., were incorporated within the total athletic budget and not separately identified. One of Colorado's colleges for example, apparently reports any payments made to its athletes for on-campus employment (guaranteed as a part of the initial athletic award) as hourly wages paid for various maintenance duties related to the athletic program. This money may originate in the school's resident instruction or physical plant maintenance budgets. A complete dollar summary of total expenditures for grants-in-aid was not determinable. The Committee was able to determine that roughly \$575,000 of the state's total tuition waiver allocation of \$3,341,000 was granted to athletic tuition waivers -- an average allocation of roughly 17.2 percent.

Conference Regulations on Awards. In addition, the Committee examined the existing regulations on the number of athletic awards established by the particular athletic conference to which each of the school's belong. The four state colleges and the University of Northern Colorado are limited by the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference to a maximum of 90 athletic awards. All of the schools appear to be well within this limitation. The University of Colorado and Colorado State University are governed by the "Big Eight" and "Western Athletic" conferences respectively. The Big Eight allows a school to grant a maximum of forty-five new awards in football annually. (Since an award may be extended over a five-year period this school could grant a maximum of 225 football awards). The Western Athletic Conference places no limitations on the number of awards that can be granted in any sport. However, at both schools, available data indicate that the schools' own internal controls and limited funds serve to limit the number of awards. The result is that their total awards do not appear to be excessive.

Other Awards. Additionally, it should be pointed out that materials presented to the Committee suggest that the

schools do not, as a matter of policy, use other scholarships, or special program grants, e.g., state minority funds, Economic Opportunity Grants, etc., for their athletic programs. This is the case even though evidence suggests that a number of the students receiving athletic scholarships are from minority families or families in the lower income brackets and, as such, could qualify for other forms of state or federally supported assistance.

The Committee has discussed several proposals to limit the total tuition waiver allocation but has not reached any conclusions. Again, in general, the Committee does believe that existing allocations among programs are not unreasonable.