

# Athletics Presentation

Charge: Review options for reducing cost, including waiver or change of NCAA 10 team rule and UAF/UA A consortium model.

Goal: By 2020, cut '16 GF by 50%; by 2025, no GF



UNIVERSITY  
of ALASKA  
*Many Traditions One Alaska*

August 17, 2016

## Team Members

- ▶ Tara Smith
- ▶ Iain Miller
- ▶ Kathleen McCoy
- ▶ Keith Hackett
- ▶ Gary Gray
- ▶ Bill Spindle
- ▶ Mike Sfraga
- ▶ Saichi Oba
- ▶ Teri Cothren
- ▶ Candice Krupa
- ▶ Bart LeBon
- ▶ Rick Nerland
- ▶ Alec Hajdukovich
- ▶ Mark Filipenko



UNIVERSITY  
of ALASKA  
*Many Traditions One Alaska*

## Key Stakeholders

- ▶ Student-Athletes (309)
- ▶ Front Line Support / Coaches / Staff (83)
- ▶ Alumni (85,000)
- ▶ Supporters (1,148)
- ▶ Fans (142,000)
- ▶ Student Body (23,457)
- ▶ Faculty (1,646)
- ▶ Corporate Sponsors (141)
- ▶ Media Outlets (UAA 55 and UAF 39)
- ▶ Conferences (6)



3

## Situation Overview

- ▶ State budget limitations require adaptation to a new environment.
- ▶ 3 options are presented, all are difficult to accomplish.
- ▶ The 2025 goal of no general funding will be the least beneficial to UA. It is a death sentence for intercollegiate athletics in Alaska.



4

## Options

- 1 – Elimination of one or both athletic programs.
- 2 – Consortium model between UAF and UAA
- 3 – Two separate programs with Modifications
  - ▶ Both programs modify sports sponsorships
  - ▶ UAA modifies sports sponsorships and UAF maintains their sports sponsorships



5

## Pros and Cons Considerations for All Options

- ▶ Pros:
  1. Cost savings that move programs closer to the goal
  2. Decrease in administration costs (staffing)
- ▶ Cons:
  1. Athletics program instability could erode the community's confidence in the university
  2. Loss of supporters, sponsors, donors, fans, and alumni support
  3. Negative media impact and loss of positive media
  4. Net loss of student athletes who tend to stay and become community leaders whether here or elsewhere
  5. Impact on local economies and visitor industry due to decreased events



6

## Option 1 – Elimination of Athletics

This option includes the following possibilities:

- ▶ Eliminate UAA or UAF Athletics to decrease between 2-3% of the current UA funding levels and reallocate those funds to another area in need. The remaining program will have increased costs due to coordination within the conference for visiting teams who were previously able to play at both programs.
- ▶ Eliminate both UAA and UAF Athletics to decrease approximately 5% of the current UA funding levels and reallocate those funds to another area in need. It would be an unprecedented decision nationally to be the only state in the union to not have an intercollegiate athletic program.
- ▶ Option 1 is the most controversial option with the most severe consequences.



7

## Pros and Cons of Option 1 - Elimination

### ▶ Pros:

1. Quickest method to satisfy the goal
2. Reallocation of funds to other areas of need

### ▶ Cons:

1. Loss of any current, prospective or future AK student-athletes to the outside and potentially not returning to Alaska
2. Only state in the union without intercollegiate athletics
3. Loss of naming rights to facilities with potential legal liability
4. Dilution of identity of respective universities
5. Long lasting statewide impact



8

## Option 2 – Consortium Model

This model would require an unprecedented exception from the NCAA to allow two athletic programs who are geographically isolated from one another to compete as one program while not duplicating sports in either location.

- ▶ Only one school would be named the sponsoring institution
- ▶ Reduce the current sports between UAA and UAF from 23 to 10+ teams
- ▶ Results in a reduced budget
- ▶ Continuation of athletics at UA

## Pros and Cons of Option 2 - Consortium

### ▶ Pros:

1. Athletics remain in state
2. Maintain successful teams at each campus
3. Reduce administration staffing

### ▶ Cons:

1. May be difficult to obtain NCAA approval due to unprecedented exception
2. Could compromise the ability to maintain compliance (NCAA and Title IX)
3. Loss of two established brands and difficulty in creating new brand at each institution
4. Community interest may decline and be slow to reestablish
5. Longest timeline to implementation

## Option 3 – Two Programs with Modifications

This option includes the following 2 possibilities:

1. Both UAA and UAF switch to the GNAC model to decrease funding levels after initial startup costs. Both programs would only have sports that compete at Div. II level in the GNAC conference versus their current model of having some Div. I sports.
  - ▶ UAA would replace hockey with men's and women's soccer and eliminate men's and women's ski and gymnastics.
  - ▶ UAF would replace 5 of their most supported and successful programs (hockey, rifle, women's swimming, men's and women's ski), with 5 new programs (men's and women's soccer, men's and women's golf, men's and/or women's track).
2. UAF maintains current program to meet NCAA membership requirements. UAA decreases funding by adopting the GNAC model as described above.



11

## Pros and Cons of Option 3 – Two Programs with Modifications (Possibility 1)

### ▶ Pros:

1. Reduces overall cost
2. Eliminates most expensive sport
3. Eliminate some sports that don't generate significant revenue
4. UAA would preserve sponsorship of successful programs
5. UAF would experience net gain in student-athletes

### ▶ Cons:

1. Loss of hockey fan base
2. Years before newly added sports will become competitive
  - ▶ At UAA only
    1. Loss of gymnastics, hockey, and ski
  - ▶ At UAF only
    1. Loss of hockey, most popular sport with most aggressive donor base
    2. Adding additional sports difficult due to seasons (options to add are all outdoor sports)



12

## Pros and Cons of Option 3 – Two Programs with Modifications (Possibility 2)

### ▶ Pros:

1. Each campus is able to maintain some of the most popular sports
2. UAA would preserve sponsorship of successful programs
3. UAF would maintain all of the existing programs

### ▶ Cons:

#### ▶ At UAA only

1. Loss of hockey fan base
2. Cost of start up/development of additional sports
3. Years before newly added sports will become competitive

#### ▶ At UAF only

1. Increase in travel costs to UAF
2. Cost to maintain game guarantees



13

## Further Analysis for Option Assessment

### All

- ▶ Political and legislative opinions regarding the elimination of sports
- ▶ Legal liability of contracts with UAA and UAF athletics
- ▶ Community and stakeholder reaction to changes

### Option 2 – Consortium and Option 3 - Modification

- ▶ Further analysis to maintain Title IX compliance
- ▶ Analysis of which sports to eliminate and which sponsoring institution to be selected
- ▶ Investigation into costs of facilities to support new sports
- ▶ Need approval of waiver from NCAA (2 years) and conferences' approval

### Option 2 - Consortium

- ▶ Ability to gain consortium approval from NCAA due to unprecedented exception
- ▶ Costing analysis on appropriate branding

### Option 3 - Modification

- ▶ Conference approval: Need approval of loaded schedule due to AK seasons (additional sports options are all outdoor sports)



14

## Legislative Intent – Item 3

*It is the intent of the legislature that the University of Alaska conduct a comprehensive and transparent cost-to-revenue analysis, which does not include student fees or appropriations from the State of Alaska's General Funds as revenue, for all of its intercollegiate athletics programs; furthermore, the university is to report back to the legislature with its findings by the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the 2017 Legislative Session.*

- ▶ The committee has met the charge of the Legislative Intent.
- ▶ The committee consensus is that the amount of the budget reductions reflected in the goal should be negotiable.

## Key Points To Remember

- ▶ Athletics should contribute to solving UA budget challenges.
- ▶ Athletics provides a highly desirable level of community involvement and public awareness of UAA and UAF.
- ▶ All legal ramifications of the options must be reviewed.



# Athletics Report

Charge: Review options for reducing cost, including waiver or change of NCAA 10 team rule and UAF/UA A consortium model.

Goal: By 2020, cut '16 GF by 50%; by 2025, no GF



UNIVERSITY  
of ALASKA  
*Many Traditions One Alaska*

August 17, 2016

## Team Members

- ▶ Tara Smith
- ▶ Iain Miller
- ▶ Kathleen McCoy
- ▶ Keith Hackett
- ▶ Gary Gray
- ▶ Bill Spindle
- ▶ Mike Sfraga
- ▶ Saichi Oba
- ▶ Teri Cothren
- ▶ Candice Krupa
- ▶ Bart LeBon
- ▶ Rick Nerland
- ▶ Alec Hajdukovich
- ▶ Mark Filipenko



UNIVERSITY  
of ALASKA  
*Many Traditions One Alaska*

## Key Stakeholders

- ▶ Student-Athletes (309)
- ▶ Front Line Support/Coaches/Staff (83)
- ▶ Alumni (85,000)
- ▶ Supporters (1,148)
- ▶ Fans (142,000)
- ▶ Student Body (23,457)
- ▶ Faculty (1,646)
- ▶ Corporate Sponsors (141)
- ▶ Media Outlets (UAA 55 and UAF 39)
- ▶ Conferences (6)



3

## Situation Overview

- ▶ State budget limitations require adaptation to a new environment.
- ▶ 3 options are presented, all are difficult to accomplish.
- ▶ The 2025 goal of no general funding will be the least beneficial to UA. It is a death sentence for intercollegiate athletics in Alaska.



4

## UA Athletics by the Numbers

	UAF	UAA	Total
Students	140	169	309
Employees	22	56*	83
Credit Hours	4,200	5,000	9,200
Fans	56,000	86,000	142,000
Community Service	2,000	2,600	4,600
Number of sports teams	10	13	23

\* UAA athletics removed 5 fte's that are directly related to intramural activity.



## Options

- ▶ 1 – Elimination of one or both athletic programs.
- ▶ 2 – Consortium model between UAF and UAA
- ▶ 3 – Two separate programs with Modifications
  - ▶ Both programs modify sports sponsorships
  - ▶ UAA modifies sports sponsorships and UAF maintains their sports sponsorships



## Pros and Cons Considerations for All Options

### Pros:

- ▶ Cost Savings to moving programs closer to the goal
- ▶ Decrease in administration costs (staffing)

### Cons:

- ▶ Athletics program instability could erode the community's confidence in the university
- ▶ Loss of supporters, sponsors, donors, fans, and alumni support
- ▶ Negative media impact and loss of positive media
- ▶ Net loss of student athletes who tend to stay and become community leaders whether here or elsewhere
- ▶ Impact on local economies and visitor industry due to decreased events (Mayor's Marathon, Great Alaska Shootout, Kendall Classic, AT&T Classic)
- ▶ Loss of UAF vs. UAA hockey rivalry
- ▶ Negative media impact and loss of positive media (data available)
- ▶ Loss of boosters, fan and alumni support from affected sports



## Pros and Cons Considerations for All Options

### Cons: cont'd.

- ▶ Loss of student credit hours and additional revenue
- ▶ Loss of employees
- ▶ Indicator of instability to community and business
- ▶ Student athletes populate teacher education programs
- ▶ Sports specific scholarships (endowed) will be affected
- ▶ Loss of promotion of university through corporate investments
- ▶ Loss of positive exposure in the form of athletes interfacing with local/rural communities and when traveling outside. Potential loss of recruitment tool.
- ▶ Contrary to recruitment and retention initiatives
- ▶ Loss of community service, community fundraising and mentorships by student athletes (elementary schools, Special Olympics, and various community charities)
- ▶ Impacts to local economies and visitor industry due to decreased events (Mayor's Marathon, Great Alaska Shootout, Kendall Classic, AT&T Classic)
- ▶ Instability within sports hinders recruitment and retention of athletes, coaches and faculty



## Option 1 – Elimination of Athletics

This option includes the following possibilities:

- ▶ Eliminate UAA or UAF Athletics to decrease between 2-3% of the current UA funding levels and reallocate those funds to another area in need. The remaining program will have increased costs due to coordination within the conference for visiting teams who were previously able to play at both programs.
- ▶ Eliminate both UAA and UAF Athletics to decrease approximately 5% of the current UA funding levels and reallocate those funds to another area in need. It would be an unprecedented decision nationally to be the only state in the union to not have an intercollegiate athletic program.
- ▶ Option 1 is the most controversial option with the most severe consequences.

## Pros and Cons of Option 1 - Elimination

### Pros

- ▶ Quickest method to satisfy the intent language of the goal
- ▶ Reallocation of funds to other area of need
- ▶ Gaining of space, facilities and parking
- ▶ Ability to save and build on success of one program (UAF or UAA)

## Option 1 – Elimination of Athletics

### Cons:

- ▶ Loss of any current, prospective or future AK student-athletes to the outside and potentially not returning to Alaska
- ▶ Only state in the union without intercollegiate athletics
- ▶ Loss of naming rights to facilities with potential legal liability
- ▶ Dilution of identity of respective universities
- ▶ Long lasting statewide impact
- ▶ If eliminated highly unlikely to ever restart programs (conference re-entry, recruitment, start up costs)
- ▶ Effective use of facilities space would be expensive
- ▶ Impact to remaining athletics program (increased operating cost)
- ▶ Diminishes communities as location for investment by new or existing businesses
- ▶ Loss of high level sports in our state



## Option 2 – Consortium Model

This model would require an unprecedented exception from the NCAA to allow two athletic programs who are geographically isolated from one another to compete as one program while not duplicating sports in either location.

- ▶ Only one school would be named the sponsoring institution
- ▶ Reduce the current sports between UAA and UAF from 23 to 10+ teams
- ▶ Results in a reduced budget
- ▶ Continuation of athletics at UA



## Pros and Cons of Option 2 - Consortium

### Pros:

- ▶ Athletics remain in state
- ▶ Maintain successful teams at each campus
- ▶ Reduce administration staffing

## Pros and Cons of Option 2 - Consortium

### Cons:

- ▶ May be difficult to obtain approval with NCAA due to unprecedented exception
- ▶ Could compromise the ability to maintain compliance (Title IX)
- ▶ Loss of two established brands and difficulty in creating new brand at each institution
- ▶ Community interest may decline and be slow to reestablish
- ▶ Longest timeline to implementation
- ▶ Conflict with current branding in each institution and costly to resolve
- ▶ Reduction from 23 sports to potentially 13 sports and the effects of the loss (data varies based on choices of cuts)
- ▶ Pressure to not duplicate administration when some may be necessary
- ▶ Difficulties for international students who have visa limitations on taking distance courses.
- ▶ Legal issues (Naming rights, media/sponsorship contracts)
- ▶ Management would be required to address unknowns and complexities
- ▶ Only one sponsoring institution can be identified

## Option 3 – Two Programs with Modifications

This option includes the following 2 possibilities:

1. Both UAA and UAF switch to the GNAC model to decrease funding levels after initial startup costs. Both programs would only have sports that compete at Div. II level in the GNAC conference versus their current model of having some Div. I sports.
  - ▶ UAA would replace hockey with men's and women's soccer and eliminate men's and women's ski and gymnastics.
  - ▶ UAF would replace 5 of their most supported and successful programs (hockey, rifle, women's swimming, men's and women's ski), with 5 new programs (men's and women's soccer, men's and women's golf, men's and/or women's track).
2. UAF maintains current program to meet NCAA membership requirements. UAA decreases funding by adopting the GNAC model as described above.



15

## Pros of Option 3 – Two Programs with Modifications (Possibility 1)

Pros:

- ▶ Reduces overall cost
- ▶ Eliminates most expensive sport
- ▶ Eliminate some sports that don't generate significant revenue
- ▶ Streamline conference involvement
- ▶ Reduce travel costs
- ▶ Connection from rural community to UAF through basketball
- ▶ Reduction in facilities costs (Carlson/Sullivan)
- ▶ Additional in state rivalries
- ▶ No game guarantees and travel subsidies relating to hockey
- ▶ **AT UAA Only**
  - ▶ Preserves sponsorship of successful programs
  - ▶ Sports added have potential for local popularity
  - ▶ Facilities built around GNAC sports enhancing value
- ▶ **AT UAF Only**
  - ▶ Net gain in student-athletes



16



## Cons of Option 3 – Two Programs with Modifications (Possibility 1)

### Cons:

- ▶ Loss of hockey fan base
- ▶ Years before newly added sports will become competitive
- ▶ Loss of skiing, strong local (Fairbanks) support
- ▶ Start up/development of additional sports (5 sports UAF, 1 UAA), recruiting challenges for outdoor sports

### AT UAA Only

- ▶ Loss of gymnastics, hockey, and ski



17

## Cons of Option 3 – Two Programs with Modifications (Possibility 1)

### Cons: cont'd

### AT UAF Only

- ▶ Loss of hockey, most popular sport and most aggressive donor base
- ▶ Adding additional sports difficult due to seasons (options to add are all outdoor sports)
- ▶ Loss of rifle, currently successful and low cost program (producing olympic athletes and NCAA champions)
- ▶ Loss of swimming majority in state athletes and successful (typically sending 6-9 athletes to NCAA championships yearly)
- ▶ Golf not in local schools or community programs
- ▶ Leaving a 4.2m locker room renovation at the Carlson
- ▶ Loss of hockey ticket sales
- ▶ Without hockey, donors may not donate to other programs



18

## Pros of Option 3 – Two Programs with Modifications (Possibility 2)

### Pros:

- ▶ Each campus is able to maintain some of the most popular sports
- ▶ Connection from rural community to UAF through basketball
- ▶ Additional in state competition \*only if modification involving addition of swimming and rifle
- ▶ Facilities built around GNAC sports enhancing value
- ▶ Reduces overall cost significantly
- ▶ Eliminates the most expensive sport
- ▶ Eliminate some sports that don't generate significant revenue
- ▶ Reduce travel costs
- ▶ Reduction in facilities costs (Sullivan)

### AT UAA Only

- ▶ Sports added have potential for local popularity
- ▶ Preserves sponsorship of successful programs

### AT UAF Only

- ▶ Would maintain all of the existing programs



UNIVERSITY  
of ALASKA  
*Many Futures One State*

19

## Cons of Option 3 – Two Programs with Modifications (Possibility 2)

### Cons: cont'd

#### UAA Only

- ▶ Loss of gymnastics, ski, (potentially)
- ▶ Loss of hockey fan base
- ▶ Public perception after investment in \$15m in gymnastics and upgrade to hockey facilities
- ▶ Cost of start up/development of additional sports
- ▶ Years before newly added sports will become competitive

#### UAF Only

- ▶ Increase in travel costs to UAF
- ▶ Cost to maintain game guarantees



UNIVERSITY  
of ALASKA  
*Many Futures One State*

20

## Other Revenue and Cost Reduction Opportunities

Options	Elements
Shared Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•HR, travel, media (Consortium), marketing and procurement</li> <li>•Centralized administration and single business office</li> </ul>
General Reductions Athletics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Cut UAA Shootout (phase out)</li> <li>•Shared procurement to reduce equipment costs through vendor management</li> <li>•UAA move intramurals to student services like UAF structure</li> </ul>
General Revenue/ Fundraising for Athletics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Market driven approach to revenue generation (i.e. entertainment)</li> <li>•Buy Carlson Center – Create a line of revenue</li> <li>•Sell and Lease back of Alaska Airlines Center</li> <li>•Rights from sales of athletic wear 100% for 3 years</li> <li>•Increased flexibility involving asks for donations</li> <li>•Increase the number of sports camps or revenue of from existing camps</li> </ul>
Student Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Re-visit Canadian student tuition waivers</li> <li>•Online classes – Pay the fees</li> <li>•Replace GF for scholarships with private funds</li> </ul>



## Further Analysis for Option Assessment

- ▶ **All**
  - ▶ Political and legislative opinions regarding the elimination of sports
  - ▶ Legal liability of contracts with UAA and UAF athletics
  - ▶ Community and stakeholder reaction to changes
- ▶ **Option 2 – Consortium and Option 3 - Modification**
  - ▶ Further analysis to maintain Title IX compliance
  - ▶ Analysis of which sports to eliminate and which sponsoring institution to be selected
  - ▶ Investigation into costs of facilities to support new sports
  - ▶ Need approval of waiver from NCAA (2 years) and conferences' approval
- ▶ **Option 2 - Consortium**
  - ▶ Ability to gain consortium approval from NCAA due to unprecedented exception
  - ▶ Costing analysis on appropriate branding
- ▶ **Option 3 - Modification**
  - ▶ Conference approval: Need approval of loaded schedule due to AK seasons (additional sports options are all outdoor sports)



22

## Legislative Intent – Item 3

- ▶ *It is the intent of the legislature that the University of Alaska conduct a comprehensive and transparent cost-to-revenue analysis, which does not include student fees or appropriations from the State of Alaska's General Funds as revenue, for all of its intercollegiate athletics programs; furthermore, the university is to report back to the legislature with its findings by the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the 2017 Legislative Session.*
- ▶ The committee has met the charge of the Legislative Intent.
- ▶ The committee consensus is that the amount of the budget reductions reflected in the goal should be negotiable.

## Key Points To Remember

- ▶ Athletics should contribute to solving UA budget challenges.
- ▶ Athletics provides a highly desirable level of community involvement and public awareness of UAA and UAF.
- ▶ All legal ramifications of the options must be reviewed.

## Addendums

- ▶ Option Narrative
- ▶ Google Drive
  - ▶ Letters regarding UA Athletics
  - ▶ Majeski Report
  - ▶ McDowell Report
  - ▶ Relevant Data



# Athletics Option Narratives

## Elimination of Intercollegiate Athletics at the University of Alaska Anchorage

**If Intercollegiate Athletics were to be eliminated at the University of Alaska Anchorage here is a partial list of what the UA System would gain:**

- The Alaska Airlines Center (approximately 200,000 square feet of space) could be repurposed for other campus/system use. Parking for up to 600 cars to accommodate additional student/faculty and staff parking and office space for up to 60 employees. The AAC would still be used as an Arena for campus and community events and activities.
- Approximately 2,000 square feet of locker room space that could be repurposed in the Wells Fargo Sports Center for use by other campus entities and additional office space for up to six persons in Athletic Offices in the WFSC.
- Based on FY 2016 numbers, the system would recover \$5.3 Million in GF funds that could be repurposed for other academic or programmatic purposes and just under \$1 Million dollars in student fee funds invested in Athletics for use across the campus. The total budget for Intercollegiate Athletics at UAA is \$9,827,745. Approximately 3% of the University of Alaska Anchorage's annual operating budget according to the Majeski Report.

**If Intercollegiate Athletics were to be eliminated at the University of Alaska Anchorage here is a partial list of what the UA System, UAA, the City of Anchorage and Alaska would lose:**

- In the McDowell Group Report Executive Interviews, of the ten items reference on page 7 under the topic of Pride in the University, two of the items referenced were our **Sports-related accomplishments and the 2016 UAA Women's Basketball Team.**
- The distinct Seawolf brand that UAA students and alumni take pride in.
- 169 outstanding young women and men who are excellent citizens, students and active Ambassadors (126 trips) for the UAA campus and the UA System.
- One of the most visible campus departments and connectors to the community.
- A strong partner across the campus for collaboration with other units, departments and organizations.
- 60 to 70 of the most committed and hardworking employees at UAA that know their business is all about serving students and helping them to succeed. Our coaches, staff and administrators work with our student-athletes daily and are committed to being the best teachers, mentors, guides and role models they can be. We are preparing our students for lives of honorable citizenship and service to others.
- Potential loss of current and future support from athletic alumni and other UAA alumni who have connections to Seawolf Athletics or have a strong identity with the Seawolf brand.
- Potential significant loss of community-wide support from those persons who attend UAA sporting events and support the Seawolves. In the 2015-16 academic year nearly 86,000 fans attended Seawolf sporting events at the Alaska Airlines Center and Sullivan Arena.
- Potential loss of 500 corporate sponsors and other local organizations who philanthropically support the efforts of Seawolf Athletics and the UA Foundation. In the past three years we have secured \$3,651,803 in charitable gifts and pledges to Seawolf Athletics.
- Potential and significant loss of sponsorships, marketing and philanthropic contributions from companies like Alaska Airlines, GCI, Pepsi, Wells Fargo Bank, Anchorage Fracture and Orthopedic Clinic

and NMS that support Seawolf Athletics and the Alaska Airlines Center. Over the past three FY's we have generated nearly \$3.5 Million in cash and trade in this area.

- Loss of annual ticket sales and seat licensing revenue. In the past two years Seawolf Athletics has averaged over \$900,000 a year.
- Loss of tuition, fees, room and board dollars from Student- Athletes who pay UAA the balance of their cost of education after financial aid is awarded. In FY 16, 170 UAA student-athletes paid over \$800,000 to the campus. That is an average of \$4,700.00 + per student in payments.
- A loss of 2,600 community service hours provided by Seawolf student-athletes in the 2015-16 academic year to local elementary schools, local charitable organizations and for special events in our community. In each of these instances our student-athletes proudly wear the colors and proudly represent UAA in a positive manner.
- The loss of over 360 positive news stories and in many cases photographs in the Alaska Dispatch News about Seawolf student-athletes and teams in the 2015-16 Academic Year. These stories represent a value in "earned media" of \$1.1 to \$1.5 Million according to a recent Vocus Report. There is no other department or campus unit that would be able to duplicate this number of exposures/penetrations in the community for UAA or the UA System.
- A loss of daily media coverage. All three major electronic media outlets cover UAA Athletics during their sports seasons. These daily mentions could not be duplicated by other departments/units if Athletics were eliminated.
- Earned Media in Newsweek for the three-page story in the March 18<sup>th</sup> edition (100,000 subscribers) and the same six page story on the Newsweek web site (over 4 Million monthly views) would be valued at \$50,000 dollars.
- During the GCI Great Alaska Shootout an estimated 806,000 people viewed each game on the CBS Sports Network for a total 5.6 Million viewers for the event. During the Women's NCAA Championship run this spring an estimated 1.6 Million viewers watched the Seawolves play on the CBS Sports Network.
- The Earned Media that we receive from our partners at Denali Media for the past year was valued at \$350,000.00 (state wide).
- Seawolf Athletics has a very strong social media reach. Our web site, [www.goseawolves.com](http://www.goseawolves.com) had 1.5 million page views in FY16 and more than 321,000 users. Our Facebook pages has 14,285 followers. Our Twitter pages have 9,792 followers and had 723,000 tweet impressions in FY 16. There are 2,106 Instagram followers as well. All continue to grow in popularity.
- Without Seawolf men's and women's basketball the connection between UAA and the rural communities where basketball is a catalyst for connection would no longer exist.
- Potential loss of 950 prospective students who attended summer sports camps at UAA in the summer of 2016. They may not have visited the campus if these summer sports camps were not offered.
- The annual Anchorage Mayor's Marathon and Half Marathon and the GCI Great Alaska Shootout are responsible for generating nearly \$4 Million dollars for the Alaska economy each year. These figures are based on the methodology used to determine the Estimated Economic Impact (EEI) data from the Alaska Visitors Statistics Program of 2011.
- The loss of a Top 10 Finisher in the 2016 Learfield Directors Cup.

For many, Athletics is the "Front Porch" of the University of Alaska Anchorage. Investing GF dollars in athletics should not be viewed as a "lost opportunity cost" or non-essential even in difficult financial times. The current GF funds allow Seawolf Athletics to generate additional dollars and exposure that would likely not be available if athletics were eliminated. We need to become less reliant on those funds and we do need to take a reduction like all other departments and units on the campus, but to eliminate Seawolf Athletics would

potentially land a significant blow to the future visibility and credibility of UAA as a four year Baccalaureate Degree Granting Institution in our state.

As the primary tenants of the Alaska Airlines Center we also have the pleasure and obligation to serve our community and all Alaskans in so many other ways during events and activities. Regardless of what event is occurring, we are there to ensure that every person that enters the AAC has a positive and memorable experience while they are our guests. At last count, over 250,000 persons have attended ticketed events in this building and the numbers will continue to grow each year.

Athletics at UAA is also very important to our partners at UAF in Fairbanks. If we were no longer competing with the Nanooks, the rivalries that have existed for years would be gone and the “spirit of competition” would be lost forever. That healthy rivalry would be missed by many loyal alumni and fans of both of our institutions.

Finally, the greatest loss to the campus and community would be the student-athletes who compete and study at UAA. This past year our department wide GPA average was 3.24. We had 18 Student-Athletes earn GNAC Scholar-Athlete Awards and Women’s Gymnastic finished the year ranked # 7 in Academic success among the 82 NCAA Collegiate Gymnastics programs with a team high GPA of 3.644. All of our students are important members of our campus and community. The potential loss of so many excellent young women and men, mentors, role models and future leaders would have a long term impact on all associated with UAA.

### **Elimination of Intercollegiate Athletics at the University of Alaska Fairbanks**

Elimination of intercollegiate athletics at the University of Alaska Fairbanks would be a drastic move to save approximately \$2.6M in GF money. This amount comprises approximately one-half of the overall athletics budget at UAF. The other half includes approximately \$950,000 in student athletic fees that go directly to the 10 sports.

Although the ramifications of eliminating Nanook Athletics are broad and varied, here is a partial list of the probable impacts:

- Approximately 140 student-athletes would likely transfers to other institutions to compete in intercollegiate athletics.
- Student credit hour productivity would drop by a minimum of 4200 credit hours per academic year plus credits taken during summer session.
- The Majeski report outlines revenue generated for the university via tuition, fees, room, board, and books, which would all disappear due to the departure of 140 student-athletes. Athletics is a major customer of many parts of the university.
- The Nanook brand would disappear; the university’s overall, general use of “Nanook Nation” would be diminished since the Nanook athletics program would be non-existent.
- The university would lose the arguably most visible department on campus – Athletics; as a result, the valuable, positive public relations aspect of sponsoring intercollegiate athletics would disappear. In fact, it could be argued that many people would react very negatively toward the university.
- We believe there is no land grant institution without an intercollegiate athletics program; this would not bring the university any positive exposure.
- The city of Fairbanks would likely lose all of the employees in the athletics department as they would seek jobs out of state in intercollegiate athletics.



- Donor support would diminish since currently UAF Athletics has many endowed scholarships, various sport-specific booster clubs, and annual donors. These generous donors restrict their giving to athletics; they are not likely to continue giving to other parts of the university.
- UAF would lose 85 corporate sponsors. The Majeski reports the many benefits gained within the community by having these close ties with so many corporations.
- The 140 Nanook student-athletes all interact within the community in dozens of community service and community engagement events. Truly, the city of Fairbanks would suffer by losing each of the events and the benefits citizens gain by interacting with our student-athletes.
- Nanook Athletics generates hundreds of news releases annually; these stories are printed and reprinted by state, regional, and national media, all bringing positive exposure to UAF.
- The Nanook Athletics website receives hundreds of thousands of hits annually. Similarly, our department Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts interact with hundreds of thousands of people. This all brings attention to UAF via athletics.
- Business owners in the city of Fairbanks would lose huge amounts of money if teams and team followers ceased to come to Fairbanks for athletics competitions. Hotels, rental car agencies, bus rental agencies, restaurants, and other merchants would lose significant amounts of business between September and March each year, a time when they need the business because the summer tourists are gone.
- Intercollegiate athletics programs are often called the “front porch” or “window” to and from the community. Many university donors came to really know the university via intercollegiate athletics as their first contact with UAF. All of this would go away without Nanook Athletics.
- In American culture and society, intercollegiate athletics is a major source of identity, pride, enjoyment, and overall quality of life. All of this would disappear without athletics at UAF.
- Our healthy, spirited rivalry with UAA is followed closely and enjoyed immensely around Alaska. Although UAA is a competitor with us, they are also a sincerely valued partner in education and athletics in Alaska. We are colleagues and all part of UA.
- Without intercollegiate athletics at UAF, there will be hundreds and then thousands of student-athletes who will never come to Fairbanks, not only to compete but also to graduate from such a fine university and, in many cases, become longtime residents of Fairbanks.

### **ATHLETICS CONSORTIUM**

Following is a narrative describing how the intercollegiate athletics program (Alaska Nanooks) at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) and the athletics program at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) could meet the requirements of an “athletics consortium” as defined and outlined in NCAA Division II Bylaw 3.2.2. It is believed that the University of Alaska Fairbanks and the University of Alaska Anchorage would enter into this athletics consortium model in order to sustain the long-term viability of NCAA intercollegiate athletics in the state of Alaska. It is understood that an athletics consortium functions under the name of one of the institutions, either UAF or UAA.

**3.2.2:** The student-athletes are expected to “satisfy the eligibility requirements of the member institution and the NCAA.” Student-athletes are currently meeting the eligibility criteria of the respective universities and the NCAA and will continue to do so under the mentoring and monitoring of their coaches, the Assistant AD for Academic Services (academic advisor in athletics), and the Assistant AD for Compliance at UAF. At UAA, the student-athletes will continue to be monitored by the Associate AD for Academics and Compliance and senior woman administrator.

**3.2.2:** This opening section also indicates “the Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve an athletics consortium....” If UAF and UAA decide to move forward with this athletics consortium model, the topic must be presented for consideration and approval by the Management Council. Gary Gray, UAF Director of Athletics and Vice Chair of the Division II Management Council, would make a formal presentation to the Management Council at a regularly scheduled meeting, answer questions from Management Council representatives and NCAA staff, and then recuse himself from the vote due to a conflict of interest.

**3.2.2.1: General Policy:** “...there shall be no change in the basic recruitment, enrollment or financial aid policies of the involved institutions as a result of such approval.” UAF and UAA will make no changes to their current policies and practices related to the recruitment, enrollment, or financial aid policies, which meet all NCAA standards.

**3.2.2.2: Combining Entire Athletics Programs:** UAF and UAA would combine their entire athletics programs, as required by this section (i.e., “the consortium shall not be formed on a sport-by-sport basis.”) Hypothetically, UAF could sponsor 5 sports: men’s ice hockey (Division I), co-ed rifle, women’s swimming, men’s skiing, and women’s skiing. UAA could sponsor men’s and women’s basketball, women’s volleyball, men’s and women’s cross country, men’s and women’s indoor track and field, men’s and women’s outdoor track and field, and women’s gymnastics. No sport will be sponsored at both campuses.

**3.2.2.3: Conference Approval:** Each conference in which a UAA/UAF team competes will be asked to approve this athletics consortium. This would include six conferences between UAA and UAF athletic programs.

**3.2.2.4: Eligibility Requirements for Student-Athletes:** There will be no change in how student-athletes are certified as meeting the eligibility requirements of the member institutions (UAF and UAA), the athletics conferences (previously listed), and the NCAA.

**3.2.2.5 Financial Assistance to Student-Athletes.** Within a consortium: *(Revised: 7/20/10)*

- (a) Each institution shall be responsible for the financial assistance awarded to its student-athletes. The financial arrangement between or among the institutions for the exchange of funds to cover academic costs of student-athletes who take part in the exchange program shall apply to student-athletes in the same manner as it applies to those students not participating in the intercollegiate athletics programs;
- (b) One institution may not provide a scholarship or any other form of financial aid to a student-athlete enrolled in another institution or transmit a scholarship or grant-in-aid to another institution to be used by one or more of its student-athletes; and
- (c) Financial aid limitations as set forth in Bylaw 15 shall be applicable to the consortium as one entity and shall include all countable student-athletes, regardless of the institution in which they are enrolled.

**3.2.2.6: Length of Approval:** UAF and UAA will agree to submit a report after a period of four academic years, “setting forth its effect upon their academic and athletics operations.”

**3.2.2.7: NCAA Division Membership:** UAF and UAA are members of NCAA Division II and will continue to select Division II as our division “for legislative and competitive purposes.” UAF will maintain its Division I Men’s ice hockey program (WCHA).

**3.2.2.8: NCAA Member Involvement:** Both UAF and UAA are currently members of the NCAA.

**3.2.2.9: NCAA Membership Application:** Since both UAF and UAA are currently NCAA members, neither institution would need to apply for NCAA membership.

**3.2.2.10 Prior Academic Consortium Relationship.** The institutions shall have had a prior academic consortium relationship.

**3.2.2.11: Recruitment:** We anticipate no change in the manner in which student-athletes will be recruited to either institution. We do not expect to recruit student-athletes who plan to enroll at the partner institution.

#### **Examples of current Athletic Consortiums;**

##### **Southern Vermont College/ Bennington College –**

Southern Vermont (SVC) is a Division III Institution that competes at the DIII Level in Intercollegiate Athletics with twelve sports. Bennington College is a private Institution in Bennington, Vermont that had only an Intramural Program. These two institutions (5 miles apart) have collaborated on many academic programs in the past. SVC serves as the sponsoring Institution. The Consortium was approved first by the New England Collegiate Conference Athletic Directors and was approved by the NCAA in the summer of 2014. Bennington students now compete as members of the SVC Mountaineers sport teams. This partnership is one that met the basic requirements of the Consortium model. Students from Bennington competed in Cross Country and Soccer in the fall of 2014.

##### **Columbia University/Barnard College -**

Columbia University and Barnard College, both elite academic institutions are located across the street from each other in New York City. Columbia University is a member of Division I in the NCAA and a member of the Ivy League. Barnard College is a Women's College. They have developed an Athletic Consortium that allows the women from Barnard to compete as members on the Columbia University Lions Athletic Teams. These two institutions have many collaborative partnerships that have also allowed students from both schools to take classes at the three campuses that are part of Columbia University. Barnard does not sponsor Intercollegiate Athletics. These institutions are neighbors. Columbia University is the consortium sponsor and all teams play under the Columbia University banner.

##### **University of South Florida/University of South Florida/Manatee –**

The University of South Florida (USF) is an NCAA Division IA Athletic Program in Tampa, Florida and is a member of the American Athletic Conference. They were approved to start an Athletic Consortium with the University of South Florida- Sarasota/Manatee (USFSM), a 55-minute drive from Tampa beginning in 2015. USFSM has not had intercollegiate athletics but will start a Women's Crew/Rowing team on that campus. Both institutions award Baccalaureate degrees and have separate accreditations. The crew/rowing team at USFSM will be part of the main campus program and will be a member of the USF Bulls Athletic Department. Crew/Rowing is a recognized NCAA sport and a championship sport in the American Athletic Conference. Students from USFSM can try out for other teams at the main campus in Tampa and students from the main campus can try out and participate in Crew/Rowing at USFSM. The Consortium is with the Sarasota/Manatee campus. USFSM hopes to launch the program in the fall of 2017.

These three models are excellent models of an Athletic Consortium per the current NCAA By-Laws. The model that has been suggested are different from the norm (distance between campuses, ability to physically take classes on each other's campus, attend regular practice sessions and the adoption of the sponsoring institution's brand) but also a very interesting possibility for us to consider. Ultimately, if this model is approved, the NCAA and the Management Council will develop and publish appropriate criteria to be applied to such a consortium like this if it reaches approval by the group.

This potential hybrid of the Athletic Consortium may be the first of its kind in the NCAA because of the number of teams involved and the fact that both institutions currently have active NCAA Division II Athletic Programs.

**Proposed UAA/UAF Athletic Consortium** – Within the athletic consortium UAA have up to ten teams competing and training at UAA in the Alaska Airlines Center and other local venues. The sports at UAA would be M/W Cross Country and W Volleyball in the fall, W/M Basketball and Indoor Track and Field in the winter and M/W Outdoor Track and Field in the spring season. All of these teams are members of the Great Northwest Athletic Conference (GNAC). Our 10<sup>th</sup> team could possibly be either Women’s Gymnastics, Women’s’ Ski or Women’s Soccer. That would be a topic for future discussion. Of the three, only soccer is a GNAC sport.

The teams at UAF would be Ice Hockey, Rifle, W Swimming and W/M Nordic Ski. A total of five teams. Combined this consortium could have up to 15 teams compared to the current total of 23 NCAA teams that compete at both UA Institutions. These reductions would result in significant savings to both campuses. At UAF the teams would all be members of individual conferences (WCHA for Hockey, Patriot Rifle Conference, the Pacific Collegiate Swim Conference, and the Rocky Mountain Intercollegiate Ski Association).

If this model would be acceptable to the NCAA and the Management Council, there would be a strong possibility for this merger to succeed and allow us to continue to have Intercollegiate Athletics on both campuses. We would be able to reduce spending on both campuses and maintain a presence for our communities to support and enjoy. This change would bring some controversy with a number of fans/supporters/students in the “Endings and Neutral Zones” categories, but in order to sustain some athletic presence at our institutions difficult decisions will have to be made.

Our biggest concerns at this time are with the administration of this Consortium and how students from both campuses could possibly participate in a sport on one or both of the campuses if they reside in either Fairbanks or Anchorage. The key point in the current NCAA Consortium model is that students can easily get from one campus to the other to participate in practices and attend classes. Our distance will not allow that to happen. The academic portion could be managed with online course work.

The administration of and oversight of the programs is where we will have to show the NCAA that we can maintain a program that is separated by 300 plus miles. With this proposed arrangement would we have two Compliance Officers filing two sets of reports to the NCAA? If one of the campuses has a major compliance violation how would it impact the other programs on the other campus? How would we file the annual EADA (Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act) Report? Title IX Compliance and meeting our gender equity requirements?

The Athletic Consortium model that currently exists in the NCAA is much different from what we are considering and/or proposing. It could be done but it will take a great deal more preparation work than we have done up to this point. The administration of this program by the sponsoring institution will also need a great deal of consideration. The sponsoring institution will have to be fully engaged with the partner campus daily/weekly to ensure both ends of the consortium are working together as a single member since that is how the NCAA will view this partnership.

### **Restructuring Sports Sponsorship**

#### **University of Alaska Anchorage for FY 18**

**Current Structure/Success of UAA Athletics** – UAA currently has 11 NCAA Division II Athletic Teams and two NCAA Division I Programs (Men’s Ice Hockey and Women’s Gymnastics). Nine of the 11 Division II Teams compete in the Great Northwest Athletic Conference (GNAC) and have been very successful members. In

2015-16 UAA teams won seven GNAC Conference Championships and one GNAC Post-Season Championship (Women's Basketball). Seawolf Athletics finished 2016 ranked # 8 out of 307 NCAA DII Institutions in the Learfield Directors Cup Competition. The Men's and Women's Ski Program finished #9 at the NCAA Ski Championships in this Multi-Divisional Sport (38 member schools among the three NCAA Divisions). Women's Gymnastics finished 5<sup>th</sup> in the MPSA and Men's Ice Hockey finished 9<sup>th</sup> in the WCHA. Our focus is to aspire to excellence in all programs.

**Approach to Restructuring** – During the past several months, Athletics has been engaged in the difficult work of reviewing how to meet the budget reduction demands that were being discussed. With only 13 sports the choices are limited.

Our first steps were to define what we are as an Athletic Department and what we needed to protect or preserve. We are a very successful NCAA Division II Athletic Program. Over the past several years we have been among the top DII programs in the Learfield Directors Cup Standings. Our Division I programs have not seen the same level of success. These programs (DI) have not had the same facilities or support as the teams they have to compete against until just recently. Our lack of success in these programs has also been a cause of concern for many years, particularly in the area of budget expenses and revenue.

When we start to look closely at what we would have to do to remain a competitive Athletic Program it is clear that one option would be to choose to suspend or eliminate those programs that put the greatest strain on the operating budget and produce limited or no revenue. We should not spread the reductions across all of the programs or teams. The term we use is to make **Vertical Cuts** (deep cuts to select programs) rather than **Horizontal Cuts** (reductions across the board to all programs). In FY 14 we made \$350,000 in horizontal reductions to all sport team budgets and have not restored any dollars to those budgets. We work closely with all of our coaches and staff to reduce and save wherever possible on a daily basis. Another reduction (even a 5% reduction) would be difficult to achieve and allow our teams to remain competitive. Success breeds pride, local and national media attention and increased revenue opportunities.

**Restructuring Plan for FY 18** – For Seawolf Athletics to reach the first budget reduction (\$2.6 Million) that has been suggested by FY 20, we offer the following options.

- Suspend/eliminate the Men's Ice Hockey Program at the conclusion of the 2016-17 season. This decision would produce an immediate net savings of \$1,407,095.00 based on FY 16 figures.
- Suspend/Eliminate M Ski Program at the conclusion of the 2016-17 season. Ski was the first sport to be introduced at UAA and has been very successful as a member of the NCAA. That being said, it is a sport that has very limited external support from Alumni and community members and does not have the ability to generate significant revenue to assist in sustaining the program. This decision would produce an immediate net savings of \$272,981.00 based on FY 16 figures.
- Total Reduction from these two decisions would be \$1,680,076.00
- Athletics has already made several smaller budget adjustments for FY 17 that would be in place of approximately \$100,000 that would bring the total reduction to \$1,780,076.00 for FY18.
- These reductions would result in the elimination or reduction of seven FT Coaching/ Staff positions, one temporary clerk/front desk position and one Temporary FT Athletic Training position. If the decision to suspend/eliminate the Men's Ice Hockey Program at UAA would be the chosen option, we would have to request a waiver from the NCAA to be permitted to compete as a member institution without the required second men's team sport until men's soccer could be added. UAA would be required to submit a plan for that addition as a part of the waiver process. This sport would carry approximately 27 players (plus two coaches) and would allow UAA to meet minimum NCAA requirements. The plan would propose a fall 2019 start of Men's Soccer. Men's Soccer is a Championship Sport in the GNAC and we would be able to fit into the conference schedule in the fall of 2019. The projected cost for adding Men's Soccer would be approximately \$400,000 annually

**Restructuring in FY 19 and Beyond** – Recognizing that an additional \$900,000.00 would have to be

eliminated in GF, additional restructuring would have to occur. Listed below are options that would be considered to meet the budget reduction demands from the Legislature and Statewide.

- W Gymnastics – Move WGYM back to DII Status. There would be an eventual savings of up to \$50,000.00 in Scholarships (scholarship limitations at the DII Level). This change would eliminate some costs for multi-divisional external audits that are currently required. These changes may impact our Title IX/Gender Equity status as well.
- Eliminate the GCI Great Alaska Shootout Basketball Tournament – This event is an important revenue generator for Athletics. It is also a key factor in attracting sponsorships and advertising to the Alaska Airlines Center. If this event were eliminated it could impact sponsorship and marketing dollars for the ACC Auxiliary as well. The revenue generated by this event does not cover all expenses at this time. Eliminating this event would show a net savings of \$372,835.00 based on FY 16 figures.
- Suspend/Eliminate two additional teams to get down to the NCAA 10 team minimum by 2020 FY. Those teams would be determined at a later date and only after a thorough review of Title IX were conducted to insure Athletics and UAA remained in compliance after the restructuring plan was put in place.

### **University of Alaska Fairbanks for FY 18**

Hockey is the costliest sport at UAF. In FY 14, hockey's expense was \$2,149,181.50, and its associated revenue was \$670,019.42; therefore, the net cost of hockey in FY 14 was \$1,479,162.10. In FY 15, hockey's expense was \$2,015,333.80, and its associated revenue was \$586,294.80; therefore, the net cost of hockey in FY 15 was \$1,429,039.00. Each year the budget is balanced by utilizing funds from the mandatory student athletic fee account and General Fund money.

If UAF decided to replace hockey with another sport, it would need to be another men's team sport, in order to meet the NCAA membership requirements of having at least two team sports for each gender (men's basketball is the other men's team sport). The remaining men's team sports sponsored by the Great Northwest Athletic Conference (GNAC) are baseball, football, and soccer. Of these three options, the most feasible sport to add at UAF is men's soccer.

Currently, seven institutions in the GNAC sponsor men's soccer; UAF would make eight. This would mean UAF would immediately have a 14-game schedule, 7 games at home and 7 away. No travel guarantees exist in the GNAC so the other 7 GNAC Teams would be required to travel to Fairbanks at their own expense.

The maximum number of games in NCAA soccer is 18 so UAF would only need a few additional extra games to complete its schedule. Soccer in Fairbanks is feasible, particularly if the GNAC schedule allowed for most of UAF's home games to be played early in the season, with more of its away games scheduled on the road in mid- to late-fall. The GNAC accommodates MSUB in this manner with softball and baseball by scheduling most of its early season games on the road since Billings tends to have a cold, often wet spring.

The men's soccer budget would depend upon a variety of factors, including: the amount of scholarship funds (NCAA maximum is 9.0 equivalencies), the number of trips (3-5 would be likely), commodities (equipment, uniforms, etc.), salaries (2 coaches), recruiting, etc. If the initial men's soccer budget was \$600,000.00, the net savings over the cost of hockey, not accounting for any associated revenue, would be in excess of \$800,000.00.

Although the cost of sponsoring men's soccer is clearly lower than the cost of sponsoring men's ice's ice hockey, it should be noted that much of the UAF corporate sponsorship program is planned around hockey. Without hockey, the nature of the UAF program would change dramatically. Hockey is the athletic program's key connection to the community; attendance is often around 3,000, whereas soccer is apt to attract 200 fans on a given day.

## Creating Additional and New Revenue Streams for Athletics

### **University of Alaska Anchorage**

- Increase Ticket Sales and Seat Licensing Revenue by 5% to 10% annually.
- Retain current donor base and increase the number of new donors and new revenue annually by 10%.
- Increase Sponsorship dollars by 10% annually to support Seawolf Athletics and the Alaska Airlines Center Auxiliary.
- Increase revenue from Licensing of the Seawolf Brand with our partners at Learfield Sports Properties by expanding the availability of Seawolf merchandise in more retail outlets in Anchorage and Alaska.
- Increase revenue from Official Online Merchandise Store (Fanatics)
- Improve efficiency in all areas of operation in the Athletic Department.

### **University of Alaska Fairbanks**

- Evaluate the structure and support of the booster clubs at UAF
  - Evaluate revenue options via booster clubs: merchandise sales that might not be allowed via current bookstore option; pull tab license in town via an Alumni Association chapter for all sports, in addition to the hockey chapter; increased outreach for booster club membership
- Evaluate and improve the annual giving and major giving outreach to individuals for athletics, including student athlete alumni and fans
  - Improve the integration of data that is captured by athletics and UAF into the fundraising system database to assist with improved outreach.
  - Can we go from transactional support to philanthropic support?