

Coastal Carolina University CCU Digital Commons

Honors Theses

Honors College and Center for Interdisciplinary
Studies

Fall 12-15-2012

Title IX Compliance: A Comparison of Division I Equality

Jacqueline Leake
Coastal Carolina University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/honors-theses>

 Part of the [Applied Mathematics Commons](#), and the [Sports Management Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Leake, Jacqueline, "Title IX Compliance: A Comparison of Division I Equality" (2012). *Honors Theses*. 59.
<https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/honors-theses/59>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College and Center for Interdisciplinary Studies at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact commons@coastal.edu.

TITLE IX COMPLIANCE: A COMPARISON OF DIVISION I EQUALITY

2012

BY

JACQUELINE LEAKE

RECREATION AND SPORT MANAGEMENT

APPLIED MATHEMATICS

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science
In the Honors Program at
Coastal Carolina University**

December 2012

Abstract

The passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 has had a significant impact on college athletics. However, there is still a large disparity between opportunities offered for men and women. This study determined the true gender equality within Division I athletics. Inequalities were assessed in the areas of athletic participation, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses. Data from these areas were gathered from the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Analysis Cutting Tool. Ratios and the difference between the ideal and current values were calculated for each category. Institutions were ranked in each category, as well as by total composite score. It is believed that schools will meet Title IX, but will not be equitable in all areas. Based upon the data and results, based on both strict proportionality and proportionality within five percent, Division I athletics are not equitable in the assessed areas.

Introduction

Since the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, gender equality in college athletics has grown significantly. Unfortunately, there are still large gaps in the equity of certain athletic components that leave college athletics as a whole inequitable. As there are still inequities in college athletics, more research needs to be conducted in order to identify the areas which are inequitable and develop solutions to create equality.

The purpose of this research is to determine whether there is true gender equality in Division I college athletics based upon the tenants of Title IX. Although many schools comply with Title IX through the three-prong test, the compliance does not reflect the true meaning or intent of the law. All Division I schools will be assessed on their gender ratios with regard to the following four areas:

- Athletic participation rates for male and female students compared to the full-time undergraduate enrollment for males and females
- Athletically related student aid for male athletes versus female athletes
- Recruiting expenses for male athletes versus female athletes
- Total expenses for male athletes versus female athletes

A composite score for each Division I school will be computed using rankings for athletic participation rates, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses. A comparison of these scores will elucidate which schools meet Title IX by the three-prong test, but are not truly equitable. This data can then be sorted to see how factors such as football/non-football schools, Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS)/Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) schools, and conference affect athletic participation rates, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses.

Literature Review

Title IX History

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states that “no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (20 U.S.C., 1972). While Title IX does not specifically apply to athletics, it has been used to increase gender equality within college and high school sport. The 1979 Policy Interpretation elucidates the three ways in which schools can provide equal opportunity in athletics. In order to meet Title IX requirements, schools must meet a minimum of one part of the three-prong test: proportional athletic participation opportunities, a history of progress towards equality, or adequately accommodating the underrepresented sex’s interests and abilities (Department of Health, Education, 1979). A clarification of the 1979 Policy Interpretation in 2003 urges schools to use the flexibility of the three-prong test to pursue athletic equality (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). Proportionality is the most commonly used method for meeting Title IX, as it is the easiest to compute and prove. Part three of the test, adequate accommodation, is often used for justification where there exists high disproportionality (Ali, 2010). In order to further simplify the steps necessary to comply with Title IX, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) released a practical guide on gender equity in 2008. When determining overall gender equity, the following components must be evaluated: equipment and supplies, scheduling of games and practice times, travel and related expenses, coaching, locker rooms, practice and competitive facilities, publicity, medical and training facilities and services, housing and dining facilities and services, academic tutoring, support services, and resources for recruiting student athletes (*A Guide to Gender*, 2009).

Title IX Legal Implications

Since 1972, several court cases have been filed citing violations of Title IX. Cases generally fall under the categories of effective accommodation, program elimination, separate programs, retaliation, sexual harassment, and employment (*Gender Equity in Intercollegiate*, 2008). As strict data can prove a violation of proportionality, it is the most common prong used when citing a violation of Title IX. One of the first cases focusing on the issue of proportionality was *Cohen v. Brown University* (1993). In this case, Brown University cut the men's water polo and golf teams and the women's gymnastics and volleyball teams in order to reduce costs. These cuts resulted in disproportionate athletic participation, thereby violating Title IX. The court ruled that Brown University must reinstate the women's gymnastics and volleyball teams (*Cohen v. Brown University*, 1993). In the same year, the court ruled in *Roberts v. Colorado State* that the 10.5 percent disparity in women's athletic opportunities, 37.7 percent, to men's 48.2 percent violated Title IX (1993). The court ruled in 2000 that Louisiana State University violated Title IX as 49% of the student population was female, but females only comprised 29% of athletes (*Pederson v. Louisiana State University*). While it is the easiest prong to prove, participation proportionality has not been the only Title IX violation brought to court. *Gonyo v. Drake University* determined in 1995 that the financial aid distribution ratio was inequitable and the university needed to increase financial assistance for women athletes.

The Controversy

Several court cases have also involved employment opportunities for women in sport. By prohibiting gender discrimination, one of the possible consequences of Title IX was to equate coaching opportunities for men and women. There remain several obstacles left to overcome until equality is reached. One of the major discrepancies between coaches is found in salaries.

Over time, courts have ruled in favor of athletic departments in salary related sex discrimination cases as schools can often justify the pay difference based on factors other than gender. A 2004 study conducted by Acosta and Carpenter showed that women were the head coaches in only seven of the twenty-five sports surveyed (Richman, 2010). In 2012, an update to this study showed promising results. The number of female professionals employed in college athletics, women's intercollegiate teams and women's teams per school, female head coaches of women's teams, paid assistant coaches of women's teams, and female paid assistant coaches were the highest in history (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Yet, there are still major discrepancies such as one in five head coaches of teams are female, less than half of women's teams are coached by a female, and 20.3% of athletic directors are women (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). There are theories that suggest that by definition of sex-segregated athletic teams, a true merit-based distribution of athletic participation is impossible. If men and women's athletic abilities are compared on a sex-specific ordinal scale, the qualitative differences are not measured. If athletic abilities are compared on a qualitative scale, the measure of quality would still be sex-specific (Yuracko, 2002). Furthermore, schools that have a football program have significantly further to go to reach equality than schools without football. With median football rosters at 110 and 92 players, for Division I-A and Division I-AA respectively, it becomes difficult to provide women with proportionate opportunity (Sigelman & Wahlbeck, 1999).

Equal treatment states that athletic departments must supply a quantity of athletic programs of quality (Buzuvis & Newhall, 2012). Violations of equal treatment are often not as widely publicized because claims are not as controversial as equal opportunity claims (Buzuvis & Newhall, 2012). Although not as widely publicized, the presence of unequal treatment displays the need for athletic departments to delve further into their programs to evaluate their

compliance with Title IX. Athletic director's face a dual issue in that they need to increase revenue while simultaneously complying with Title IX. Maintaining successful football and basketball programs is the easiest method to increase revenue (Kennedy, 2007). Unfortunately, these programs do not typically have female participants and therefore will not increase female athletic participation to meet Title IX requirements.

Determining whether schools meet Title IX through the proportionality requirement should occur through a "flexible, case specific analysis" (Stevens, 2004, p. 174). Substantial proportionality is not defined through set ratios, causing dilemmas when athletic departments are reviewed for compliance with Title IX. The flexibility allowed often permits athletic departments to meet the first part of the three-prong test without meeting the true intent of the law, to provide equality in athletics. If true equality of opportunity existed, substantial proportionality would not be necessary as the proportions of athlete ratios to undergraduate ratios would inherently balance (Simons, 2011). A continuance of disproportionality will ultimately lead to a resurgence of gender roles, the exact opposite of the purpose of Title IX (Simons, 2011). Between 1981-82 and 1998-99, women collegiate athletes rose from 90,000 to 163,000 (Staurowsky, 2003). Yet, in 2000-01, the number of institutions meeting substantial proportionality for participation and scholarships was 79 and 91, or 25 and 28 percent, respectively (Stafford, 2004). Institutions are more likely to meet compliance or be in the process of making progress towards compliance when the institution is large and/or has low percentages of female undergraduates (Stafford, 2004).

One method of measuring institution compliance is through the Kennedy Index. Data was compiled for each student in the categories of athletic participation, scholarship allocations, recruitment spending, operating expenditures, and coaching salaries. With each criterion, the

difference is calculated between the true institutional value and the established goal. The established goals for participation and scholarship are 0.00% and the goals for operations expenses, recruitment budget, and coaching salaries is 40.00%. These five criteria are then summed to determine a composite score for each institution. (Kennedy, 2006)

This study will compile institutional data in the categories of participation, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses. Based on this data, composite scores will be computed in order to determine the level of equitability in each institution. The data will illustrate the gaps that remain within athletic departments regarding Title IX. There is a need for this study because there is still room for improvement with regard to gender related athletic opportunity. Title IX was created to eliminate gender discrimination in federally funded educational programs. If schools are meeting Title IX through one of the three prongs, but are far from being proportional in terms of student aid, recruiting expenses, and operating expenses, then they are still discriminating based on gender. In the essence of what the law is intended to do, the lack of proportionality in these areas would be a violation of Title IX. This study will show which areas are still unproportional and how far away the areas are from being proportional. In elucidating the areas in which athletic departments are not truly equitable, athletic departments can redirect their efforts towards achieving the goal of equality.

Hypothesis

It is believed that while many schools will meet Title IX by the three-prong test, they will not be equitable in areas of athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses. This study will allow Division I schools to identify areas of weakness and make necessary changes to continue to strive for gender equity.

Methodology

Participants

This study was conducted using the 343 schools within Division I athletics during the 2010-2011 academic year. Furthermore, 117 schools were part of the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), 123 schools were part of the Football Championship Subdivision (FCS), and 103 schools did not have football. The schools comprised 35 different conferences. The list of schools used can be found in Table 1.

Data Collection

Data gathered for each school was provided by the Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool (EADA). The data provided by the EADA was collected by The Office of Postsecondary Education during the 2010-2011 academic year. Schools are required to submit data by the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act in order to assist the U.S. Department of Education's report on gender equity in intercollegiate athletics (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2012). The categories of data used by this study are undergraduate enrollment, football/non-football school, FBS/FCS school, conference, athletic participation, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses. Demographic information was also collected on each Division I school.

Procedure

After data was collected, ratios were calculated for male/female athletic participation, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses. For athletic participation, the difference was calculated between the total undergraduate population for males and the unduplicated athletic participation for males. For athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses, the difference was calculated between unduplicated athletic

participation for males and the male ratio for the respective three categories. Unduplicated athletic participation was used as this most accurately reflects the true amount of male and female athletes. This is based on factors such as women's track athletes being counted twice for indoor and outdoor track and male practice players being counted as women athletes. Schools were then ranked 1-343 in each category based on these differences, with 1 being the school with the difference closest to 0 and 343 being the school with the furthest distance from 0. Once rankings were determined for the four components, athletic participation, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses, the rankings were summed to determine a total composite score for each school. The lower the total composite score, the closer a school is to true gender equity in athletics. For example, Michigan State University had a participation ranking of 52, athletically related student aid ranking of 76, recruiting expenses ranking of 67, and total expenses ranking of 16. Adding these rankings together, the total institution score was 211, the lowest total institution score in Division I, giving them an overall ranking of 1.

Schools were also compared based on conference. Each school was given a ranking within their conference from 1-n, where n is the number of schools in a given conference. The average participation, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, total expenses, and total composite score for each conference were determined. The conferences were then ranked based on average conference composite score. Similarly, average rankings were given for football/non-football schools and FBS/FCS schools.

Data Analysis

T-tests and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used to determine whether conference, having a football program, and being in the FBS or FCS affected participation, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses.

Results

Average values for the four data values and total composite score can be found for FBS programs, FCS programs, schools without football, and conferences. The average scores for schools based upon football can be found in the Table 2 below.

Table 2: FBS/FCS/No Football Averages

Football Division	Average Participation Score	Average Athletic Student Aid Score	Average Recruiting Expenses Score	Average Total Expenses Score	Average Total Institution Score
FBS	143.68	160.32	163.72	168.85	636.57
FCS	218.07	184.22	150.21	210.48	762.98
No Football	149.15	170.67	207.43	129.63	656.87

Table 3 displays the 35 conferences used in this study and their respective average institution score. The top ten Division I schools and total institutional scores are as follows:

1. Michigan State University- 211
2. University of Vermont- 215
3. Baylor University- 224
4. University at Buffalo- 225
5. University of Maryland- Baltimore County- 232
6. Robert Morris University- 248
7. Saint Bonaventure University- 271
8. Saint Peter's College- 290
9. University of Tulsa- 292
10. American University- 311

The following ten Division I schools have the worst ten institutional scores:

1. Citadel Military College of South Carolina- 1271

2. Norfolk State University- 1207
3. University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff- 1183
4. Troy University- 1176
5. Bethune-Cookman University- 1164
6. University of South Alabama- 1132
7. Charleston Southern University- 1132
8. Valparaiso University- 1125
9. Arkansas State University- Main Campus- 1116
10. Butler University- 1115

The entire list of schools and scores can be found in Table 1.

Table 4 shows the number of schools that are found to be gender equitable within athletic participation, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses when using strict proportionality.

Table 4: Number of Schools Meeting Strict Proportionality

	Total Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools (%)	Number of FBS Schools	Number of FCS Schools	Number of schools without football
Athletic Participation	14	4.08	6	2	6
Athletically Related Student Aid	5	1.46	1	3	1
Recruiting Expenses	2	0.58	0	2	0
Total Expenses	1	0.29	0	0	1

Table 5 shows the number of schools found to be equitable in the same categories using the standard five percent deviation.

Table 5: Number of Schools Meeting Proportionality Within Five Percent

	Total Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools (%)	Number of FBS Schools	Number of FCS Schools	Number of schools without football
Athletic Participation	126	36.73	59	23	44
Athletically Related Student Aid	122	35.57	42	44	36
Recruiting Expenses	68	19.83	28	29	11
Total Expenses	60	17.49	22	21	17

A statistical significance with $p=0.00$ was found between FBS/FCS and population within five percent of strict proportionality. Statistical significances were not found between FBS/FCS or conference and strict proportionality. The University of Toledo, the Big Ten Conference, and FBS rank first in total Division I, conferences, and football, respectively. Statistical significances of $p=0.00$ were found between FBS/FCS, as well as conference, and athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses. The top programs for athletically related student aid are the University of Pennsylvania, the Big Twelve, and FBS. Campbell University, the Southwestern Athletic Conference, and FCS rank first in recruiting expenses. Total expenses are most equitable at Niagara University, in Division I Independents, and in the FBS.

Discussion

These results show that football programs and whether the program is a member of the FBS or the FCS plays a large role in determining participation proportionality within five percent. Neither conference, nor FBS/FCS involvement, has a factor in determining strict proportionality. FBS/FCS has a statistical significance with athletically related student aid,

recruiting expenses, and total expenses. With only 14 schools meeting Title IX through strict proportionality and 126 meeting Title IX through the five percent allowance, the majority of schools do not meet Title IX through the first prong of athletic participation. As such, athletic departments need to be aware of the effects football programs have on athletic participation opportunities. These effects can alter decision making processes of maintaining a football program, reclassifying to a new division, or creating a football program.

With so many schools not meeting Title IX through the participation prong, the question arises of how many of the remaining 217 schools are in compliance of Title IX through the history of progress or accommodation prongs. Many schools may not be in compliance with Title IX through any prong, but may not be receiving consequences for their lack of compliance. The FBS has the lowest average value in comparison with the FCS and no football schools. This is most likely because FBS schools are under more scrutiny to be in compliance with Title IX than smaller schools in the FCS or schools without football.

The results of this study show that there are still large inequities within Division I collegiate athletics. Fewer than five percent of schools are gender equitable in athletic participation, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses with respect to strict proportionality. Similarly, fewer than 37% of schools display gender equality in the same categories when allowing for a five percent deviation. This shows that while schools may be meeting Title IX through the three-prong test, they are still not meeting the true intent of the law.

Limitations

This research study was limited by the data provided by the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Analysis Cutting Tool. All data provided by schools was assumed to be factual in our analysis.

Recommendations

While this research shows that there are statistical significances between FBS/FCS and conference with relation to participation within five percent, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and total expenses, further research is needed to determine the exact causes of these differences. The EADA provides further data categories than the four analyzed in this study. As such, subsequent research could delve into whether FBS/FCS and conference have an effect on these other categories, such as coaching salaries and coaching numbers. This study could also be applied to Division II and Division III programs to determine gender equality.

Appendices
Table 1: Division I Schools and Scores

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
Michigan State University	52	76	67	16	211	1
University of Vermont	9	33	105	68	215	2
Baylor University	81	56	39	48	224	3
University at Buffalo	36	10	23	156	225	4
University of Maryland-Baltimore County	32	22	80	98	232	5
Robert Morris University	30	169	14	35	248	6
Saint Bonaventure University	90	103	18	60	271	7
Saint Peter's College	91	155	6	38	290	8
University of Tulsa*	14	146	78	54	292	9
American University	72	79	116	44	311	10
DePaul University	6	170	74	77	327	11
Rutgers University-New Brunswick	20	153	113	46	332	12
West Virginia University*	62	157	75	43	337	13
Oregon State University*	11	192	83	53	339	14
Purdue University-Main Campus	73	13	175	79	340	15
Harvard University	172	4	34	134	344	16
Niagara University	142	139	70	1	352	17
Longwood University	175	68	102	7	352	18
Vanderbilt University	109	150	93	4	356	19
Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi	82	91	179	13	365	20
Northern Arizona University	188	119	57	3	367	21
University of Central Florida	164	125	65	20	374	22
Colorado State University-Fort Collins	18	190	149	18	375	23
Ball State University	53	214	8	100	375	24
University of Maryland-College Park*	60	59	161	97	377	25
University of Arkansas at Little Rock	128	55	188	8	379	26
Idaho State University	118	26	176	63	383	27
Ohio State University-Main Campus*	4	164	146	70	384	28
Brown University	70	83	168	66	387	29
Texas A & M University-College Station*	15	37	123	212	387	30
Belmont University	167	57	159	6	389	31

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
Washington State University	12	230	49	103	394	32
The University of Texas-Pan American	235	40	36	86	397	33
Illinois State University	158	81	107	56	402	34
Iowa State University	38	16	157	193	404	35
Kansas State University	3	73	202	128	406	36
Xavier University	92	133	171	15	411	37
Syracuse University	203	102	104	12	421	38
Loyola Marymount University	154	115	133	19	421	39
La Salle University	44	30	321	26	421	40
Wichita State University	89	182	135	33	439	41
University of Louisiana-Monroe	324	3	4	109	440	42
Central Connecticut State University	33	194	187	37	451	43
Clemson University	22	259	101	71	453	44
Texas Tech University	64	90	61	238	453	45
Auburn University	112	35	150	157	454	46
Saint Louis University-Main Campus	58	138	164	99	459	47
Northwestern University	48	41	64	312	465	48
The University of Tennessee	83	47	40	296	466	49
Villanova University	56	70	85	256	467	50
Youngstown State University	136	173	118	41	468	51
Weber State University	87	210	127	49	473	52
University of Akron Main Campus	161	167	53	92	473	53
Chipola College	147	237	15	76	475	54
Oklahoma State University-Main Campus	103	224	54	94	475	55
University of Utah	27	282	45	122	476	56
Miami University-Oxford	115	260	46	61	482	57
Tennessee Technological University	99	21	95	269	484	58
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	10	14	279	190	493	59
Rice University	221	19	122	132	494	60
University of Pennsylvania*	246	1	2	246	495	61
Kent State University at Kent	250	52	91	105	498	62
Gonzaga University	19	160	312	9	500	63

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
Saint Francis University	263	162	51	25	501	64
Old Dominion University	148	195	84	75	502	65
Towson University	237	39	25	202	503	66
Boston College*	67	222	191	30	510	67
University of Iowa	65	50	284	112	511	68
University of Hawaii at Manoa	150	24	231	107	512	69
University of Missouri-Kansas City	57	255	199	5	516	70
Pennsylvania State University-Main Campus*	69	281	3	164	517	71
Centenary College of Louisiana	205	9	247	62	523	72
Columbia University in the City of New York	28	8	239	248	523	73
South Dakota State University	7	196	184	141	528	74
Stanford University*	59	58	170	241	528	75
Northeastern University	135	114	248	32	529	76
St. Francis College	149	227	43	110	529	77
College of Charleston	139	116	265	11	531	78
University of California-Davis	97	180	79	178	534	79
University of Idaho	105	15	183	231	534	80
Marquette University	8	243	246	39	536	81
University of Notre Dame*	145	123	5	263	536	82
University of New Hampshire-Main Campus	74	184	224	57	539	83
Northern Illinois University	137	229	126	51	543	84
Loyola University-Chicago	275	131	69	69	544	85
Oakland University	216	118	193	24	551	86
University of Maine*	71	258	108	116	553	87
Radford University	31	84	329	114	558	88
University of Washington-Seattle Campus	39	217	160	144	560	89
University of Arkansas*	125	144	233	64	566	90
Santa Clara University	25	108	260	179	572	91
University of Florida	212	44	197	120	573	92
University of Kansas	43	159	290	82	574	93
SUNY at Binghamton	94	136	35	310	575	94
The University of Texas at Austin	45	130	300	101	576	95
Rider University	248	78	232	21	579	96
Presbyterian College	289	62	17	217	585	97

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
George Mason University	108	142	297	42	589	98
University of Georgia	187	17	294	93	591	99
The University of Texas at Arlington	190	86	156	159	591	100
Indiana University-Bloomington	50	109	213	220	592	101
Colgate University	184	186	142	83	595	102
University of New Orleans	285	20	32	258	595	103
University of Louisville	79	172	288	58	597	104
University of Rhode Island	68	165	185	180	598	105
University of Nebraska-Lincoln*	151	48	201	200	600	106
Saint Marys College of California	24	231	258	88	601	107
Arizona State University	185	54	219	145	603	108
University of Massachusetts Amherst	23	27	326	230	606	109
Providence College	86	149	276	96	607	110
Saint Joseph's University	123	264	137	84	608	111
Utah State University	76	262	147	125	610	112
University of South Carolina-Columbia	78	286	106	146	616	113
Temple University	106	197	289	27	619	114
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	93	75	230	221	619	115
University of Oklahoma Norman Campus*	42	69	314	196	621	116
The University of Alabama	75	38	256	253	622	117
Southern Illinois University Carbondale	126	107	182	208	623	118
Quinnipiac University	80	64	335	147	626	119
Creighton University	61	174	273	119	627	120
Florida Gulf Coast University	40	270	172	149	631	121
University of California-Riverside	16	226	249	143	634	122
University of Miami	55	187	320	73	635	123
Howard University	313	12	221	89	635	124
University of New Mexico-Main Campus	268	7	119	242	636	125
University of Connecticut	104	128	124	280	636	126
Portland State University	178	212	131	117	638	127
Dartmouth College	110	124	143	261	638	128

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
University of Illinois at Chicago	236	85	13	305	639	129
Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus	252	141	97	151	641	130
California State University-Northridge	100	233	280	29	642	131
California State University-Fullerton	183	202	203	55	643	132
Boise State University	119	256	178	90	643	133
University of Northern Iowa*	215	6	228	195	644	134
University of Wisconsin-Madison	34	269	311	31	645	135
University of South Dakota	213	247	24	162	646	136
Montana State University	95	89	173	290	647	137
Mississippi Valley State University	303	80	128	137	648	138
Bucknell University	13	225	287	124	649	139
University of Mississippi Main Campus	259	74	90	227	650	140
Pepperdine University	170	63	158	260	651	141
California State University-Sacramento	122	241	262	28	653	142
University of Denver	194	32	226	203	655	143
Indiana State University	96	94	257	209	656	144
Hofstra University	120	100	285	153	658	145
Louisiana Tech University	179	295	16	169	659	146
University of Southern California	130	175	167	187	659	147
Texas Southern University	254	287	55	65	661	148
South Carolina State University	210	45	166	240	661	149
Bowling Green State University-Main Campus	191	232	153	87	663	150
University of North Carolina at Charlotte	2	236	251	177	666	151
New Jersey Institute of Technology	260	42	98	266	666	152
Texas Christian University	267	49	56	295	667	153
San Diego State University	54	284	308	22	668	154
Houston Baptist University	220	137	259	52	668	155
University of North Dakota*	17	310	333	10	670	156

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*	37	249	282	102	670	157
University of California-Santa Barbara*	180	2	195	294	671	158
Lehigh University	26	261	86	302	675	159
Cornell University*	157	296	76	148	677	160
Drexel University	77	211	261	129	678	161
University of Missouri-Columbia	272	101	99	206	678	162
Morgan State University	232	34	112	300	678	163
Drake University	211	134	162	172	679	164
Stony Brook University	159	120	77	333	689	165
University of Pittsburgh-Pittsburgh Campus*	193	206	141	150	690	166
George Washington University	29	315	301	50	695	167
University of Nevada-Las Vegas	144	179	313	67	703	168
Iona College	140	257	305	2	704	169
Liberty University	256	307	30	111	704	170
North Carolina A & T State University	177	104	242	181	704	171
Canisius College	207	121	190	186	704	172
Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis	21	306	332	47	706	173
Wake Forest University	265	293	37	113	708	174
Gardner-Webb University	342	61	82	226	711	175
Northwestern State University of Louisiana	337	188	27	161	713	176
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	332	277	21	85	715	177
Georgia Southern University	171	291	81	173	716	178
Fordham University	239	53	148	277	717	179
Winthrop University	286	95	174	163	718	180
Eastern Kentucky University	293	65	222	140	720	181
Virginia Commonwealth University	189	279	58	194	720	182
Marshall University	225	93	144	259	721	183
Wright State University-Main Campus	113	113	216	279	721	184
University of Richmond*	168	11	339	204	722	185

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
Fairleigh Dickinson University-Metropolitan Campus	153	163	115	292	723	186
Duquesne University	146	185	204	189	724	187
Alabama State University	298	283	63	81	725	188
Ohio University-Main Campus	181	292	42	210	725	189
Jacksonville State University	281	96	103	245	725	190
East Carolina University	280	288	19	139	726	191
Delaware State University	266	23	253	184	726	192
Yale University*	152	25	227	326	730	193
University of North Carolina at Wilmington	98	321	278	34	731	194
University of Hartford	196	66	237	232	731	195
Florida State University	227	198	33	274	732	196
Brigham Young University-Provo	163	43	238	288	732	197
University of California-Irvine	169	151	275	138	733	198
Western Illinois University	231	88	114	301	734	199
University of Toledo	1	285	323	126	735	200
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	249	132	136	219	736	201
University of San Diego	182	82	181	291	736	202
University of Virginia-Main Campus	222	147	277	91	737	203
The University of Montana	245	18	223	252	738	204
University of Nevada-Reno	66	317	342	14	739	205
The University of Texas at El Paso	219	92	263	165	739	206
Davidson College	229	207	38	265	739	207
University of North Florida	51	251	343	95	740	208
University of Delaware	226	98	218	198	740	209
Georgia State University	308	171	10	255	744	210
Southern Methodist University	111	36	293	306	746	211
Coppin State University	321	145	241	40	747	212
University of North Carolina at Asheville	247	67	205	228	747	213
University of Louisiana-Lafayette	309	127	47	264	747	214
Mercer University	318	99	59	271	747	215

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
University of North Texas	46	154	324	224	748	216
Missouri State University-Springfield	141	140	220	247	748	217
Southern University and A & M College	319	111	12	307	749	218
California State University-Fresno	117	252	322	59	750	219
University of California-Los Angeles	107	166	304	175	752	220
San Jose State University	127	143	250	233	753	221
Mount St Mary's University	209	204	211	131	755	222
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	134	337	87	201	759	223
University of the Pacific	47	203	336	174	760	224
Stetson University	116	250	207	188	761	225
Utah Valley University	85	300	165	211	761	226
North Carolina State University at Raleigh	114	326	72	250	762	227
Western Michigan University	155	60	244	304	763	228
Lafayette College	132	324	140	168	764	229
Chicago State University	336	298	110	23	767	230
James Madison University	224	77	292	176	769	231
University of Dayton	121	325	48	275	769	232
Middle Tennessee State University	291	168	26	284	769	233
University of Houston	255	156	31	328	770	234
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	162	223	309	78	772	235
New Mexico State University-Main Campus	88	161	298	225	772	236
Seton Hall University	133	248	271	121	773	237
University of Evansville	186	200	270	118	774	238
University of Wyoming	200	320	41	213	774	239
Central Michigan University	276	29	255	214	774	240
California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo	131	191	209	244	775	241
Eastern Michigan University	238	220	214	108	780	242
California State University-Long Beach	84	314	341	45	784	243

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College	223	193	100	270	786	244
California State University-Bakersfield	173	268	331	17	789	245
Florida International University	258	97	111	324	790	246
Monmouth University	206	5	264	316	791	247
Marist College	269	297	68	158	792	248
University of Arizona	243	254	28	268	793	249
Campbell University	290	189	1	318	798	250
Seattle University	242	209	269	80	800	251
College of the Holy Cross	204	265	198	133	800	252
Hampton University	322	221	129	130	802	253
Grambling State University	307	129	71	297	804	254
Elon University	304	152	11	337	804	255
University of Detroit Mercy	279	87	240	199	805	256
Bradley University	218	205	96	287	806	257
Bryant University	124	319	29	335	807	258
Loyola University-Baltimore	166	289	317	36	808	259
Cleveland State University	198	234	306	74	812	260
Sacred Heart University	277	242	155	142	816	261
Princeton University* (no athletic aid)	208	343	163	104	818	262
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*	129	302	151	236	818	263
Siena College	49	271	316	185	821	264
Southeastern Louisiana University	302	46	281	192	821	265
Southern Utah University	241	28	243	311	823	266
Mississippi State University	234	148	117	325	824	267
Sam Houston State University	288	303	52	182	825	268
Jackson State University	315	71	186	254	826	269
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay*	176	112	225	314	827	270
Kennesaw State University	5	327	330	166	828	271
St John's University-New York	63	215	299	251	828	272
High Point University	165	276	318	72	831	273

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
Florida Atlantic University	301	135	60	340	836	274
Indiana University-Purdue University-Fort Wayne	197	51	274	319	841	275
University of Colorado Boulder	192	278	267	106	843	276
University of Central Arkansas	251	31	252	309	843	277
Boston University	138	216	302	191	847	278
Morehead State University	323	105	121	298	847	279
Manhattan College	101	239	196	315	851	280
SUNY at Albany*	195	246	286	127	854	281
Eastern Washington University	41	208	327	281	857	282
The University of Texas at San Antonio	102	311	310	136	859	283
Lipscomb University	233	263	212	152	860	284
Murray State University	278	72	291	222	863	285
Austin Peay State University	296	240	92	239	867	286
University of Alabama at Birmingham*	283	294	89	205	871	287
Stephen F Austin State University	294	228	215	135	872	288
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville	230	304	94	249	877	289
Western Kentucky University	284	110	152	331	877	290
Lamar University	299	312	62	207	880	291
Prairie View A & M University	310	316	22	235	883	292
Western Carolina University	271	280	7	329	887	293
University of South Florida-Main Campus*	214	122	334	218	888	294
The University of Tennessee-Martin	274	235	73	308	890	295
University of Southern Mississippi	320	126	189	267	902	296
North Carolina Central University	343	238	50	273	904	297
Fairfield University	174	267	295	170	906	298
Furman University	331	219	134	229	913	299
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	292	158	125	341	916	300
Oral Roberts University	282	290	132	216	920	301
Texas State University-San Marcos	273	332	20	299	924	302

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
East Tennessee State University	270	176	200	285	931	303
Jacksonville University	300	253	44	334	931	304
University of California-Berkeley	201	199	234	303	937	305
Savannah State University	311	178	130	320	939	306
Georgetown University	228	274	315	123	940	307
Tennessee State University	330	275	9	327	941	308
University of Kentucky	244	201	236	262	943	309
Coastal Carolina University	261	322	210	160	953	310
Alcorn State University	340	308	194	115	957	311
University of South Carolina-Upstate*	312	106	325	215	958	312
University of Oregon	217	301	272	171	961	313
University of Portland	262	213	303	183	961	314
College of William and Mary	202	272	337	154	965	315
University of Cincinnati-Main Campus	160	177	307	322	966	316
University of Northern Colorado	306	117	268	283	974	317
Duke University	143	340	338	155	976	318
Alabama A & M University	257	331	145	243	976	319
Eastern Illinois University	287	330	88	276	981	320
Georgia Institute of Technology-Main Campus	35	335	328	286	984	321
Wofford College	305	273	66	342	986	322
Appalachian State University*	240	305	254	197	996	323
Wagner College	314	329	120	234	997	324
North Dakota State University-Main Campus	199	318	319	167	1003	325
Virginia Military Institute*	156	339	180	338	1013	326
Southeast Missouri State University*	295	183	206	330	1014	327
Tulane University of Louisiana	264	323	192	237	1016	328
Samford University	335	244	139	332	1050	329
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	333	266	109	343	1051	330
University of San Francisco	316	181	296	272	1065	331

Institution Name	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Total Institution Ranking
University of Memphis	334	245	229	282	1090	332
Nicholls State University	328	336	154	293	1111	333
Butler University	326	338	138	313	1115	334
Arkansas State University-Main Campus	317	309	169	321	1116	335
Valparaiso University	297	333	217	278	1125	336
Charleston Southern University	327	299	283	223	1132	337
University of South Alabama	325	218	266	323	1132	338
Bethune-Cookman University	338	334	235	257	1164	339
Troy University	329	313	245	289	1176	340
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff	339	328	177	339	1183	341
Norfolk State University*	341	341	208	317	1207	342
Citadel Military College of South Carolina	253	342	340	336	1271	343

Title IX Compliance 28

Conference	Number of Schools	Participation Score	Student Aid Score	Recruiting Score	Expenses Score	Total Institution Score	Ranking
Atlantic Coast Conference	12	132.75	236.25	173.4166667	155	697.4166667	22
Western Athletic Conference	10	146.6	185.9	235.4	151.5	719.4	23
Conference USA	12	224.1666667	161.9166667	142.8333333	199.5	728.4166667	24
Pioneer Football League	2	205.5	144.5	109.5	278	737.5	25
Horizon League	10	207.3	185.5	182.4	197.4	772.6	26
Atlantic Sun Conference	10	181.2	205.2	205.1	186.1	777.6	27
Big South Conference	17	245.125	200	158.75	180.125	784	28
Division I-AA Independents	3	175.6666667	243.3333333	184.6666667	183.6666667	787.3333333	29
Sun Belt Conference	12	258.8333333	143.4166667	151.5	251.6666667	805.4166667	30
Southland Conference	9	283.1111111	174.4444444	132.1111111	220.8888889	810.5555556	31
Ohio Valley Conference	11	271.4545455	175.0909091	126.7272727	263.9090909	837.1818182	32
Southwestern Athletic Conference	10	304.2	224.4	105.3	207.3	841.2	33
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	13	282.2307692	166.4615385	185	211.6923077	845.3846154	34
Southern Conference	11	270.2727273	241.5454545	131.1818182	246.5454545	889.5454545	35

References

- Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2012). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal, national study thirty-five year update. 1977-2012.*
- Ali, R. (2010, April 20). [Letter]. United States Department of Education Office for Civil Rights.
- Buzuvis, E. E., & Newhall, K. E. (2012). Equality beyond the three-part test: Exploring and explaining the invisibility of Title IX's equal treatment requirement. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 22(2), 421-459.
- Cohen v. Brown University. No. 92-2483, 991 F.2d 888; 1993 U.S. App. LEXIS 7912, slip op. (1st Cir. April 16, 1993).
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office for Civil Rights, A Policy Interpretation: Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics, Doc. (1979).
- Gender equity in intercollegiate athletics: A practical guide for colleges and universities* [Pamphlet]. (2008). NCAA.
- Gonyo v. Drake University. No. 4-93-70470, 879 F. Supp. 1000; 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3820, slip op. (S.D. Iowa, March 10, 1995).
- A guide to gender equity in athletics in pennsylvania schools* (Report). (2009, March). Women's Law Project.
- Kennedy, C. L. (2006). College Sports and Title IX #3. *Gender Issues*, 23(2), 69-79.
doi:10.1007/s12147-000-0024-z
- Kennedy, C. L. (2007). The athletic directors' dilemma: "\$\$\$ and women's sports". *Gender Issues*, 24(2), 34-45.
- Office of Postsecondary Education. (2012). The Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool. Retrieved November 20, 2012 from <http://ope.ed.gov/athletics/>

Pederson v. Louisiana State University. No. 97-30719, 213 F.3d 858; 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 12019; 46 Fed. R. Serv. 3d (Callaghan) 1254. (5th Cir. June 1, 2000).

Richman, R. (2010). Title IX: The trojan horse in the struggle for female athletic coaches to attain equal opportunity in intercollegiate sports. *Virginia Sports and Entertainment Law Journal*, 10(1), 376-413.

Roberts v. Colorado State. No. 93-1086, 998 F.2d; 1993 U.S. App. LEXIS 16957, slip op. (10th Cir. July 7, 1993).

Sigelman, L., & Wahlbeck, P. J. (1999). Gender proportionality in intercollegiate athletics: The mathematics of Title IX compliance. *Social Science Quarterly*, 518-538.

Simons, R. S. (2011). The Title IX athletic regulations and the ideal of a gender-free society. *University of Denver Sports and Entertainment Law Journal*, 3-56.

Stafford, S. L. (2004). Progress toward Title IX compliance: The effect of formal and informal enforcement mechanisms. *Social Science Quarterly*, 1469-1486.

Staurowsky, E. J. (2003). Title IX and college sport: The long painful path to compliance and reform. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 14(1), 95-121.

Stevens, L. Y. (2004). The sport of numbers: Manipulating Title IX to rationalize discrimination against women. *Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal*, 13(1), 155-189.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1681-1688 (1972).

U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, Further Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Guidance Regarding Title IX Compliance, Doc. (2003).

Yuracko, K. A. (2002). Title IX and the problem of gender equality in athletics. *Gender Issues*, 20(2-3), 65-80.