

## MS Citizens on Hook for USM Athletics in Major Way

TOTAL SUBSIDY TO USMAD OVER \$8 MILLION ACCORDING TO RECENT *USA Today* REPORT

*USA Today* recently released [another new set](#) of collegiate athletics financials, and it indicates that the USM athletics department's public subsidy (tax dollars and tuition fees) accounts for almost 40% of its total revenue, amounting to just over \$8 million annually. According to the report, \$8,015,417 of the USMAD's \$20,673,597 annual revenue comes from its public subsidy, accounting for 38.8% of the total take. This massive subsidy for sports is likely to be [of great interest](#) to Mississippians, particularly in light of the [recent budget scandal](#) ongoing in the USMAD. The *USAT* report also notes that there are seven schools whose athletics departments receive \$0 in public subsidies. These are Texas, Purdue, Penn State, Oklahoma, Ohio State, Nebraska, and LSU. Revenues for these schools range from a low of \$59.4 million (Purdue) to a high of \$150.3 million (Texas), suggesting that a big-time athletics program can be achieved without having material support from public coffers. Among those schools receiving *some* public subsidies, like USM, the five receiving the smallest portions (in % terms) are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Rank	School	Revenues	Subsidy	%
1	Michigan	\$122.7 million	\$0.3 million	0.2%
2	Iowa	\$ 93.4 million	\$0.6 million	0.6%
3	Tennessee	\$104.4 million	\$1.0 million	1.0%
4	Kentucky	\$ 84.9 million	\$0.8 million	1.0%
5	Arkansas	\$ 91.8 million	\$1.9 million	2.0%

These data convincingly show that big-time success can be achieved without material support from taxpayer and tuition dollars. USM's approach is nowhere near that of these 5 schools, nor of the seven schools listed above, in terms of subsidy dollars or the portion of revenues that comes from subsidies.

In terms of Mississippi's other big schools, Ole Miss reports a subsidy of only \$3.7 million, which is about 8% of its \$49.2 million revenue. Mississippi State is similar in reporting a subsidy of \$4.8 million, accounting for about 8% of its \$59 million revenue. Together, these schools receive subsidies amounting to only \$8.5 million – only \$0.4 million more than what USM is allotted – yet these schools generate total revenues of about \$100 million without the subsidy. Surely, supporters of OM and MSU will want to know what it will take to *each* receive \$8 million annually for athletics, instead of something close to that sum across the both of them.