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ABSTRACT

This paper explores the benefits and negative aspects of a collegiate athletic department contracting with a third-party multimedia rights holder company, such as IMG, and allowing for this company to manage their sponsorship inventory. Secondary and primary research is presented to show how IMG is perceived and how well the relationship between the two entities works. Although some may see this company as too good to be true with its guaranteed payments over the contractual period, interviews with both collegiate athletic department and IMG staff prove that they have a very positive, opportunistic, and mutually beneficial relationship. The testimony offered in this paper presents a convincing argument that IMG is much more beneficial than detrimental to a collegiate athletic department.
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Introduction

As a business management student at the University of Arizona who has participated in sports marketing and management classes, my interest and desire to work in the sports industry has grown tremendously over the years and researching this topic will help me gain a more in-depth analysis on a field that will be part of my future career. The business of sports is a very large and complex industry, full of many different positions, levels of experience, and revenue generating entities. Rules and regulations for college-level sports highly differ from those of the professional-level. One thing that they both have in common is that the businesses driving the industry love to make money through ticket sales and sponsorship sales, among other things. Numerous colleges and universities contract with third-party multimedia rights holders such as IMG, while others opt to do everything in-house. In writing my thesis paper, I wanted to learn if it is more beneficial or detrimental for a collegiate athletic department to contract with a third-party multimedia rights holder like IMG, allowing for them to manage their sponsorship inventory. As with any partnership, the relationships between third-party multimedia rights holders and corresponding collegiate athletic departments are not all roses. Downsides are presented alongside the benefits of the relationships. After conducting sufficient research on this topic, I have discovered that it is very beneficial for a collegiate athletic department to form a mutually agreed upon contract with IMG, a third-party multimedia rights holder, because of their specialization, guaranteed payments, global presence, national sales capabilities, and strong relationship priorities.

Methodology

In order to gain insight on third-party multimedia rights holders and their relationships with corresponding collegiate athletic departments, I conducted secondary and primary research to collect useful data. The data collected gives a more in-depth, personal perspective on just how helpful the relationship may be between the two. A list and description of these data collections are shown below.

Secondary

The secondary data that was collected pertains to multimedia rights holders and focuses mainly on IMG. The first topic is the multimedia rights industry and key companies such as CBS Sports, Nelligan Sports Marketing Inc., ISP Sports, and Learfield Sports. Once all of the companies have been described, I have focused on IMG, which could arguably be the most powerful multimedia rights holder amongst its competitors. IMG has provided a large number of its own accomplishments as well as the major properties that it represents. Although most of the data that has been reported about IMG has been fabulous, there have been some blemishes in IMG’s image in recent news, shown in a lawsuit brought against IMG Worldwide’s Chairman Ted Forstmann (Drape).
Primary

In addition to existing secondary data, I conducted personal and phone interviews with both IMG employees who work closely with collegiate athletic department staff and with those collegiate athletic department staff who work closely with IMG employees. Both IMG and collegiate employees interviewed were of varying ranks and levels of management within their organizations. I interviewed five IMG employees and four collegiate athletic department staff members, each from a different college or university, and their backgrounds are listed below.

IMG

Ben Lorenzen started out as a Marketing Intern during his freshman year at Colorado State University, and then became an Athletic Marketing and Sales Associate at Wichita State University where he oversaw twenty corporate sponsorship accounts and all business aspects of the Wichita State Baseball Team. Ben was hired at Colorado State University as an Assistant Marketing Director for two years, promoted to Marketing Director for five years, saw that he was on the path to becoming an Athletic Director and decided to change his career direction. From there he learned to negotiate and generate revenue, and jumped into multimedia rights through IMG at The University of Arizona as a Sponsorship Consultant for two years. He has been the General Manager of IMG Arizona since January 2010. (Lorenzen)

Katie Stockberger started out as an intern for the Sacramento River Cats, a CSTV Campus rep intern and graduated from The University of Arizona. She then interned at IMG Arizona as a Sponsorship Assistant for one year. Katie was brought on board to IMG West Coast Conference in the Bay Area from IMG Arizona in September of 2008, right after a four-year agreement between IMG and the WCC was announced. She is currently a Sponsorship Service Executive and follows through with contracts made with sponsors as well as promotions during games. (Stockberger)

Dan Shell graduated from the University of California and worked as the Assistant Men’s Basketball Coach at St. Mary’s College for seven years. When the West Coast Conference formed a four-year agreement with IMG in September of 2008, Dan was brought on board as the General Manager of IMG West Coast Conference and oversees other smaller schools. In is dual role as the WCC’s General Manager, Dan is also a National Seller, meaning that any sponsor that he partners in the west he can sell across any university in the nation under IMG. (Shell)

Paul Woody started out by working in sales at the Las Vegas Motor Speedway. He maintained contacts and connections in college athletics and eventually became the Assistant General Manager and Corporate Sales Executive at UNLV ISP Sports and Entertainment Properties. ISP was acquired by IMG on December 1, 2010 and Paul maintained his position. (Woody)
Jason Kramer graduated as an undergrad in Marketing and worked in the Marketing Department of a college Athletic Department. He spent two years in grad school at UCLA, transferred to Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, TX. From there he worked for Learfield Sports Marketing for three years and then transferred to Jayhawks Sports Marketing at the University of Kansas where he currently works as a Senior Accounting Executive for IMG and the University of Kansas. (Kramer)

*Collegiate Athletics*

Shawn Chevreux is the Director of Marketing and Licensing for Arizona Athletics at The University of Arizona. His goal is to drive attendance and revenue, create an enjoyable atmosphere, and is in charge of advertisements, group tickets, and programming at sporting events. (Chevreux)

Michael Samuels is an Assistant Athletic Director of External Relations at St. Mary’s College. (Samuels)

Jerry Koloskie is the Deputy Director of Athletics at UNLV. (Koloskie)

Pete Muther is the Assistant Director for Sales and Marketing at the University of Kansas’ Jayhawks Sports Marketing. He is responsible for ticket sales, hospitality sales, and group sales. Pete focuses on revenue generating like selling sports merchandise and the Final 4 floor seats. (Muther)

*Literature Review*

*Multimedia Rights Competitors*

*Learfield Sports*

Learfield Sports has been in the multimedia rights business for over 35 years. Learfield’s mission is to “Build the Team, Grow the Company and Have Fun.” They pride themselves on their ability to provide over 1,000 sports radio programming stations all over the nation and strive to serve every relationship to the best of their ability. Learfield specializes in radio, signage, promotions, television, marketing, hospitality, internet, print and special events. Learfield currently is partnered with approximately fifty, large-scale colleges, universities, and conferences, such as Oklahoma, Texas A&M, and the Big Ten Conference. The last deal that Learfield Sports has signed was a $13 million contract with SDSU in February of 2011 (“Brookings”). A full list of Learfield properties is shown in Appendix A. (“Learfield Communications, Inc.”)
CBS Sports

CBS Collegiate Sports Properties, known as CBS Sports, was founded as Premier Sports in 1984 to be a leader in sports marketing. Top management has approximately 100 years of combined experience in the college sports marketing industry. They focus on creativity, professionalism, discipline, and the “true value of a relationship” that must exist between a university and a multimedia rights holder such as themselves. As a division of CBS, CBS Sports is part of a multimillion dollar entity that is continuing its strive to dominate many different areas of media and marketing. CBS Sports is in agreement with the NCAA worth $545 million a year, giving them the right to televise the tournaments of men’s basketball ("USATODAY.com") CBS Sports is partnered with eleven, small-scale properties, such as LSU, that are shown in Appendix B. (“Home.”)

Nelligan Sports Marketing Inc.

Nelligan Sports Marketing focuses on managing its partnered properties, building long-term relationships, and revenue generation. They have experienced sales executives that have generated beyond $375 million in contracts with sponsors. After eight years in the multimedia rights and marketing industry, Nelligan represents thirty collegiate properties and partakes in over 400 television and radio programs a year. They are partnered with three conferences, including the Pac 10, twenty-two collegiate properties, including Marquette, and four other properties, including the Capital One Bowl. In the first year at the University of Louisville, Nelligan Sports Marketing Inc. increased revenue from corporate sponsors by over $4 million. A full list of these properties is provided in Appendix C. (Nelligan Sports.)

ISP Sports

International Sports Properties, known as ISP Sports, was formed in 1992 in North Carolina. ISP has been a multimedia rights holder of about fifty universities such as Arizona State, Duke, UCLA, and Georgia. A full list of their partners is provided in Appendix D. ISP has a network of over 1,000 radio partners and 100 television outlets. ISP is partnered with the Sun Belt, BIG EAST, MAC, and ACC conferences, controls more than sixty offices regionally, partners two bowl games, and two sports venues. ISP had approximately 300 employees when it was acquired by IMG in 2010. (“IMG to Acquire ISP.”)

IMG

Company Overview

International Management Group, known as IMG College, considers themselves as “the leader in collegiate marketing (IMG College.,”IMG Worldwide”).” Although I am focusing on the U.S. market, IMG Sports and Entertainment operates in about thirty countries over a broad range of business practices (“IMG to acquire ISP.”). In 1974, Host Communications became the innovator in multimedia rights at a college level through the first radio contract with the
University of Kentucky (IMG College.). Host Communications and The Collegiate Licensing Company, known as the CLC, were acquired in 2007 by IMG World to create the foundation for what is now IMG College. IMG World has several divisions, including IMG Joint Ventures, IMG Reliance, IMG CCTV, IMG Events and Federation, IMG Fashion, IMG Models, IMG Arts+Commerce, IMG Clients, and IMG Academies (“IMG CONNECTS”). The IMG College division focuses on multimedia rights and licensing in the collegiate market and generates about “$1.083 billion in annual operating revenue (IMG College; Wong 232).”

ISP Acquisition

In 2010, IMG acquired ISP Sports and increased the ability for national sales in collegiate athletics. Collegiate athletic teams that were formerly under ISP Sports seem to show great anticipation and excitement for the increased potential of interest from national sponsors. They see this combination of two powerful forces as a great opportunity in revenue growth and fan base growth, as well as an increase in competition among sponsorships. As a result of the ISP acquisition, IMG will increase employment by 700 to accommodate former ISP employees and is expecting sales of more than $400 million a year. (“IMG to Acquire ISP Sports.”)

Multimedia Rights Services Offered

Multimedia services companies offers colleges and universities a large amount of services that generate revenue, provide a quality image, and generate an intricate marketing platform as a means to reach millions of fans (IMG College.). These services are listed below.

- Brand Licensing—IMG has its own licensing team, the CLC, that is used to protect numerous brands through trademarks. The CLC has an 80 percent market share of college licensing sales and represents the NCAA, bowl games, colleges, universities, conferences, and The Heisman Trophy. (IMG College.)
- Corporate Relationships—IMG and its competitors maintain excellent corporate sponsorship relationships in order to maximize revenue growth. (Nelligan Sports.)
- Events and Hospitality—IMG and its competitors provide an enjoyable experience and atmosphere for fans and a desired attraction for sponsors at events. (IMG College.; Nelligan Sports.)
- NCAA—IMG has been partnered with the NCAA since 1976 and prints all of the NCAA Championship Programs. (IMG College.)
- NCAA Football—IMG acts as a mediator and managing partner for NCAA Football since 1997. (IMG College.)
- Legends—A joint venture was formed with Legends Hospitality Management and gives IMG the right to sell to the U.S. college market licenses for premium seats, suites, tickets, concessions, and merchandise. (IMG College.)
- Marketing and Media Solutions—IMG participates in national, regional, and local multimedia sales with its 35 years of experience in the field. Radio and television programming totals about 8,500 hours a year and they produce over 400 collegiate
prints each year. IMG has long-term relationships with very well-known collegiate properties and conferences. (IMG College.)

Properties

IMG College partnered with a number of top colleges, universities, and conferences all across the United States over the 35 years that it has run its multimedia rights holder business. The partners include various teams, bowls, and conferences such as the West Coast Conference, the Little Caesars Pizza Bowl, The University of Arizona, UNLV, The University of Kansas, and St. Mary’s College. A full list of all of IMG’s partners is provided in Appendix E.

Positive Press

The majority of press on IMG comes from its own website and news section. There are, however, other sources that have reported on the success and positivity of IMG. The Better Business Bureau reports that IMG of Lexington, KY, although not a BBB accredited business, received an A+ rating based on its length of business operation, lack of filed complaints, and adequate amount of background on the business (“BBB Review”). The Daily Telegraph, a UK newspaper, called IMG College “a leader in collegiate marketing, licensing and media rights (“IMG Worldwide”).

Negative Press

Practically every business experiences negative press at some point, which is no exception to IMG. One of the only sources that I could find on IMG that appears to be negative came from a sports marketing blog called “rEvolution.” This source feels as though the promise that IMG and ISP make of picking up the tab if the guaranteed goal is not met will not be fulfilled and that it will not be solely put on IMG or ISP’s shoulders (“rEvolution Sports Marketing Blog”). ISL Worldwide, a world sports marketing agency that failed 8 years ago, could not fulfill its guarantee for the ATP Tour, having no way to retrieve the promised cash (“rEvolution Sports Marketing Blog”). It’s as if ISL did not know the right figures to project and pay their partnered collegiate athletic departments and there is a fear that the same fate will find IMG (“rEvolution Sports Marketing Blog”).

The other negative press that IMG received has to do with Ted Forstmann, IMG Worldwide’s chairman. Ted was sued in the fall of 2010 through the Los Angeles County Superior Court and accused of gambling on the men’s NCAA basketball tournaments and football games. This betting has been reported at an amount totally $600,000 from 2004 to 2007 at a point where IMG was already representing coaches from top college teams. This lawsuit has led to IMG creating its own compliance program against wagering for all IMG employees to comply with (Drape, Hanna).
Results

The interviews that I conducted contained various questions (See Appendix F) on specific topics like the relationships between IMG and college athletics staff, what benefits were apparent, and the conflicts that might arise. Since I could not find any secondary research on these topics, many questions were asked to see how well these two groups perceive each other. The topics and responses are discussed below.

Scope of IMG’s Responsibilities

The responsibilities of IMG are great in number and vary from one university to the next. In general, IMG is responsible for all corporate sponsorship sales and marketing for a specific college or university (Kramer, Samuels, Koloskie). This consists of television and radio networks, weekly coach shows, live men’s basketball games, venture signage, internet, special events, coach endorsements, brand protection, prints, game programs, and advertisements (Kramer, Koloskie, Lorenzen, Woody, Stockberger). IMG is the third-party multimedia rights holder that drives revenue, maintains the sensitivity to culture of the property, and has staff working at the university’s property (Shell).

Individual Responsibility at IMG

The interviewees are all currently in different positions within IMG’s corporate structure and with each position there is a separate span of control and individual responsibilities. Dan Shell, the GM of IMG at the WCC, has two employees and an intern that report to him (Shell). Ben Lorenzen, the GM of IMG Arizona, has eleven employees that report to him while he oversees the entire property (Lorenzen). Ben’s number one responsibility is to generate revenue, but he also has to fulfill contracts, keep a good relationship with the Athletic Director, run the television and radio broadcasting, and complete computer work (Lorenzen). At the University of Kansas, Senior Accounting Executive Jason Kramer works on projects with his interns, focuses on sales, handles the TV network, makes day-to-day contacts, and helps with all signage production (Kramer). Through the WCC, Katie Stockberger, the Sponsorship Service Executive, runs a small operation with the two interns that report to her and is responsible for maintaining relationships with sponsors as well as fulfilling promises to them (Stockberger). Former ISP turned IMG Assistant GM of UNLV Paul Woody is responsible for hitting his sales goals and orders and replaces signage (Woody).

New Sponsor Contact Methodology

The methodology used most often by IMG to contact new, potential corporate sponsors is cold calling (Shell). About 95% of these corporate sponsors have been reached by IMG’s cold calls since they are more personal than other channels such as email (Kramer). The most successful method comes from referrals of current clients, but does not happen very often (Woody). Once a potential client has been reached and is interested in becoming a sponsor,
IMG has an initial meeting with them to learn more about their business (Kramer). IMG then follows up with a customized package geared to the business’s individual needs (Kramer). As of late, IMG has mainly focused on regional companies, but, with the increased collegiate athletic market share due to the acquisition of ISP, IMG is beginning to focus on more national sales with larger companies (Stockberger).

Acquisition of ISP

Each IMG employee comes from a different background and set of experiences and each provide a unique perspective on IMG’s acquisition of ISP. The interviewees expect a positive affect with better benefits and more of a national platform (Lorenzen, Woody, Shell). They foresee more opportunities to grow and move among properties and are just waiting to see the changes that will take place (Kramer, Stockberger). Increasing from twenty to about 85 properties, IMG is proving itself as a growing company with a great reputation (Kramer, Lorenzen). IMG sees this opportunity to be similar to the NFL in that colleges across the nation may be packaged together for corporate sponsors to buy inventory as a single deal (Lorenzen). This acquisition will increase sponsorship, allow for IMG employees of separate universities to work together, and create more package inventory (Lorenzen). On a personal level, the interviewees see little to no change in their own responsibilities and an increase in their opportunities due to the upside potential of their contracts (Stockberger, Kramer, Shell, Woody).

Perceived Competition

Although there are a few other multimedia rights holders in the collegiate athletic market, the majority of IMG interviewees do not see any emerging competitors, especially nationally (Woody, Shell). They identified Learfield Sports as their closest competition, followed by Nelligan Sports since they acquired ISP (Woody, Stockberger, Shell, Kramer). Additionally, Stockberger sees universities that do everything in house such as USC as competition since they show no need for IMG staff (Stockberger).

University Contracts

When a university or college is ready to contract with a third-party multimedia rights holder, they are required by law to participate in a bidding process (Chevreux). During the bidding process, IMG and other multimedia rights holders evaluate the university, compare it to other schools, look at their corporate sales financial statements, and then put in a bid for what they feel the property is worth (Chevreux, Kramer, Woody). Once a university receives all of its bids, the Athletic Director and sometimes even the University President will choose a multimedia rights holder and negotiate the bid that they are comfortable with achieving (Samuels, Chevreux, Lorenzen). The multimedia rights holder determines the price to offer and usually the highest price or company with the best relationship to the university gets chosen (Kramer).
The majority of contracts are 10 years, which is important because it takes about 2 to 4 years for the program to establish itself in the community (Kramer, Woody, Lorenzen, Chevreux, Koloskie). It is beneficial for IMG to enter in a long-term contract, because it allows for relationships to develop and for sponsor partnerships to remain strong (Chevreux). Although IMG and their competitors do not release the guidelines of their contracts to the public, it is very likely that there are caveats within the contract relating to the deterioration of a collegiate sports team’s performance or the failure of a multimedia rights holder to perform at the level they projected. These caveats must be present within the contract to say that, if the teams of a collegiate athletic department have a certain number of consecutive losing seasons, then the multimedia rights holder is not to be held responsible for the lost revenue that may result. Additionally, if the collegiate sports team is performing much better than when the contract was initially negotiated with a certain multimedia rights holder, then the collegiate athletics department may want to renegotiate the current contract in order to bring in more money than previously agreed upon. Similarly, a multimedia rights holder may want to drop out of a contract or negotiate a lower guaranteed payout if the collegiate sports teams are not performing as well as they were during the initial agreement. These statements need to be mentioned within the contract and agreed upon in order to be valid.

During an established contract, they are allowed one extension, typically seen at 5 years added on to the current 10 year contract (Chevreux). The University of Arizona extended their contract with IMG in 2009 by 5 years for over $81 million that will be spread out over each year of the contract in guaranteed payments (Lorenzen). The University of Kansas has also extended their contract with IMG in 2010 by 5 years for $86 million in guaranteed payments over the span of the contract (Muther). IMG feels as if it is never too early to initiate renegotiation, but there needs to be a reason to do so (Lorenzen). Arizona’s contract was renegotiated and extended as a way to fund a new video board at their football stadium (Lorenzen, Kramer). Without a cause for an extension, renegotiation is initiated 6 months to a year before the contract it up (Kramer, Stockberger, Chevreux, Samuels, Muther).

**IMG’s Competitive Advantage**

IMG’s competitive advantage lies within its size and capabilities globally. IMG is a huge, global company with many, specialized divisions (Stockberger, Shell). IMG College has a huge network of schools and also has the ability to channel its best practices through a greater amount of resources (Kramer, Woody, Shell). A major competitive advantage of IMG is the fact that they own the CLC (Kramer, Stockberger). This CLC ownership leverages sponsorship dollars and is needed to protect the use of university logos (Kramer, Stockberger).

**IMG and Collegiate Athletics Relationship**

All IMG and collegiate athletics interviewees see their relationships with each other as great, positive, and mutually beneficial (Muther, Lorenzen, Woody, Shell, Stockberger, Chevreux, Kramer, Koloskie, Samuels). These relationships are seen as win-win and IMG employees are integrated and treated as if there were athletic department employees, where
they work in-house (Lorenzen, Woody, Shell, Stockberger, Chevreux). A good relationship between the two is a top priority of IMG employees like IMG Arizona GM Ben Lorenzen (Lorenzen). IMG staff attends all meetings with athletic department staff and sees no real difference except for the title on the paycheck (Lorenzen, Shell, Kramer, Koloskie). A very high trust level is present and they understand the importance of having each other (Shell, Lorenzen). Shawn Chevreux of Arizona Athletics knows that it is in IMG’s best interested to gain a profit and that building a strong relationship and helping each other will be beneficial for all (Chevreux, Kramer).

Reasons for IMG Partnership

Athletic departments completely understand the desire for teaming up with IMG. For practically all universities, athletic departments were handling ticket sales at the same time as they were trying to maximize their sponsorship revenue and it was way too time consuming (Chevreux). IMG provides a focused staff that is solely dedicated to maximizing sponsorship revenue and helps to balance the tasks of athletic departments, enabling specialization (Chevreux, Shell). Universities are guaranteed specific amounts of money regardless of certain situations, such as a downturn in the economy, which may cause IMG to fall short of their goals (Chevreux, Woody, Kramer). Once IMG has reached and exceeded the guaranteed amount in sponsorship revenue, IMG shares the additional revenue 50/50 with the university (Lorenzen). IMG provides national exposure and the ability to sell to multimillion dollar sponsors across 85 universities around the country (Koloskie, Muther, Samuels).

Discrepancies in Communication

The presence of discrepancies in communication between IMG and university athletics varies greatly in the responses from the interviewees. Some do not see any from their positions and feel as though communication goes pretty smoothly (Muther, Samuels, Shell, Koloskie). Others feel as though there always are and will always be discrepancies in communication (Chevreux, Kramer, Lorenzen, Stockberger, Woody). Athletic department staff speak with IMG staff about 5 times a day and are in charge of implementing and fulfilling the promotions and promises made to corporate sponsors (Chevreux, Kramer, Woody). Sometimes communication does not flow 100% when IMG is asked to do one thing and they do another (Woody, Chevreux). Having IMG as part of athletic department staff takes time getting used to and there is a constant butting of heads between the marketing and ticket office (Stockberger, Lorenzen).

Conflicts with IMG

The collegiate athletic staff found a few conflicts of interest that make working with IMG somewhat difficult. They understand that IMG is trying to please their corporate sponsorship clients, but that may clash with or encroach on what the collegiate athletic staff are doing already (Muther, Chevreux). There is an opportunity for give and take in this situation (Chevreux). IMG might want prime advertisement space on the website, but the athletic
department needs that space for sporting event information and will have to draw the line (Muther). Coaches may want to go sell their program, which conflicts with the IMG contract, so there is a continual education of coaches to make sure they have a clear understanding of how IMG fits into the program (Koloskie). Even with these possible issues, the collegiate athletic interviewees still see the relationship with IMG as very positive, balanced, and working very well (Samuels, Muther).

**Personal Effects to Job**

The majority of collegiate athletics interviewees feel as though having IMG as part of their university's marketing team makes their jobs easier (Chevreux, Koloskie, Muther). IMG allows for athletic departments to be more focused on their own responsibilities, frees up more time to sell tickets, and generates revenue for them without the athletics department forcing them to (Chevreux, Muther). Mike Samuels thinks it depends on how you look at it since IMG creates more work for him to implement, but generates more revenue and a greater opportunity for the athletic department (Samuels). “Difficulty is added, but the gains far outweigh the negatives (Chevreux).”

**Analysis/Conclusion**

The secondary and primary research compiled in this paper present both positives and negatives of collegiate athletic departments working with IMG, a third-party multimedia rights holder. IMG is much more beneficial than detrimental to collegiate athletic departments and the IMG’s number of university partners in continuing to grow. The major benefits of a college or university contracting with IMG would be:

- Extra time to focus on ticket sales and other aspects of business
- Revenue generated from sponsorships sales through IMG
- A guaranteed payment from IMG (around $86 million if the property is assessed to be in similar value to that of the University of Kansas) regardless of economic downturns
- Possible revenue sharing once the guaranteed amount has been reached
- IMG staff in-house to discuss sponsorships
- Possibility of partaking in national sponsorship sales
- Position in the largest third-party multimedia rights company with over 85 schools
- Teaming up with the owners of the CLC
- Strong, positive relationship with IMG staff

IMG has proven to be a credible business with a focused scope of responsibilities in which the company truly shows its expertise. With any partnership, there will be some conflicts that need to be overcome. IMG works very well with its collegiate partners and focuses on their relationship as a top priority in order to minimize the discrepancies in their communication. With all of the data presented previously in this paper, it is easy to see why an athletic department of a college or university would partner with IMG and build their brand.
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APPENDIX A

Learfield Sports Partners:

("Learfield Communications, Inc.: Our Partners.")
APPENDIX B

CBS Sports Partners:

LSU Sports Properties
N. Stadium Dr. at Nicholson Dr.
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
P.O. Box 26066
Baton Rouge, LA - 70894
Phone: 225 578 7049
Fax: 225 578 6966

Virginia Sports Properties
1815 Stadium Rd.
Bryant Hall, 2nd Fl.
Charlottesville, VA - 22903
P.O. Box 400857
Charlottesville, VA - 22904
Phone: 434 982 4887
Fax: 434 982 4788

Falcon Sports Marketing
2610 Rebecca Lane, Suite 121
Colorado Springs, CO 80917
Phone: 719 596 6752
Fax: 719 596 9997

Terrapin Sports Marketing
407 Samuel Riggs IV Alumni Center, Suite 2144
College Park, MD 20742
Phone: 301 405 9993
Fax: 301 314 0373

Towson Sports Properties
Towson Center
8000 York Road
Towson, MD 21252
Phone: 410 704 3201
Fax: 410 704 3270

ODU Sports Properties
124 Athletic Administration Building
Norfolk, Virginia 23529-0201
Phone: 757 680 4705
Fax: 757 683 3119

Utah Sports Properties
421 Wasara Way, Suite 201
Salt Lake City, UT - 84108
Phone: 801 587 2050
Fax: 801 587 3416

Tallahassee Leon County Civic Center
2525 Country Club Drive
Norcross, GA 30071
Phone: 225 578 5977
Aloha Sports Properties
1360 Kapiolani Pkwy
Honolulu, HI 96817
Phone: 433-502-5471

("Home.")
APPENDIX C

Nelligan Sports Partners:

CONFERENCES

- Horizon League
- Patriot League
- PAC 10

COLLEGE PROPERTIES

- Brown University Bears
- Bucknell University Bison
- Cal Poly Mustangs
- Cleveland State University Vikings
- Colorado State Rams
- Fairfield Stags
- Florida Atlantic Owls
- Indiana State Sycamores
- Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne Mastodons
- Louisville Cardinals
- Marquette Golden Eagles
- Middle Tennessee Blue Raiders
- Missouri State Bears
- Monmouth University Hawks
- University of Pennsylvania Quakers
- Princeton Tigers
- Providence Friars
- Rutgers Scarlet Knights
- West Virginia Mountaineers
- Wisconsin-Green Bay Phoenix
OTHER PROPERTIES

Capital One Bowl  Champs Sports Bowl  Orlando Citrus Parade

The Penn Relays

(Nelligan Sports.)
APPENDIX D

ISP Partners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Southern Miss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>USF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal</td>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>Villanova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>Washington State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>BIG EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami (Fla.)</td>
<td>MAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Sun Belt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(“IMG to Acquire ISP.”)
### APPENDIX E

**IMG Partners:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Big East</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Big 12</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>SEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Cal</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Football Championship Subdivision Partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big South Conference Appalachian State</th>
<th>MAC</th>
<th>Sun Belt</th>
<th>U-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big South Conference Appalachian State</td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>South Alabama</td>
<td>UCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>East Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Western Kentucky</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Miss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UTEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TCU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Valued Partners**

- Belk Bowl
- D-1A Athletic Directors Association
- Dave Campbell's Texas Football
- UNC Greensboro
- Greensboro Coliseum
- Gonzaga
- Little Caesars Pizza Bowl
- Lone Star Showdown
- Longwood
- NCAA
- NCAA Football
- Pepperdine
- Red River Rivalry
- Santa Clara
- Saint Mary's College
- University Interscholastic League
- West Coast Conference
- Winston-Salem Entertainment Sports Complex
National reach with local execution

IMG College leverages multi-media rights at over 70 collegiate properties, leasing conferences and the NCAA offering integration asset opportunities, including:

- Digital
- Print
- TV
- In-Venue
- Radio
- Digital
- Hospitality
- New Media

(IMG College.)
Interview Questions

1. Why would (your college or university) contract with IMG? What are you doing for them/what are they doing for you?
2. What is the scope of IMG’s responsibilities?
3. What type of relationship do you feel IMG has with (your college/university)? Is it mutually beneficial?
4. Are there any discrepancies in communications?
5. How long is (your school’s) contract and who determines the length?
6. Who determines how much the contract is for?
7. How soon before the contract ends does IMG initiate renegotiation?
8. What changes do you foresee as a result of IMG’s acquisition of ISP?
9. Who are the emerging competitors in this industry?
10. What are IMG’s competitive advantages?
11. What methodology does IMG use to contact new customers?
12. What is your position at (IMG or the collegiate athletic department) and how did you get into this current position?
13. What are your personal responsibilities?
14. What is your span of control at IMG?
15. How do you feel about IMG’s acquisition of ISP? Will it affect your position? Will you gain more responsibilities?
16. What aspect of the business gives you the most trouble?
17. As a collegiate athletic department staff member, how often do you work with IMG employees? Do you have a close relationship?
18. Does having IMG as part of (your collegiate athletic department’s marketing team) make your job easier or harder?
19. What do you least enjoy about working with IMG?