
Title IX Athletics Compliance at California's Public High Schools, Community Colleges, and Universities

*A Report Prepared for the
California Postsecondary Education Commission
and the California Department of Education*

by RMC Research Corporation

Dr. Margaret Beam
Dr. Bonnie Faddis
Dr. Pat Ruzicka



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P.O. Box 944272
1430 N Street (95814)
Sacramento, California 94244-2720



CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION COMMISSION
1303 J Street ♦ Suite 500
Sacramento, California 95814-2938

Summary

With the enactment of Assembly Bill 2295 (Chapter 1060, Statutes of 2002), the California Department of Education and the California Postsecondary Education Commission were directed to conduct a study of Title IX compliance in athletics in California's public high schools, community colleges, and universities.

This study found that California public educational institutions, overall, are not fully in compliance with Title IX, especially with regard to athletics participation and coaching parity. Based on the findings, this report makes recommendations that generally fall into the following four categories: (1) better data collection; (2) increased technical assistance to districts and schools; (3) improved training for school administrators, athletic directors, and coaches; and (4) additional research regarding specific areas of compliance, particularly coaching.

California's public high schools, community colleges, and universities are strongly committed to improving Title IX compliance in athletics. This report contributes meaningful knowledge toward that goal.

The Commission adopted this report at its meeting of March 30, 2004. The report is available on the Commission's website -- www.cpec.ca.gov -- and is electronically accessible to the general public.

Additional printed copies of this report and other Commission documents may also be obtained by e-mail at PublicationRequest@cpec.ca.gov or by writing the Commission at 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814-2938; or by telephone at (916) 322-9268.

Title IX Athletics Compliance at California's Public High Schools, Community Colleges, and Universities

*A Report Prepared for the
California Postsecondary Education Commission
and the California Department of Education*

*by
RMC Research Corporation*

Dr. Margaret Beam
Dr. Bonnie Faddis
Dr. Pat Ruzicka



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P.O. Box 944272
1430 N Street (95814)
Sacramento, California 94244-2720



CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION COMMISSION
1303 J Street ♦ Suite 500
Sacramento, California 95814-2938



COMMISSION REPORT 04-04
PUBLISHED MARCH 2004

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 04-04 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

**California Department of Education
California Postsecondary Education Commission**

**Title IX Athletics Compliance at California's Public High Schools,
Community Colleges, and Universities**

Report to the Governor and the Legislature

Introduction

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is a federal law that prohibits sex discrimination in all educational institutions, including K-12 and higher education, that receive federal funding. The key provision of Title IX states:

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.

Title IX applies to all aspects of education, but is especially well known for opening the door to greater athletic opportunities for female students.

With regard to athletics, Title IX generally requires educational institutions and programs to do the following:

- Offer male and female students equal opportunities to participate in athletics, including interscholastic, intercollegiate, intramural and club sports;
- Treat male and female athletes fairly; and
- Give male and female athletes their fair share of athletic scholarship money and other resources.

Prior to the passage of Title IX, female students had only limited athletic opportunities open to them in high school and college, and represented only a very small proportion of school athletes. Since the passage of Title IX, the athletic participation rate of female students has increased greatly at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. However, while significant progress has been made, the 1999-2000 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Gender-Equity Report indicates that more than 80 percent of postsecondary schools have not yet achieved full compliance with the provisions of Title IX. On-site reviews in California high schools over the past ten years have also indicated some continuing compliance problems at the secondary level.

Assembly Bill (AB) 2295 (Chapter 1060, Statutes of 2002) was an expression of interest in gaining more information about the degree to which obstacles continue to face female students in high school and postsecondary athletics in California. That legislation required that a survey be conducted regarding Title IX compliance in athletics in

California's public high schools, community colleges, and universities. It also called for recommendations to improve compliance.

As a result of the enactment of AB 2295, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and the California Department of Education (CDE) began a joint effort to secure a contractor to conduct the mandated study. CPEC issued a Request for Proposals and, following a selection process, contracted with RMC Research Corporation of Portland, Oregon. That firm brought expertise in Title IX and a long history of conducting research of this type to their assignment. Dr. Bonnie Faddis led the study, supported by Dr. Margaret Beam and Dr. Patricia Ruzicka. Work on the contract began in the spring of 2003.

The project required RMC to conduct research and prepare a written report with recommendations that addressed the participation of males and females in interscholastic and intercollegiate athletics in California, and that further identified areas in which participation, and the administrative support for participation, differentially affects male and female students. The report was designed to develop findings for each of the following:

- (1) Public schools that include Grades 7 and 8 (subsequently dropped due to budget constraints)
- (2) Public schools that include Grades 9-12
- (3) The campuses of the University of California
- (4) The campuses of the California State University
- (5) The campuses of the California Community Colleges

The report was required to address, but not be limited to, the following topics:

- (1) Participation in interscholastic, intercollegiate, intramural, and club athletic opportunities
- (2) Distribution of benefits and services, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - (a) Overall support of athletics programs
 - (b) Equipment and supplies
 - (c) Scheduling of games and practice teams
 - (d) Travel and related expenses
 - (e) Availability of coaches and their compensation
 - (f) Locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities
 - (g) Medical and training services
 - (h) Publicity and marketing
 - (i) Recruitment (Particularly for higher education programs)

- (j) Availability of tutors and their compensation (particularly for higher education programs)
 - (k) Housing and dining facilities and services (particularly for higher education programs)
 - (l) The distribution of financial support for all of the above, including booster group contributions
- (3) Distribution of athletic scholarship money
 - (4) The impact of Title IX on participation in athletics by women of color
 - (5) The academic and graduation success of students by gender and level of athletic competition
 - (6) Athletic teams added or disbanded as a result of institutional effort to comply with Title IX
 - (7) The nature and extent of training that is provided to athletic administrators, coaches, and other staff regarding the requirements of Title IX and strategies to eliminate sex discrimination in athletic programs.
 - (8) Any related topic that contributes to an assessment of the level of compliance with Title IX as it relates to athletics in the identified California educational institutions, or to recommendations for increasing gender equity in athletics.

In addition to providing data supporting its findings relative to each item addressed above, the contractor was also directed to provide proposed recommendations for legislative or administrative action consistent with the findings in the report. To the extent data were not available relative to any of the above topics, the contractor was required to identify the lack of data and provide proposed recommendations thereto.

The project got underway in late spring 2003 with the contractor meeting with both CPEC and CDE staff. Shortly thereafter, an Advisory Committee representing all key institutional and community stakeholders was convened to assist in planning the survey and developing the survey instruments. The actual surveys were sent out to a random sample of California high schools and to all of the community colleges and to all campuses of the University of California and the California State University in late summer. In the fall of 2003, survey results were collected and the contractors conducted site visits at a sample of institutions at each level. Data analysis and report preparation ensued, and the final report was submitted on February 27, 2004. It was discussed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission at its March 10 meeting and adopted at a meeting on March 30. It was also transmitted to California State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell, who has reviewed and accepted the report and recommendations.

The report's Executive Summary gives an overview of the major findings and recommendations, and the report itself includes more extensive discussion of all the findings, as well as the data that supports them. The study found that California public educational institutions vary in the degree to which they comply with Title IX as regards

athletics participation and coaching parity. [NOTE: The findings reflect statistically significant results of data representing secondary and postsecondary institutions in California; they do not indicate whether an individual institution is or is not in compliance with the law.]

Based on the findings, the report makes a number of recommendations that may be generally categorized as follows:

- Better data collection;
- Increased technical assistance to districts and schools;
- Improved training for school administrators, athletic directors and coaches; and
- Additional research regarding specific areas of compliance, particularly coaching.

The report does not address how such recommendations shall be carried out, leaving those decisions to the State Legislature and responsible agencies.

The report is consistent with national data showing that considerable progress has been made to assure equity in public school athletics since Title IX was enacted. However, it also shows that some of California's high schools, community colleges, and universities still have significant inequities to address. The report's recommendations are reflective of those made by Title IX and other gender equity experts at the state and national levels. The California Postsecondary Education Commission and the California Department of Education are strongly committed to improving Title IX compliance in public school athletics in California and hope that this report contributes meaningfully toward that goal.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The findings of the 2003 study of Title IX compliance in athletics programs in California's public high schools, community colleges, and universities indicate that significant compliance issues remain at some institutions. This study helps identify and categorize these compliance issues and offers strategies that could address them.

The agencies responsible for the report—the California Postsecondary Education Commission and the California Department of Education, headed by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell—do not have a specific basis to dispute any of the report's findings, although the agencies agree that a larger sample of public high schools would have strengthened confidence in the findings. As to the report's recommendations, the agencies agree with the intent of promoting Title IX compliance. However, the agencies caution against (1) placing new burdens on institutions that are already in compliance and (2) redirecting limited resources from the actual delivery of athletic programs to the support of administrative activities. With those cautions, the agencies encourage the California Legislature to consider the report and take action as appropriate.

Title IX Athletics Compliance at California's Public High Schools, Community Colleges, and Universities

Prepared for
**California Postsecondary Education Commission and
California Department of Education**

Prepared by
RMC Research Corporation
522 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1407
Portland, OR 97204

March 22, 2004

Title IX Athletics Compliance at California's Public High Schools, Community Colleges, and Universities

Prepared for

**California Postsecondary Education Commission
and
California Department of Education**

Prepared by

**Dr. Margaret Beam
Dr. Bonnie Faddis
Dr. Pat Ruzicka**

**RMC Research Corporation
522 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1407
Portland, OR 97204**

March 22, 2004

Contents

Exhibits.....	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Executive Summary	ix
I. Introduction	1
Study Background.....	2
Study Design	4
II. High School Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	5
Significant Issues	5
Areas With Ambiguous Findings	12
Areas With No Significant Gender Disparities.....	19
Strategies Used to Achieve Gender Equity.....	21
III. Community College Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	23
Significant Issues	23
Areas With Ambiguous Findings	30
Areas With No Significant Gender Disparities.....	36
Strategies Used to Achieve Gender Equity.....	38
IV. University Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	41
Significant Issues	41
Areas With Ambiguous Findings	49
Areas With No Significant Gender Disparities.....	51
Strategies Used to Achieve Gender Equity.....	53
Appendix A High School Data Tables	
Appendix B Community College Data Tables	
Appendix C University Data Tables	
Appendix D Data Collection Instruments	
Appendix E Methodology	

Exhibits

Exhibit 1	High School Athletics Participation	7
Exhibit 2	High Schools Adding and Deleting Varsity Teams in the Past Five Years...	9
Exhibit 3	High School Coaching Positions	10
Exhibit 4	High School Coaches' Years of Experience	11
Exhibit 5	High School Gender Equity Training Participation	12
Exhibit 6	High School Enrollment and Athletics Participation by Race/Ethnicity.....	13
Exhibit 7	High School Provision of Uniforms and Equipment	15
Exhibit 8	High School Booster Club Contributions.....	18
Exhibit 9	High School Facility Quality and Availability	20
Exhibit 10	Community College Athletics Participation	25
Exhibit 11	Community College Head Coach Positions by Team	28
Exhibit 12	Community College Head Coach Positions	29
Exhibit 13	Community College Head Coaches' Years of Experience	29
Exhibit 14	Community College Expenditures for Uniforms and Equipment	32
Exhibit 15	University Athletics Participation	43
Exhibit 16	Universities Adding and Deleting Teams in the Past Five Years	44
Exhibit 17	University Coaching Data	48
Exhibit 18	University Expenditures for Community Publicity.....	50
Exhibit 19	University Enrollment and Athletics Participation by Gender and Race/Ethnicity	51

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team thanks Murray Haberman of the California Postsecondary Education Commission and Karen Humphrey and Mary Gallet of the California Department of Education for their guidance and support through all phases of the study. We also thank the members of the advisory committee for their participation at three meetings and their assistance in developing the survey instruments, providing background information, and commenting on draft versions of this report. The advisory committee members included:

- Sarah Angel, Office of Assembly Member Jenny Oropeza
- Hilary Baxter, University of California Office of the President
- Roger Blake, California Interscholastic Federation
- Ed Connolly, Community College Chancellor's Office
- Alison Cone, California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo
- Jim DeBoo, Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Paula Duncan, Sheldon High School (Sacramento)
- Joanne Fortunato, California Commission on Athletics
- Mike Garrison, Rocklin High School (Rocklin)
- Jeanie Hamilton, Citrus College
- Wendy Hill, Office of Assembly Member Hannah-Beth Jackson
- Annik Hirshen, University of California Office of the President
- Marie Ishida, California Interscholastic Federation
- Linda Joplin, California National Organization for Women
- Rita Mize, Community College League
- Tamara Rasberry, Office of Assembly Member Herb Wesson
- Paula Rudolph, University of California, Santa Barbara
- Jim Smrekar, Elk Grove Unified School District
- Betsy Stephenson, University of California, Los Angeles
- Dawn Theodora, California State University
- Stuart Van Horn, California Commission on Athletics
- Mary Wiberg, California Commission on the Status of Women

Finally, we thank the many high school, community college, and university athletic directors who responded to our surveys and site visit inquiries.

Executive Summary

Title IX of the Education Amendments was enacted in 1972 to reverse a history of sex discrimination in educational programs and institutions receiving federal funds. A 2002 report by the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education indicated that educational institutions had made progress over the past 30 years in creating more equitable opportunities for males and females, but that athletic programs still fell short of being equitable. Although some data pertaining to athletic programs are available nationally at the university and community college levels, very little data are available at the K–12 level, and to date, no systematic study of Title IX in athletics has been conducted in California. Thus the purpose of the present study was to evaluate interscholastic and intercollegiate athletics programs in the state of California with regard to compliance with Title IX, as set forth in AB 2295.

The study included an analysis of student participation and opportunities in public high school and postsecondary programs; the treatment of students and coaches involved in athletic programs; the allocation of financial resources and scholarship money; and the distribution of program benefits and services. Also analyzed were factors such as academic success, training for coaches and administrators, and program trends related to adding or deleting teams or opportunities. The data collection included written surveys sent to public high schools, community colleges, and universities in fall 2003; Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) reports from community colleges and universities; site visits to a sample of six high schools, three community colleges, three California State University (CSU) campuses, and three University of California (UC) campuses; and enrollment data from the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) websites. All data were for the 2002–2003 academic year.

Study Findings

Data from this study revealed that schools at all levels experienced some areas of noncompliance with Title IX but were doing well in terms of achieving gender equity in other areas. Two common problem areas across high school, community college, and university athletics programs were participation and coaching. Specific findings and recommendations related to the key issues for high schools, community colleges, and universities are provided below.

High Schools

The study found that the majority of high schools did not have proportional rates of participation for boys and girls. In fact, of the 125 high schools that returned surveys, only 26% were in compliance with Title IX based on proportionality—that is, had participation rates that were within five percentage points of the enrollment rates for

each gender. In addition to having greater numbers of male participants, high schools on average had a greater number of varsity teams for boys than for girls.

Although proportionality (Prong 1) is the most common method for schools to achieve Title IX compliance in athletics participation, schools also can achieve compliance by expanding opportunities for the underrepresented sex (Prong 2) or by reviewing on-campus club and intramural sports, reviewing feeder school sports, and conducting an interest survey of enrolled students to determine if there is unmet interest in an interscholastic or intercollegiate team (Prong 3). Eighty-five percent of responding high schools reported using one of these three prongs to achieve compliance (65%, 15%, and 5% for Prongs 1, 2, and 3, respectively). Fifteen percent had not reviewed their athletic participation in the last five years.

Although it is not possible to determine from the survey data whether the 20% of high schools using Prongs 2 and 3 are in compliance, it is clear from the data that only 26% of high schools are in compliance using Prong 1 (not 65% as reported). Thus, at most only 46% of high schools are in compliance with Title IX in athletics participation.

Survey data also revealed that fewer than 25% of the high school survey respondents reported that coaches or administrators had received Title IX training in the previous three years and that only 31% of schools had conducted a student interest survey in the previous three years. These findings, in combination with the fact that more than half of all responding high schools were out of compliance with Title IX in athletics participation, underscore the need for training and technical assistance to assist high schools in creating gender equitable athletic programs.

Disproportional participation by gender was the greatest disparity at the high school level. Survey data also indicated that coaching was not comparable across boys' and girls' teams. Specifically, boys' teams had more coaches than similar girls' teams, and boys' teams had more experienced coaches than girls' teams.

The study findings lead to the following recommendations to assist high school athletic programs in achieving Title IX compliance:

-
- **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should provide resources for professional development to school districts in meeting the athletics participation requirements of Title IX. (CDE and the California Interscholastic Federation are two agencies currently equipped to provide this training.)
 - **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should require that public high schools report athletics data annually (a) to ensure an efficient process for monitoring Title IX compliance and analyzing schools' progress at the state level and (b) to increase districts' and schools' awareness of issues and guide administrators in making improvements.

- **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should request that school districts receive training for administrators and athletic directors in strategies for ensuring that boys' and girls' teams have comparable coaches.
-

Community Colleges

Overall, the study findings revealed that community colleges' greatest gender disparity in athletics was in the area of participation. In fact, only 8% of the 91 responding community colleges were in compliance with Title IX based on proportionality—that is, had participation rates that were within five percentage points of the enrollment rates for each gender—and 84% were considerably outside the range of acceptability. The majority (55%) of community colleges reported using Prong 2—expanding opportunities for the underrepresented sex—to achieve Title IX participation compliance. Yet despite efforts to create greater gender equity, fewer than half of the community college respondents indicated that administrators or head coaches had attended equity training in the past three years, and only 29% reported assessing student interest through a survey within the previous three years.

One other area of concern was coaching. Data from 69 community colleges showed that the number of community colleges with full-time men's team head coaches was disproportionately greater than the number with full-time women's team head coaches for the four most common men's and women's sports. Athletic directors reported a total of 243 women's team head coaches (45% of whom were full time) and 233 men's team head coaches (63% of whom were full time). EADA data showed that men's teams at community colleges have on average more coaches and more FTE than women's teams. Finally, the average number of years of head coach experience was substantially greater for men's teams than women's teams regardless of whether the head coach was full time or part time, and the men's team head coaches' greater level of experience corresponded with higher salaries.

The study findings lead to the following recommendations to assist community college athletic programs in achieving Title IX compliance:

- **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should request that the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges provide technical assistance to individual community colleges that are not achieving gender equity in athletics participation. The Chancellor's Office should coordinate this activity with the Commission on Athletics. Technical assistance should involve assisting community colleges to develop a long-range plan for their athletics program that takes into consideration financial and facility resources and student populations. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.

- **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should require that all community colleges collect student interest data and report those data to the Commission on Athletics at least every three years. Community colleges should use student interest survey data to assist in their short- and long-range planning, and technical assistance providers should use those data to guide community colleges and to inform decisions regarding community college athletics programs statewide.
 - **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should request that the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges provide annual equity training to coaches and administrative staff at community colleges and encourage the dissemination of information to ensure that all staff and students are cognizant of current Title IX issues. The Chancellor's Office should coordinate this activity with the Commission on Athletics. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.
 - **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should request that the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges conduct an in-depth study of hiring practices for coaches. Such a study should explore the reasons that fewer full-time head coach positions exist for women's teams relative to men's teams and the reasons that the coaches of women's teams have less experience than the coaches of men's teams. The study should also explore alternative hiring approaches that might facilitate more equitable coaching for women's teams. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.
-

Universities

The study found that universities were further advanced than high schools and community colleges in terms of achieving equitable rates of student participation by gender (57% of universities were within currently acceptable margins of representation of enrolled students participating in athletics by gender). In contrast to the 57% of responding universities that actually were within the range of acceptability, 89% of respondents indicated that their university was in compliance with Title IX participation requirements as measured by proportionality (Prong 1). Only 11% of the universities reported using Prong 2 (expanding programs for the underrepresented gender) as their standard for Title IX compliance, and none reported using Prong 3. The study's data on university athlete participation therefore do not support athletic directors' perceptions of participation, and suggest a need for closer monitoring of data and additional training and technical assistance to ensure that participation meets the three-prong test.

The second area of gender equity concern is the higher compensation for coaches of men's teams compared to women's teams. If salary differences reflect lower levels of experience and other qualifications, then women's teams are at a disadvantage.

The third area of gender inequity at the university level involved operating and recruiting expenditures. Data from the 28 responding universities showed that overall, total operating expenses were higher for men's teams—this difference was true for total and per athlete expenditures. In addition, men's teams spent more on recruiting (in terms of both total and per athlete expenditures) than did women's teams.

- **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should support state-level monitoring of Title IX compliance in university athletic programs through the universities' respective systemwide offices. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.
 - **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should request that the University of California Office of the President and the Chancellor's Office of the California State University strengthen training and seek any technical assistance necessary to ensure their respective campuses know how to meet the participation requirements of Title IX using each part of the three-prong test.
 - **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should request that the University of California Office of the President and the Chancellor's Office of the California State University ensure that annual equity training is provided to coaches and athletic administrators at their respective campuses. The training should include Title IX requirements, sexual harassment, and other nondiscrimination issues. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.
 - **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should request that the University of California Office of the President and the Chancellor's Office of the California State University institute stronger policy directives and monitoring systems to ensure that female and male students receive comparable coaching. In addition, further study of university coaching should be conducted to determine if compensation is related to quality of coaching.
 - **Recommendation:** The California Legislature should institute stronger policy directives and monitoring systems to ensure that universities are meeting the federal requirements of Title IX, especially in the areas of operating and recruiting expenses.
-

I. Introduction

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 was enacted to reverse a history of sex discrimination in educational programs and institutions receiving federal funds. Federal regulations were issued in 1975, expanded in 1979, and clarified in 1996 to guide the implementation and enforcement of Title IX, but the 30-year history of Title IX has been one of both successes and stumbling blocks. Although progress has been made, there still is work to do.

Before 1972 females had limited opportunities for participation in athletics compared to the opportunities available today. Expanded opportunities and increased participation in the past 30 years are evident at all levels of play—from youth sports clubs and elementary school programs, through high school and college, to amateur and professional sports leagues and Olympic competition. The benefits of participation in sports extend far beyond the realm of athletic excellence and have been shown to influence factors such as physical health, body image, perception of self-worth, and psychological well-being.

In 2002 the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education published a report on Title IX after 30 years¹. This report described significant progress in athletics for women and presented these findings:

- In 1971 only 7% of all participants in high school varsity athletics were female; by 2001 that figure had risen to almost 42%.
- College women's athletic participation increased over 400% from 1971 to 2001.
- Before Title IX, women's intercollegiate athletic programs received only 2% of the total dollar amount spent on intercollegiate athletics, and athletic scholarships for women were virtually nonexistent.

¹National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education. (2002, June). *Title IX at 30: Report card on gender equity*. Retrieved from www.aahperd.org/nagws/pdf_files/title930.pdf

The report also found, however, that “the resources and benefits allocated to female athletes . . . fall far short of what equity requires.”

California has passed several state laws to support gender equity in education since the federal Title IX legislation, and some specifically address gender equity in athletics. In 1974 Assembly Bills 3650 and 3651 encouraged equality in athletics in public high schools and institutions of higher education. In 1975, Assembly Bill 1559 required equality in participation and funding for high school athletic programs. In 1981 Senate Bill 19 gave the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) authority over high school interscholastic athletic programs. Female participation in high school athletics has increased since Title IX legislation was enacted. According to data provided by CIF, girls represented 21% of high school athletes in 1973, 38% in 1998, and 41% in 2002.

In 1977 the Commission on Athletics (COA) became responsible for the administration of intercollegiate athletics at California's community colleges, and since its inception COA has modified its women's sports offerings according to female student interest. In the past ten years the percent of female athletes has risen. According to data provided by COA, women represented 31% of community college athletes in 1992 and 35% in 2002. Participation data prior to 1992 are not available.

Study Background

In September 2002 the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill 2295, which required the California Department of Education and the California Postsecondary Education Commission to contract with an independent evaluator to study the overall level of compliance with Title IX in athletics in California's public high schools, community colleges, and universities.

Some of the data needed to evaluate Title IX compliance were already available at the community college and university levels. The federal Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) requires coed institutions of postsecondary education to report annually on student participation in athletics and expenditures for male and female teams. Among high school programs, however, data collection on student participation and

expenditures for athletics is not required. Thus, accurately determining the level of compliance is difficult. Furthermore, evaluating compliance with Title IX goes beyond aggregating numbers; it includes an analysis of (a) opportunities for participation, (b) equality of treatment, and (c) the distribution of financial and other resources.

Purpose of the Study

This study included analysis of student participation and opportunities in public high school and postsecondary programs; the treatment of students and coaches involved in athletic programs; the allocation of financial resources and scholarship money; and the distribution of program benefits and services. Also analyzed were such factors as academic success, training for coaches and administrators, and program trends related to adding or deleting teams or opportunities.

The Three-Prong Test for Athletics Participation

The first step in evaluating compliance with Title IX and California state law (AB 833) is examining whether the participation of male and female students in athletics is equitable. Compliance is measured using a three-prong test for participation opportunities, and a school needs to meet only one prong to comply. An institution may (1) provide participation opportunities for male and female students that are substantially proportionate to their enrollment, or (2) demonstrate a history and continuing practice of program expansion for the underrepresented gender, or (3) fully and effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of the underrepresented gender.

Although not a legal standard for meeting the Prong 1 standard of substantial proportionality, a variance of five percentage points is generally considered acceptable in California; thus if 49% of a school's enrollment is female, then females should constitute between 44% and 54% of the athletes. Schools can meet the Prong 2 standard by adding interscholastic or intercollegiate teams, increasing numbers of participants, developing and communicating a policy for adding teams, or implementing a plan for expanding opportunities for the underrepresented sex. Schools can meet the Prong 3 standard by reviewing on-campus club and intramural sports, reviewing feeder

school sports, and conducting an interest survey of enrolled students to determine if there is unmet interest in an interscholastic or intercollegiate team.

Study Design

To determine whether high schools, community colleges, and universities were in compliance with Title IX, the evaluation team developed a data collection plan that included the following three sources of data:

- Written surveys sent to public high schools (a representative sample), community colleges, and universities in fall 2003. The surveys requested data covering the 2002–2003 academic year.
- EADA surveys from community colleges and universities, covering the 2002–2003 academic year.
- Site visits to a sample of six high schools, three community colleges, three California State University (CSU) campuses, and three University of California (UC) campuses.

The surveys and site visits collected information on participation in athletic opportunities by gender and race/ethnicity; student interest in athletic participation; equipment, uniforms, and supplies; scheduling of games and practices; travel and related expenses; coaches and compensation; locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities; medical and training facilities and services; publicity and promotion; support services; Title IX and gender equity training; and academic outcomes for student athletes. The evaluation team downloaded high school enrollment data from the California Department of Education (CDE) website and community college and university enrollment data from the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) website. These data included numbers of full-time students in fall 2002 by gender and ethnicity. More detailed information about the development of surveys, data collection methods, and data analysis can be found in Appendixes D and E.

II. High School Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter presents the high school survey findings in three parts. Significant issues and corresponding recommendations are presented first, followed by areas with ambiguous findings. Finally, areas in which no equity issues surfaced are noted. Approximately 44% of the sampled schools returned surveys, representing about 15% of all California public high schools with athletic programs.

The survey findings showed that high schools' greatest disparities in regard to gender equity were in participation in athletics and coaching. Lack of gender equity training was also an issue. The survey data revealed several areas of potential concern: participation in athletics by race/ethnicity; equipment, uniforms, and supplies; travel; publicity and promotion; and support services. Areas with no significant gender disparities included scheduling of games and practices; locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities; and medical and training facilities and services. However, the lack of disparities in some areas should not be construed to mean that all schools were in compliance; individual schools may have problems that are not reflected in the system findings as a whole.

Significant Issues

Brief summaries of the findings and recommendations for each issue are followed by a more detailed analysis.

Participation in Athletics

- **Finding:** Participation data reveal that only 26% of the 125 reporting high schools were in compliance with Title IX based on proportionality—that is, they had participation rates that were within five percentage points of the enrollment rates for each gender. On average, although girls composed 49% of the high school student population, only 41% of the high school athletes in this sample were girls. In addition, boys had nearly two more varsity teams, on average, than did girls.

- **Conclusion:** Female students are underrepresented in high school athletics programs, and fewer varsity sports are offered to female students. Most athletic directors don't really know if they meet the participation test because they don't collect and review participation data.
 - **Recommendation 1:** The California Legislature should provide resources for professional development to school districts in meeting the athletics participation requirements of Title IX. (CDE and the California Interscholastic Federation are two agencies currently equipped to provide this training.)
 - **Recommendation 2:** The California Legislature should require that public high schools report athletics data annually (a) to ensure an efficient process for monitoring Title IX compliance and analyzing schools' progress at the state level and (b) to increase districts' and schools' awareness of issues and guide administrators in making improvements.
-

Analysis of Participation in Athletics

The evaluators compared the percentage of male and female participants in athletics to the percentage of male and female students enrolled in each school in 2002–2003. Twenty-six percent of the high schools had a difference between enrollment and athletics participation of less than or equal to five percentage points; 44% of the schools had a variance between five and ten percentage points; and 30% of the schools had a variance greater than 10%.

These findings conflict with the finding that 65% of the surveyed athletic directors thought their school was in compliance with Title IX using the Prong 1—that is, that males and females at their school participated in interscholastic athletics in numbers proportionate to their enrollment in school. Twenty percent of the athletic directors reported that their school had addressed Title IX participation requirements using one of the two other prongs: 15% had expanded programs within the last two years to accommodate student interest, and 5% had appropriately accommodated student abilities and interests as documented by a student interest survey. The remaining 15% of the responding high schools had not reviewed the issue in the last five years. Clearly, the majority of California's public high schools are out of compliance with Title IX participation requirements, and a contributing factor is that athletic directors do not

correctly apply the three-prong test to their schools. Exhibit 1 shows the number of students who participated in each sport for this sample of 125 high schools. Football clearly has more participants than any other sport, and it is the size of those rosters and the concomitant resource demands that may create inequities for girl's sports.

Exhibit 1 High School Athletics Participation

Sport	Girls		Boys		Total Participants
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Football	25	0	9,990	100	10,015
Soccer	3,554	48	3,838	52	7,392
Basketball	3,450	47	3,930	53	7,380
Track and field	3,371	46	3,914	54	7,285
Volleyball	3,450	72	1,362	28	4,812
Swimming and diving	2,675	59	1,822	41	4,497
Baseball	94	2	4,188	98	4,282
Cross country	1,938	48	2,107	52	4,045
Tennis	2,195	56	1,735	44	3,930
Softball	3,413	99	47	1	3,460
Water polo	1,448	50	1,474	50	2,922
Wrestling	101	4	2,727	96	2,828
Golf	534	33	1,083	67	1,617
Badminton	637	61	403	39	1,040
Lacrosse ^a	207	51	196	49	403
Skiing/Snowboarding ^a	71	44	92	56	163
Field hockey ^a	103	100	0	0	103
Gymnastics ^a	97	100	0	0	97
Fencing ^a	22	42	31	58	53
Roller hockey ^a	1	4	24	96	25
Surfing ^a	1	4	22	96	23
Rodeo ^a	1	100	0	0	1
Total	27,388	41	38,985	59	66,373

Note. Data are from 125 high schools.

^aSport not listed by name on the survey form. Because the survey requested data only for specific sports, data for write-in sports may be underreported.

Number of Athletic Teams

At all levels (varsity, junior varsity, and freshman) the average number of boys' teams significantly exceeded the average number of girls' teams. For example, boys had an average of 1.89 more varsity teams than did girls. The fact that fewer sports are available to girls undoubtedly contributes to their underrepresentation in athletics compared to their enrollment in school (See Exhibits A-1 and A-2 in Appendix A).

Program Expansion

To determine whether any of the high schools were using the Prong 2 standard of demonstrating a history and continuing practice of program expansion for the underrepresented sex, the survey asked whether the school had added or deleted any teams within the past five years. Exhibit 2 shows the number of schools that reported adding and deleting various varsity teams for girls and boys within the five years prior to the survey administration. Approximately two thirds of all teams added were girls' teams. The most commonly added varsity sports for girls were golf, water polo, lacrosse, and soccer. The most commonly added varsity sports for boys were golf, water polo, lacrosse, and volleyball. More teams were added than dropped in the past five years, and both boys' and girls' athletics experienced program expansion. (See Exhibits A-3 and A-4).

Student Interest

Only 26% of high school athletics programs in this sample met the Prong 1 standard for proportional participation of both male and female students, and less than 5% of the respondents reported that their school had met the Prong 3 standard. To determine whether schools were fully addressing the interests and abilities of males and females, the survey asked athletic directors to report how often their high schools administered student interest surveys. The majority of athletic directors indicated that their high school rarely or never administered student interest surveys or were unsure how frequently the school administered student interest surveys (48% and 10%, respectively). Of the remaining 42% of the schools surveyed, approximately 18%

administered a student interest survey annually, 13% administered one every two or three years, and 12% administered one every four or five years. Although an interest survey alone is not usually sufficient to conclude that student interests have been met, it is an important component of meeting the Prong 3 test.

Exhibit 2
High Schools Adding and Deleting Varsity Teams in the Past Five Years

Sport	Number of Sampled Schools With Girls' Teams			Number of Sampled Schools With Boys' Teams		
	Current	Added	Deleted	Current	Added	Deleted
Badminton	23	2	0	16	0	0
Baseball	0	0	0	111	1	1
Basketball	109	1	0	110	1	0
Cross country	92	3	2	96	3	3
Football	0	0	0	104	0	1
Golf	62	39	1	95	9	2
Gymnastics	7	1	0	0	0	0
Lacrosse	7	7	0	5	6	0
Roller hockey	2	2	0	2	2	0
Skiing or snowboarding	7	2	0	6	2	0
Soccer	100	7	0	104	3	0
Softball	111	2	0	1	0	0
Swimming	80	4	1	83	3	1
Tennis	97	0	1	93	0	1
Track and field	97	1	3	98	1	3
Volleyball	111	0	0	56	5	1
Water polo	54	12	0	56	7	0
Wrestling	11	3	0	82	2	0
Total	970	86	8	1,118	45	13

Note. Data are from 125 high schools.

Coaching

- **Finding:** Boys’ teams had more coaches than similar girls’ teams and boys’ teams had more experienced coaches than girls’ teams. However, there were no clear differences between boys’ and girls’ teams in the use of on-campus versus off-campus coaches.
- **Conclusion:** Coaching for girls’ and boys’ teams is not comparable.
- **Recommendation 3:** The California Legislature should request that school districts receive training for administrators and athletic directors in strategies for ensuring that boys’ and girls’ teams have comparable coaches.

Analysis of Coaching

Exhibit 3 shows the average number of head coaches and assistant coaches for each sport. On-campus coaches are part of the school staff (e.g., teachers), and off-campus coaches (commonly referred to as *walk-ons*) are not. Football had the largest number of coaching positions. For similar sports, boys’ basketball had more coaching positions than girls’ basketball, and baseball had more coaching positions than softball. No differences in the number of coaches for boys’ and girls’ soccer were evident.

**Exhibit 3
High School Coaching Positions**

Team	Head Coaches				Assistant Coaches			
	<i>n</i>	On Campus	<i>n</i>	Off Campus	<i>n</i>	On Campus	<i>n</i>	Off Campus
Softball (Girls)	64	1.23	58	1.24	11	1.09	41	1.39
Baseball (Boys)	77	1.25	47	1.28	19	1.32	43	1.60
Basketball (Girls)	75	1.24	51	1.47	15	1.13	26	1.35
Basketball (Boys)	80	1.30	47	1.57	22	1.00	24	1.46
Soccer (Girls)	45	1.07	62	1.37	7	1.00	23	1.09
Soccer (Boys)	52	1.10	60	1.30	5	1.00	25	1.08
Volleyball (Girls)	68	1.31	55	1.35	6	1.33	22	1.18
Football (Boys)	85	1.35	33	1.39	68	2.46	77	2.52

Note. Data are from 113 high schools. Numbers represent average number of coaches.

Exhibit 4 shows that coaches for boys’ basketball and soccer were more experienced than coaches for girls’ basketball and soccer, and baseball coaches had more experience than softball coaches. These differences are reflected in the disparities in coaching stipends, which are typically based on years of experience. Site visit interviews and survey comments indicated that stipend schedules are set by collective bargaining agreements. (See Exhibit A-5).

Exhibit 4
High School Coaches’ Years of Experience

Team	Head Coaches’ Experience				Assistant Coaches’ Experience			
	<i>n</i>	On Campus	<i>n</i>	Off Campus	<i>n</i>	On Campus	<i>n</i>	Off Campus
Softball (Girls)	56	8.50	49	5.48	9	6.78	30	6.00
Baseball (Boys)	72	12.44	44	4.89	16	11.08	36	6.78
Basketball (Girls)	69	10.52	45	5.06	14	6.52	19	6.54
Basketball (Boys)	70	11.09	41	5.49	17	6.88	19	6.65
Soccer (Girls)	41	5.91	50	5.69	6	5.00	18	4.28
Soccer (Boys)	46	9.48	52	5.20	4	3.75	20	5.60
Volleyball (Girls)	61	8.71	48	5.11	5	3.00	18	4.08
Football (Boys)	69	10.44	27	7.70	56	9.80	64	6.16

Note. Data are from 125 high schools. Experience reported in number of years.

Gender Equity Training

- **Finding:** Fewer than 25% of the survey respondents reported that coaches or administrators had received Title IX training in the previous three years.
- **Conclusion:** Athletic directors, coaches, and administrators have insufficient information about Title IX to ensure that opportunities are equitable for male and female students.
- **Recommendation 4:** The California Legislature should provide funding to CDE or CIF to train administrators, athletic directors, and coaches annually in meeting Title IX requirements in their athletics programs.

Analysis of Gender Equity Training

As part of the Coordinated Compliance Review, California high schools are required to provide professional development on “strategies for identifying and eliminating bias on the basis of sex. . . .”² However, less than 35% of any group received gender equity training. Exhibit 5 summarizes the gender equity training high schools reported providing in the three years prior to survey administration. Administrators were more likely to participate in training than coaches, and coaches on the teaching staff were more likely to participate in training than walk-on coaches.

Exhibit 5
High School Gender Equity Training Participation

Topic	Percent of Schools With Training Attendees			
	On-Campus Coaches	Off-Campus Coaches	Administrators	Students
Title IX and athletics	21	15	24	12
Sexual harassment	30	20	34	30
Nondiscrimination	24	18	26	20
CIF Coaching Education Program	34	30	16	7
Other	4	4	2	0

Note. Data are from 122 high schools.

Areas With Ambiguous Findings

The evaluators found five areas with possible gender disparities; however, data for these areas were ambiguous and thus the evaluators could not make any clear gender equity determinations. These areas include participation in athletics by race/ethnicity; equipment, uniforms, and supplies; travel; publicity and promotion; and support services.

² California Department of Education (2002). *Coordinated Compliance Review Training Guide 2003–2004*. Compliance item IV-EE9, page 191.

Participation in Athletics by Race/Ethnicity

- **Finding:** Compared to their enrollment in school, Hispanic students are underrepresented in athletics participation by 8%. White students are overrepresented by 6%, and African American students are overrepresented by 3%.
 - **Conclusion:** Hispanic students are underrepresented in athletics.
 - **Recommendation 5:** Professional development for administrators and athletic directors should include collecting race/ethnic participation data, surveying student interests, and addressing possible race/ethnic participation inequities.
-

Analysis of Participation by Race/Ethnicity

Of the 125 high school respondents, 84 (67%) provided participation data by race/ethnicity. Several of the schools that did not provide race/ethnicity data indicated that these data were not readily available. Overall, African American and White students were overrepresented in athletic participation, and Hispanic students were underrepresented (see Exhibits A-6 and A-7).

Exhibit 6 High School Enrollment and Athletics Participation by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Percent of Population		Difference
	Student	Athlete	
American Indian	2	1	1
Asian	8	8	0
Pacific Islander	1	1	0
Filipino	3	2	1
African American	6	9	-3
Hispanic	35	27	8
White (non-Hispanic)	44	50	-6
Mixed/Other	2	1	1
Total	100	100	

Note. Data are from 84 high schools. Negative numbers indicate overrepresentation.

Equipment, Uniforms, and Supplies

- **Finding:** On average, high schools provided practice uniforms to a greater number of boys' teams than girls' teams. In addition, a greater number of boys' teams than girls' teams also provided their own practice uniforms. Total expenditures for equipment, uniforms, and supplies also were significantly greater for boys' teams than girls' teams.
 - **Conclusion:** High schools' purchasing of equipment, uniforms, and supplies may not be comparable for boys' and girls' teams.
 - **Recommendation 6:** Schools should examine expenditure data over a three-year period in order to determine whether equipment, uniforms, and supplies are comparable for boys' and girls' teams.
-

Analysis of Equipment, Uniforms, and Supplies

High schools generally provided the basic uniforms and equipment needed to compete in a sport and the protective gear necessary for athlete safety (e.g., helmets, pads). Site visit data suggest that higher profile sports also may receive some nonessential items such as practice uniforms. Some schools indicated that nonessential items often were provided through team fundraisers. Athletes usually provided personal items such as ball gloves, athletic supporters, and personalized shirts (see Exhibit A-8).

The evaluators compared the number of boys' and girls' teams (out of the four boys' and four girls' teams listed in Exhibit A-8) for which each school provided game uniforms, practice uniforms, and equipment. Exhibit 7 shows that no significant differences were evident in terms of the number of boys and girls' teams for which schools provided game uniforms or equipment, but on average schools provided practice uniforms to a greater number of boys' teams than girls' teams. The evaluators also compared the number of boys' and girls' teams for which the athletes provided their own game uniforms, practice uniforms, and equipment. On average, a greater number of boys' teams than girls' teams provided their own practice uniforms. Although these findings are significant statistically, the practical differences are small and may not be a

significant concern. The reported quality of uniforms and equipment did not differ for boys' and girls' teams.

Exhibit 7 High School Provision of Uniforms and Equipment

Provider	Mean No. of Teams	
	Boys	Girls
School (n = 124)		
Game uniforms	3.35	3.31
Practice uniforms ^a	1.78	1.40
Equipment	3.40	3.35
Athletes (n = 123)		
Game uniforms	0.43	0.48
Practice uniforms ^b	1.34	1.18
Equipment ^b	0.79	0.68

Note. Means range from 0 to 4 (i.e., the number of teams for which the analysis was conducted).

^aDifference between boys' and girls' teams statistically significant, $p < .001$.

^bDifference between boys' and girls' teams statistically significant, $p < .05$.

The average expenditure across the four boys' teams and four girls' teams varied significantly, with boys' team expenditures averaging \$5,212 per school and girls' team expenditures averaging \$2,943 per school. The evaluators also examined per athlete expenditures overall by gender and for similar teams by gender. Findings showed only one significant difference—girls' basketball teams had a significantly higher mean per athlete expenditure than did boys' basketball teams (see Exhibit A-9).

The findings in the area of uniforms and equipment are inconclusive for two primary reasons. First, fewer than 70% of the responding schools provided any information about expenditures for uniforms and equipment because the data was not readily available. Second, the question asked only for expenditures for the preceding academic year. Most schools do not expend funds for every team every year—schools are often on a rotating schedule in which uniforms and equipment are provided only once every three to five years. Whether the data reported for the 2002–2003 year are typical is not known.

Travel

- **Finding:** Team expenditures were significantly greater for boys' teams than girls' teams, but per athlete expenditures did not differ for boys and girls. Findings regarding travel arrangements and expenditures are obscured by the lack of detailed information on teams' expenditures and fundraising contributions toward those expenditures.
 - **Conclusion:** High schools' travel expenditures may be inequitable between boys' and girls' teams.
 - **Recommendation:** None.
-

Analysis of Travel

To determine whether gender differences existed in schools' travel expenditures for athletes, the evaluators conducted analyses using the provided data (about half of the responding high schools were unable to provide travel expenditures by team). The analyses revealed a significant difference between boys' and girls' teams for overall team travel expenditures—that is, schools spent an average of \$3,446 on travel for boys' teams and an average of \$3,190 on travel for girls' teams. The evaluators also conducted analyses to determine whether per athlete travel expenditures differed overall by gender and for similar sports by gender. The analyses revealed only one statistically significant difference: per athlete travel expenditures were significantly greater for girls' basketball teams than for boys' basketball teams (see Exhibits A-10 and A-11). However, the magnitude of this difference is of little practical significance.

Publicity and Promotion

- **Finding:** Boys' teams received more publicity than girls' teams both on campus, and at or for team events. Although differences in publicity were statistically significant, the practical magnitude of these differences is small.
- **Conclusion:** High schools' publicity and promotion may be inequitable between boys' and girls' teams.

- **Recommendation 7:** Publicity and promotion should be addressed as a potential issue in the recommended gender equity training.
-

Analysis of Publicity and Promotion

Campus publicity (e.g., pep rallies, posters) and publicity at competitive events (e.g., game programs) was greater for football than any other sport. No differences in publicity were evident for boys' and girls' teams for basketball and soccer, but baseball tended to have better publicity than softball at events. Cheerleaders were more likely to accompany football teams to away games than any other teams. Cheerleaders were also more likely to attend away games for boys' basketball than for girls' basketball (see Exhibit A-12).

The evaluators examined whether, overall, boys' teams received more frequent publicity and promotion than girls' teams. Boys' teams received more publicity than girls' teams both on campus, and at or for team events. The practical magnitude of these differences, however, is not large (see Exhibit A-13).

Support Services

- **Finding:** Office space provided to football coaches was rated considerably higher than for other sports, creating potential gender inequities for coaches of girls' teams. In addition, high schools' football teams reportedly received higher booster club contributions than other teams, although differences were negligible after dividing the total contributions by number of athletes. Site visit data and survey comments indicate that high schools often do not have mechanisms in place to track booster club funds.
- **Conclusion:** Support services provided to coaches of boys' and girls' teams may be inequitable.
- **Recommendation 8:** As part of the recommended technical assistance and training, technical assistance providers should help high schools set up systems for tracking booster club funds in order to have an accurate record of spending for boys' and girls' teams.

Analysis of Support Services

Field sports were rated lower than gym sports in terms of facility maintenance, but no differences in terms of gender were evident (see Exhibit A-14).

In order to accurately evaluate the funds spent on every team, booster club contributions must be taken into account. However, survey comments and site visit interviews revealed that many high schools do not track booster club funds. Exhibit 8 presents the average reported amount of booster club contributions by team. The average varied by team, and football received almost three times as much as any other team. Although an examination of average booster club contributions per athlete revealed no significant differences between boys' teams and girls' teams, these findings should be considered tentative because of incomplete data.

Exhibit 8
High School Booster Club Contributions

Team	<i>n</i>	Mean Booster Club Financial Support	
		Total	Per Athlete
Softball (Girls)	61	\$1,923	\$54
Baseball (Boys)	63	\$2,332	\$56
Basketball (Girls)	60	\$2,139	\$73
Basketball (Boys)	63	\$2,495	\$71
Soccer (Girls)	56	\$1,340	\$32
Soccer (Boys)	56	\$1,454	\$31
Volleyball (Girls)	61	\$1,468	\$47
Football (Boys)	62	\$7,172	\$63

Site visit interviews and survey comments reflected that some schools had one booster club for all sports, and in other schools each team had its own booster club. In some schools the booster clubs gave financial support to teams as needed, but in other schools the booster clubs gave the athletic director a lump sum to disperse among teams. Several respondents were unable to track booster club support because the funds were not kept in an account controlled by the school.

Areas With No Significant Gender Disparities

Three areas of investigation had no apparent gender disparities: scheduling of games and practices; locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities; and medical and training facilities and services.

Scheduling of Games and Practices

No significant differences in the number of games played by boys' and girls' teams were evident. Site visit interviews and survey comments indicate that the scheduling of game days and times often is guided by league or conference policy and similar sports appeared to have similar game and practice times. For example, both boys' and girls' basketball teams practiced primarily in the afternoons and played their games primarily in the evenings. About 85% of the responding schools reported rotating practice times to provide equitable access to desirable times and facilities for all teams. Site visit interviews and survey comments from high school athletic directors indicate that practice times varied according to coaches' schedules, facility availability, and rotation systems (see Exhibits A-15 and A-16).

Locker Rooms, Practice, and Competitive Facilities

For the most part, high schools rated the quality and availability of their locker rooms, practice facilities, and competition facilities as adequate or very good (see Exhibits A-17 and A-18). Exhibit 9 shows the mean ratings of facility quality and availability by team gender. Analyses revealed two statistically significant differences: respondents rated both the quality of locker rooms and the quality of practice facilities to be poorer on average for boys than girls. These differences are largely the result of low ratings for the quality of locker rooms and practice facilities for football. When the evaluators excluded football from the analyses, no significant differences between boys' and girls' teams emerged.

Exhibit 9
High School Facility Quality and Availability

Facility Type	Mean Rating	
	Boys' Teams	Girls' Teams
Locker rooms		
Quality ^a	2.30	2.34
Availability	2.56	2.59
Practice facilities		
Quality ^b	2.37	2.45
Availability	2.57	2.59
Competitive facilities		
Quality	2.55	2.56
Availability	2.69	2.72

Note. 1 = *inadequate*, 2 = *adequate*, 3 = *very good*.

^a Difference between boys' and girls' teams statistically significant, $p < .05$.

^b Difference between boys' and girls' teams statistically significant, $p < .001$.

Site visit interviews and observations suggested that the lower ratings for football were the result of locker rooms that were too small to accommodate the large number of players and practice facilities that had to be shared with other teams. (To preserve the condition of their football fields for competitions, many football teams practice on other fields). The majority (65%) of respondents indicated that their school had comparable boys' and girls' team rooms. Approximately 17% of respondents indicated that their school did not have team rooms for either gender, 15% reported that boys' and girls' team rooms were not comparable, and 4% were unsure. Site visit data indicated that high school team rooms were either part of the locker rooms or were equipment storage rooms that were also used for team meetings.

Medical and Training Facilities and Services

Although more than a third of the schools that responded to the survey did not have athletic trainers or medical personnel available to their teams, the schools that did have trainers and medical personnel rated their quality and availability as adequate or very good (see Exhibit A-19). No differences between boys' teams and girls' teams were evident in this area. Survey comments and site visit interviews revealed a variety of

arrangements for trainer services. Some schools had one trainer for the school's entire athletics program, and that person might be a full-time staff member, a part time contractor, or a volunteer. Some schools had certified trainers and some had student trainers. A few schools hired extra part-time trainers during the fall season for soccer and football. The trainers were not necessarily on duty daily nor did they always serve all teams.

Football teams had somewhat greater access to weight rooms or conditioning facilities than other teams. The data do not, however, clearly indicate whether access to weight training facilities was primarily through physical education classes or during after-school practice. Site visit data suggested that high school weight rooms were generally small and inadequate (see Exhibit A-20).

Strategies Used to Achieve Gender Equity

The evaluators observed several effective strategies during site visits that high schools had used to achieved gender equity in athletics. Survey respondents also were asked to list strategies that their school had used to achieve gender equity in athletics. The California Department of Education might wish to consider the following strategies when planning professional development activities for administrators, athletic directors, and coaches.

- Review program participation each year to monitor the numbers of participants and sports offerings.
- Participate in training, including CIF classes, coaches' seminars, and sexual harassment training.
- Provide policies to new staff upon hiring (coaches' orientation or training).
- Gather input and engage in discussion before making decisions or taking action.
- Offer as many freshman teams as possible.

III. Community College Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter presents the community college findings in three parts. Significant findings and corresponding recommendations are presented first, followed by areas needing further study. Finally, areas in which data do not suggest inequitable treatment of men's and women's teams are noted. Ninety-one (89%) community colleges with athletic programs returned surveys.³

The survey findings revealed that community colleges' greatest gender disparity in athletics was in the area of participation. One other area of concern involved coaching. The evaluators could not make equity determinations in the areas of student participation by race/ethnicity; equipment, uniforms, and supplies; travel; and publicity and promotion. Areas in which community colleges' data did not suggest inequitable treatment of men's and women's teams included scheduling of games and practices; locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities; medical and training facilities and services; support services; recruiting expenses; and financial aid. However, the lack of disparities in some areas should not be construed to mean that all colleges were in compliance; individual schools may have problems that are not reflected in the system findings as a whole.

Significant Issues

Brief summaries of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are followed by a more detailed analysis of each issue.

Participation in Athletics

- **Finding:** Although females composed 54% of the community college full-time student population, only 35% of the athletes were

³ Community colleges that did not respond to multiple requests for completed surveys included Alameda, Antelope Valley, Desert, Laney, Lassen Los Angeles City, Los Angeles Southwest, Merritt, Mira Costa, Napa Valley, and Santa Monica Colleges.

female. Only 8% of the community colleges met the Prong 1 standard for proportional participation of male and female students, and 84% were considerably outside the range of acceptability.

- **Conclusion:** Females are underrepresented in community college athletic programs.
 - **Recommendation 9:** The California Legislature should request that the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges provide technical assistance to individual community colleges that are not achieving gender equity in athletics participation. The Chancellor's Office should coordinate this activity with the Commission on Athletics. Technical assistance should involve assisting community colleges to develop a long-range plan for their athletics program that takes into consideration financial and facility resources and student populations. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.
 - **Recommendation 10:** The California Legislature should require that all community colleges collect student interest data and report those data to the Commission on Athletics at least every three years. Community colleges should use student interest survey data to assist in their short- and long-range planning, and technical assistance providers should use those data to guide community colleges and to inform decisions regarding community college athletics programs statewide.
-

Analysis of Participation in Athletics

The evaluators examined the percentage of athletes by gender in comparison to the percentage of full-time male and female students enrolled in each community college in 2002–2003 (enrollment data by gender were obtained from the CPEC website⁴). Across the 89 community colleges that provided participation data, the percentage of female athletes was 35%, compared to average full-time⁵ female student enrollment of 54%.

A frequency distribution showed all but 2 of the 89 community colleges had a smaller percentage of female athletes than female students. Eight percent of the community colleges had a variance between participation and enrollment of less

⁴<http://www.cpec.ca.gov/OnLineData/OnLineData.asp>

than or equal to five percentage points; 8% had a difference between participation and enrollment between five and ten percentage points, and 84% had a variance that exceeded ten percentage points. A variance of five percentage points is generally considered acceptable in California. Exhibit 10 shows community college athletics participation by sport and gender. Football clearly has more participants than any other sport, and it is the size of those rosters and the concomitant resource demands that may create inequities for women’s sports.

Exhibit 10 Community College Athletics Participation

Sport	Women		Ment		Total Participants
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Badminton	126	100	0	0	126
Baseball	0	0	2,304	100	2,304
Basketball	977	46	1,157	54	2,134
Cross country	518	47	589	53	1,107
Football	58	1	4,565	99	4,623
Golf	155	29	385	71	540
Soccer	1,376	50	1,350	50	2,726
Softball	998	100	0	0	998
Swimming	584	50	585	50	1,169
Tennis	399	49	415	51	814
Track and field	781	38	1,289	62	2,070
Volleyball	879	86	146	14	1,025
Water polo	480	49	498	51	978
Wrestling	0	0	401	100	401
Equestrian ^a	15	100	0	0	15
Ice hockey ^a	20	100	0	0	20
Rowing ^a	3	23	10	77	13
Skiing ^a	28	36	49	64	77
Total	7,397	35	13,743	65	21,140

Note. Data are from 89 community colleges.

^aSport not listed by name on the survey form. Because the survey requested data only for specific sports, data for write-in sports may be underreported.

⁵Full-time student enrollment figures were used because these are the figures requested by the U.S. Office of Postsecondary Education for EADA reporting.

Program Expansion

Clearly, community colleges are struggling with the issue of participation. The majority (81%) of athletic directors reported that they did not use the Prong 1 compliance method—ensuring that males and females participate in athletics in numbers proportionate to their enrollment—to comply with Title IX. Of those 81% who were not using Prong 1, 55% indicated that their school had achieved compliance by expanding programs within the past two years to accommodate student interests (Prong 2), 18% reported using Prong 3, and 8% had not reviewed participation in the past 5 years. Community colleges added a total of 141 teams over the past five years, over 70% of which were women’s teams (see Exhibit B-1 in Appendix B). Despite attempts to expand athletic opportunities for women, schools continue to face obstacles. For example, one community college athletic director indicated that in 2002–2003 the college had suspended a recently established women’s team due to an insufficient number of participants.

Student Interest

Although student interest surveys can provide valuable information (e.g., sports that students are most likely to participate in, athletic interests of ethnic minority populations, ways in which the school could better address students’ athletic interests), only 8% of the community college athletic directors reported administering student interest surveys annually, and only 29% reported administering a survey within the past three years. Given current budget considerations, limited resources for athletics programs, and the significant disparity between male and female participation in community college athletics, community colleges would benefit from more recent documentation that either provides a rationale and guidance for program changes or substantiates that low participation is due to female lack of interest in athletics.

Gender Equity Training

- **Finding:** Fewer than half of the community college respondents indicated that administrators or head coaches had attended equity training in the past three years.
 - **Conclusion:** Administrators and coaches are not receiving regular training on gender equity issues.
 - **Recommendation 11:** The California Legislature should request that the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges provide annual equity training to coaches and administrative staff at community colleges and encourage the dissemination of information to ensure that all staff and students are cognizant of current Title IX issues. The Chancellor's Office should coordinate this activity with the Commission on Athletics. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.
-

Analysis of Gender Equity Training

Despite gender equity issues related to participation, only 45% of community colleges indicated that administrators had attended equity training in the past three years and only 41% reported that head coaches had attended training in the past three years (see Exhibit B-2).

Coaching

- **Finding:** Survey data revealed that the number of full-time men's team head coaches was disproportionately greater than the number of full-time women's team head coaches for the four most common men's and women's sports. The athletic directors of 69 community colleges reported a total of 243 women's team head coaches (45% of whom were full time) and 233 men's team coaches (63% of whom were full time).
- **Finding:** The average number of years of head coach experience was substantially greater for men's teams than women's teams regardless of whether the head coach was full time or part time. Additionally, men's team head coaches had a greater level of experience that presumably corresponded with their higher salaries.

- **Finding:** EADA data showed that women’s teams at community colleges have on average fewer coaches and fewer full-time equivalent (FTE) coaches than men’s teams.
- **Conclusion:** Head coaches for men’s teams are more likely than head coaches for women’s teams to be full time and have more years of coaching experience that correspond with higher salaries. Women’s teams also have fewer coaches on average than men’s teams and fewer full-time equivalent (FTE) coaches.
- **Recommendation 12:** The California Legislature should request that the Chancellor’s Office of the California Community Colleges conduct an in-depth study of hiring practices for coaches. Such a study should explore the reasons that fewer full-time head coach positions exist for women’s teams relative to men’s teams and the reasons that the coaches of women’s teams have less experience than the coaches of men’s teams. The study should also explore alternative hiring approaches that might facilitate more equitable coaching for women’s teams. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.

Analysis of Coaching

About 85% of the community college athletic directors reported the numbers of full-time and part-time coaches for the four most common women’s and men’s sports (see Exhibit 11). Total percentages of full-time head coaches for men’s (63%) versus women’s (45%) teams reflect the degree of inequity in coach status.

Exhibit 11
Community College Head Coach Positions by Team

Sport	Head Coach: Women’s Teams				Sport	Head Coach: Men’s Teams			
	Full-Time		Part-Time			Full-Time		Part-Time	
	<i>n</i>	Percent	<i>n</i>	Percent		<i>n</i>	Percent	<i>n</i>	Percent
Softball	31	55	25	45	Baseball	39	57	30	43
Basketball	31	46	37	54	Basketball	47	70	20	30
Soccer	20	34	38	66	Soccer	13	30	30	70
Volleyball	27	44	34	56	Football	47	87	7	13
Total	109	45	134	55	Total	134	63	87	37

Note. Data are from 69 community colleges.

EADA data for all sports from 100 community colleges indicate that women’s teams have fewer coaches on average and fewer FTE than men’s teams. Differences are statistically significant (see Exhibit 12).

**Exhibit 12
Community College Head Coach Positions**

Head Coach Position	Men’s Teams	Women’s Teams
Number of head coaches*	6.58	6.18
Number of FTE**	2.99	2.63

Note. Data collected from EADA reports on 100 community colleges.

** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$.

Survey data on head coaches’ years of experience show that on average men’s team coaches had more experience than women’s team coaches for similar sports regardless of whether the position was full time or part time (see Exhibit 13).

**Exhibit 13
Community College Head Coaches’ Years of Experience**

Sport	Full-Time		Part-Time	
	<i>n</i>	Years	<i>n</i>	Years
Softball (Women)	23	16.78	25	10.28
Baseball (Men)	39	17.62	27	12.48
Basketball (Women)	29	14.79	36	11.6
Basketball (Men)	45	18.20	19	15.68
Soccer (Women)	17	14.29	39	10.33
Soccer (Men)	13	15.77	29	14.17
Volleyball (Women)	26	14.50	30	10.73
Football (Men)	44	22.49	6	17.83

Note. Data are from 69 community colleges.

Salary data collected from EADA reports revealed statistically significant salary differences between head coaches of men’s and women’s teams that presumably correspond to differences in years of experience (see Exhibit B-3).

Areas With Ambiguous Findings

Data analysis revealed several areas in which the meaning of statistically significant differences between men's and women's teams are ambiguous. These areas include student participation by race/ethnicity; equipment, uniforms, and supplies; travel; and publicity and promotion.

Participation in Athletics by Race/Ethnicity

- **Finding:** Compared to enrollment percentages, Asian males and females were underrepresented in community college athletics, and African American males and White females were overrepresented.
 - **Conclusion:** Some racial/ethnic groups may be underrepresented in athletics.
 - **Recommendation 13:** To determine whether racial/ethnic underrepresentation is a problem and to address any participation concerns, community colleges should administer student interest surveys that include a racial/ethnic identifier.
-

Analysis of Participation by Race/Ethnicity

Of the 91 community colleges that returned surveys, 72 provided participation data by race/ethnicity. Asian males and females were underrepresented in community college athletics compared to their enrollment. Asian males represented 6% of the male athlete population and 19% of the male student body; Asian females represented 7% of the female athlete population and 16% of the female student body. African American males and White females were overrepresented in the athlete population. African American males represented 23% of the male athlete population but only 7% of the male student population. White females represented 51% of the female athlete population but only 42% of the female student body. See Exhibits B-4 through B-6 in Appendix B for data exhibits related to race/ethnic participation and enrollment.

Equipment, Uniforms, and Supplies

- **Finding:** Community college athletic directors reported men's teams' uniforms to be of lower quality, on average, than women's teams' uniforms.
 - **Finding:** In 2002–2003 total expenditures for equipment, uniforms, and supplies for men's teams were greater than for women's teams. Per athlete expenditures, however, were significantly lower for men's teams than for women's teams..
 - **Finding:** Survey comments and interview data indicate that (a) expenditures for any given year vary because community colleges' athletic team purchases occur on a 3-year cycle, (b) equipment durability varies by sport and by gender, and (c) teams often fundraise to support additional purchases of uniforms.
 - **Conclusion:** Statistically significant findings related to uniforms, equipment, and supplies are ambiguous and qualitative data suggest that policies are relatively efficient and equitable. Data are insufficient to draw any conclusions regarding community colleges' management of equipment, uniforms, and supplies.
 - **Recommendation 14:** The California Legislature should request that the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges examine expenditure data over a three-year period to determine whether expenditures for equipment, uniforms, and supplies are comparable for men's and women's teams.
-

Analysis of Equipment, Uniforms, and Supplies

Analyses of survey data revealed no statistically significant differences in terms of the number of men's and women's teams for which the community colleges provided practice uniforms, but on average the colleges provided game uniforms to a slightly greater number of women's teams than men's teams. In addition, significantly more women's teams than men's teams provided their own game uniforms. The quality of uniforms, equipment, and supplies across colleges was reportedly lower for men's teams than for women's teams. This difference is largely accounted for by low ratings for the quality of football and baseball

uniforms and equipment. Colleges also provided equipment to more women’s teams than men’s teams, on average (see Exhibits B-7 and B-8).

Exhibit 14 shows the mean team and per athlete expenditures for uniforms, equipment, and supplies during the 2002–2003 academic year. Although the average expenditure across the four most common men’s and women’s teams varied significantly, with men’s team total expenditures exceeding those of women’s teams (\$7,836 and \$4,381, respectively), per athlete expenditures were significantly lower for men’s teams than women’s teams (\$287 and \$324, respectively). When comparing expenditures for similar sports, per athlete softball expenditures were significantly greater than per athlete baseball expenditures, and per athlete expenditures for women’s soccer exceeded those of men’s soccer. Per athlete expenditure differences between men’s and women’s basketball were not significant.

Exhibit 14
Community College Expenditures for Uniforms and Equipment

Sport	n	Mean Uniform/Equipment Expenditure	
		Team	Per Athlete
Softball (Women)	70	\$5,601	\$404
Baseball (Men)	78	\$8,995	\$329
Basketball (Women)	76	\$4,340	\$373
Basketball (Men)	76	\$4,693	\$349
Soccer (Women)	72	\$3,879	\$203
Soccer (Men)	53	\$3,667	\$152
Volleyball (Women)	74	\$3,469	\$319
Football (Men)	63	\$13,701	\$223

Note. Many respondents indicated that they were unable to disaggregate expenditures by sport.

Site visit data and survey comments indicated the existence of policies regarding the rotation of equipment, uniforms, and supplies; the typical rotation schedule timeline was three years, and the scheduled rotation method varied from college to college. Site visit data and survey comments also indicated that although

colleges commonly met teams' minimum needs, coaches often were responsible for fundraising or securing donations to support any additional uniform or equipment needs of their sport.

The statistically significant differences discussed above do not provide any conclusive evidence for inequitable treatment of men and women athletes because (a) the underlying issue is that women are underrepresented in community college athletics, making it difficult to expect equity in expenditures without considering the number of athletes, and (b) community colleges rotate purchases of uniforms and equipment on a three-year cycle, making evaluation of uniform and equipment purchasing practices in any given year incomplete.

Travel

- **Finding:** In 2002–2003 travel expenditures for men's teams were significantly greater than expenditures for women's teams, but per capita expenditures for men's teams were significantly lower than those of women's teams'.
 - **Conclusion:** Although survey data on community colleges' travel expenditures revealed statistically significant differences between men's and women's teams, survey comments and site visit interview data suggest travel is equitable between men's and women's teams.
 - **Recommendation:** None.
-

Analysis of Travel

Statistical analysis revealed a significant difference between travel expenditures for men's and women's teams, with colleges spending an average of \$6,824 on travel for the four most common men's teams and an average of \$4,621 on travel for the four most common women's teams. A comparison of per athlete expenditures for similar teams and across all teams showed, however, that on average women's teams' per athlete travel expenditures were significantly greater than those of men's teams. (See Exhibits B-9 and B-10).

Site visit interview data and survey comments suggest that institutional policies and the nature of the sport tend to dictate travel arrangements at the community college level and are equivalent for both genders. The statistically significant differences discussed above do not provide any conclusive evidence for inequitable treatment of men and women athletes in regard to travel because it is impossible to interpret gender discrepancies in travel without first understanding the extent to which female athletic underrepresentation affects other areas of the athletic program.

Publicity and Promotion

- **Finding:** Differences existed in the amount of reported publicity both in the community (e.g., media contacts, advertisements) and at events (e.g., game programs, rosters, schedules, videotaping). The survey respondents reported that men’s teams were more likely than women’s teams to receive these types of publicity.
 - **Conclusion:** The observed differences between men’s and women’s teams are small, and site visit data and survey comments suggest that the amount of publicity is more specifically related to the type of sport than the gender of the athletes. For example, soccer received the least publicity, and football and basketball received the most publicity.
 - **Recommendation:** None.
-

Analysis of Publicity and Promotion

Campus and community publicity (e.g., newspapers, posters) was infrequent for most community college sports. Publicity at events (e.g., programs, rosters, schedules) tended to be greater for football and basketball (both men’s and women’s) than for other sports. Expenditures for community publicity were comparable for men’s and women’s teams. The evaluators examined whether, overall, men’s teams received more frequent publicity and promotion than women’s teams. Statistically, men’s teams received significantly more publicity

than women's teams in the community and at or for team events, but community colleges' campus publicity was comparable. (See Exhibits B-11 through B-13).

Site visit interview data and survey comments indicate that the advertisement of games on electronic marquees placed at each of the campus entrances on the day of the competition substantially increased students' awareness of games and competitions as a whole, and thus provided less of a distinction between the promotion of men's and women's sports. Other methods that community colleges reported using to promote sports include student newspapers and websites.

Operating Expenses

- **Finding:** Average total operating expenses across the 100 community colleges that submitted EADA reports were significantly greater for men's teams than for women's teams. However, average per athlete expenditures were significantly lower for men's teams than for women's teams.
 - **Conclusion:** The statistically significant findings related to operating expenses are inconclusive and difficult to interpret without first understanding the extent to which female athletic underrepresentation impacts other areas of the athletic program.
 - **Recommendation:** None.
-

Analysis of Operating Expenses

On EADA forms, athletic directors reported operating expenses, which typically include team transportation, lodging, and meals; uniforms and equipment; and compensation for game officials. The average total operating expenses across the 100 community colleges that submitted EADA reports were \$71,193 for men's teams and \$47,498 for women's teams. Average per athlete expenditures were \$589 and \$684 for men's and women's teams, respectively. Men's teams' total expenditures were significantly greater than women's teams' total expenditures, but men's teams' per capita operating expenditures were significantly lower than women's teams' per capita operating expenditures. These statistically significant

differences do not provide any conclusive evidence for inequitable treatment of men and women athletes in regard to operating expenses because it is impossible to interpret gender discrepancies in operating expenses without first understanding the extent to which female athletic underrepresentation affects other areas of the athletic program.

Areas With No Significant Gender Disparities

Areas in which community colleges' athletic programs demonstrated no significant gender disparities included the scheduling of games and practices; locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities; medical and training facilities and services; support services; recruiting expenses; and financial aid.

Scheduling of Games and Practices

There were no significant differences in the number of games for similar men's and women's sports, which are dictated by the colleges' conference schedules (see Exhibits B-14 and B-15). About 75% of the respondents indicated that their college rotated practice times to provide equitable access to desirable times and facilities for all teams. In instances where multiple teams shared the same practice facility, coaches generally worked out a mutually agreeable schedule; in a few instances practice times depended on the coach's availability. In interviews conducted during site visits, coaches generally reported that scheduling was not an issue. One athletics administrator reported setting the practice schedule at the beginning of each season after soliciting coaches' preferred practice schedules.

Locker Rooms, Practice, and Competitive Facilities

Locker room quality and availability, and practice and competition facility quality and availability information is presented in Exhibits B-16 and B-17. Only one significant gender difference existed; on average respondents rated the quality of practice facilities for men as poorer than the facilities for women. This difference is small and significantly different only for football (see Exhibit B-18).

Site visit data and survey comments indicate that the quality of community college locker room facilities were similar for men and women. Several athletic directors reported, however, that because the locker room facilities were designed before Title IX legislation, they were outdated and often did not provide gender equivalent access to other facilities (e.g., training facilities, equipment rooms). The athletic directors further indicated that to the extent possible these inequities had been addressed through facility renovations or by making access to facilities more equitable for male and female athletes. Interviewees and survey respondents generally did not view locker room and practice and competitive facilities as gender equity issues.

Medical and Training Facilities and Services

Community college survey respondents' ratings of the athletic trainers and medical personnel are presented in Exhibit B-19 and findings regarding the scheduling of weight room or conditioning facilities at community colleges are summarized in Exhibit B-20. No gender differences were evident for ratings of athletic trainers and medical personnel. Both in season and off season, scheduling for weight room or conditioning facilities was generally rated as adequate or very good. No differences were evident between men's and women's teams, in part because most community colleges had only one weight room shared by all teams and the general student population.

Support Services

Community college survey respondents' ratings of tutoring services, coaches' office space, and facilities maintenance are summarized in Exhibit B-21. Tutoring for community college athletes was not usually distinct from general college tutoring opportunities and was generally rated as adequate or very good. Office space for coaches also was rated as adequate or very good, with no differences between men's and women's team coaches. Respondents rated facilities maintenance for field sports (e.g., football, soccer, baseball, softball) lower than

maintenance for gym sports (e.g., basketball, volleyball), but no gender differences were reported.

The majority of community college teams did not receive booster club financial support. Of those that did, the average amount varied by sport. Baseball and football received the largest booster club contributions. Further analyses showed that average per athlete contributions did not differ overall across men's and women's sports nor between similar men's and women's sports (see Exhibit B-23 for average amounts of booster club contributions by team).

Recruiting Expenses

Recruiting expenses include transportation, lodging, and meals for recruits and college personnel engaged in recruiting and other major expenses related to recruiting. EADA data indicate that the average recruiting expenditures were \$679 and \$431 for men's and women's teams, respectively. Although the average difference appears to be significant, it is not; one college submitted a substantially large number that skewed the men's team average.

Financial Aid

Student aid across the community colleges was similar for men's and women's teams. Men's teams received an average total of \$92 for student aid and women's teams received an average total of \$93.

Strategies Used to Achieve Gender Equity

The evaluators observed several effective strategies during site visits that community colleges had used to achieved gender equity in athletics. Survey respondents also were asked to list strategies that their community college had used to achieve gender equity in athletics. The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges and the Commission on Athletics might wish to consider the following practices when planning training activities for administrators, athletic directors, and coaches. These practices include:

- Conducting self-studies or program reviews regularly and writing plans that include goals for improving equity.
- Conducting annual mandatory coaches' meetings that include Title IX guidelines and sexual harassment training.
- Scheduling team weight room training in the course catalog or having a set schedule for teams' weight room access instead of allowing access on a first-come, first-serve basis.
- Coordinating fundraising across sports instead of requiring each coach to be responsible for team fundraising.

IV. University Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter presents findings related to university athletic programs in three parts. Significant issues and corresponding recommendations are presented first, followed by areas that may need further exploration. Finally, areas in which data revealed no significant gender disparities are noted. The university sample for this study represents 28 of the 30 schools in the CSU and UC systems⁶.

Significant issue areas included athletics participation, coaching, and operating and recruiting expenditures. A concomitant issue involves insufficient Title IX training for athletic administrators and coaches. Ambiguous areas affecting compliance included student academic outcomes and publicity and promotion. No significant gender disparities were evident in the areas of scheduling of games and practices, locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities; medical and training facilities and services; support services; and student athletic scholarships. However, the lack of disparities in some areas should not be construed to mean that all universities were in compliance; individual schools may have problems that are not reflected in the system findings as a whole.

Significant Issues

Notable gender differences were evident in the areas of athletics participation, coaching, and operating and recruiting expenditures. Brief summaries of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are followed by more detailed descriptions of the findings.

Participation in Athletics

- **Findings:** Although 57% of California universities had athletics participation percentages within five percentage points of student

⁶UC-Berkeley and CSU-San Bernardino did not respond to multiple requests for completed surveys.

enrollment for each gender, 43% of California universities were still outside the range of acceptability.

- **Conclusion:** Male and female athletic participation in university athletics is not proportional to male and female student enrollment.
 - **Recommendation 15:** The California Legislature should support state-level monitoring of Title IX compliance in university athletic programs through the universities' respective systemwide offices. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.
 - **Recommendation 16:** The California Legislature should request that the University of California Office of the President and the Chancellor's Office of the California State University strengthen training and seek any technical assistance necessary to ensure their respective campuses know how to meet the participation requirements of Title IX using each part of the three-prong test.
-

Analysis of Participation in Athletics

Exhibit 15 shows the number of male and female athletes who participated in each sport for the 28 universities that provided data. Approximately 10,500 athletes participated in 22 sports. Full-time undergraduate enrollment at these 28 campuses included 201,766 women and 158,528 men. Although males and females participated in almost equal numbers in university athletic programs, athletic participation was not proportional to student enrollment. Women were underrepresented in athletics compared to their enrollment.

Most (25) of the universities reported being in compliance with Title IX as measured by Prong 1, but only 16 of the 28 reporting universities actually had athletics participation rates within 5% of enrollment by gender. Ten had proportionality gaps between 5% and 10%, and two of the universities had proportionality gaps greater than 10%. Universities that do not meet the Prong 1 test for proportional participation can meet Title IX requirements for participation through Prongs 2 or 3. However, only three of the universities reported using Prong 2 (expanding programs for the underrepresented gender) as their standard for Title IX participation compliance, and none reported using Prong 3 (fully and

effectively meeting the interests and abilities of the underrepresented gender). The qualitative data from the site visits revealed a degree of frustration with the Prong 1 standard among administrators and coaches. Some interviewees reported interest in using Prong 3 instead of Prong 1 as the compliance standard, but cited an incomplete understanding how to meet the requirements of Prong 3.

Exhibit 15 University Athletics Participation

Sport	Women		Men		Total Participants
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Baseball	0	0	775	100	775
Basketball	385	48	417	52	802
Cross country	488	62	294	38	782
Equestrian ^a	102	100	0	0	102
Fencing ^a	21	55	17	45	38
Field hockey ^a	7	100	0	0	7
Football	0	0	819	100	819
Golf	127	37	218	63	345
Gymnastics ^a	99	100	0	0	99
Lacrosse ^a	22	100	0	0	22
Rowing ^a	431	78	122	22	553
Rugby ^a	0	0	28	100	28
Sailing ^a	19	48	21	53	40
Soccer	680	50	690	50	1,370
Softball	396	100	0	0	396
Surfing ^a	428	62	258	38	686
Swimming	380	64	215	36	595
Tennis	206	57	156	43	362
Track and field	800	54	668	46	1,468
Volleyball	390	73	147	27	537
Water polo	322	64	182	36	504
Wrestling	0	0	179	100	179
Total	5,303	50.5	5,206	49.5	10,509

Notes. Data are from 28 universities. Full-time undergraduate enrollment at these 28 campuses included 201,766 women and 158,528 men.

^aSports not listed by name on the survey form. Because the survey requested data only for specific sports, data for write-in sports may be underreported.

Program Expansion

Data on teams recently added or deleted reveal efforts to encourage or maintain gender equity in athletics. Prong 2 requires universities to demonstrate a history and continuing practice of program expansion for the underrepresented gender. In the past five years, 75% of all teams added to university athletic programs were women’s teams. The most commonly added teams for women were golf, track and field, and water polo, and the most commonly added team for men was golf. No women’s teams and only five men’s teams were deleted from university athletic programs in the past five years. The fact that no women’s teams were deleted, combined with the addition of more teams for women than for men, suggests that UC and CSU campuses made progress toward gender equity in athletics in the past five years. (See Exhibit 16).

Exhibit 16
Universities Adding and Deleting Teams in the Past Five Years

Sport	Number of Sampled Schools With Women’s Teams			Number of Sampled Schools With Men’s Teams		
	Current	Added	Deleted	Current	Added	Deleted
Baseball	0	0	0	20	1	0
Basketball	24	1	0	25	0	0
Cross country	24	3	0	19	0	1
Football	0	0	0	8	0	2
Golf	13	8	0	20	7	0
Soccer	24	4	0	24	1	0
Softball	19	0	0	0	0	0
Swimming	12	0	0	8	0	0
Tennis	18	3	0	12	0	1
Track and field	21	8	0	17	2	0
Volleyball	24	0	0	6	0	0
Water polo	10	6	0	7	0	0
Wrestling	0	0	0	6	0	1
Total		33	0		11	5

Note. Data are from 28 universities.

Student Interest

Although 38% of the universities reported conducting annual surveys of student interest, 47% reported rarely or never conducting student interest surveys or were unsure how frequently such surveys were conducted. Competitive opportunities offered at feeder high schools or through university recreational and club sports programs may be overlooked in the assessment of student interests; such programs may indicate areas where student interests and abilities have not been fully accommodated in university athletics.

Summary of Athletics Participation Issues

When Title IX came into being 30 years ago, females as a whole were drastically underrepresented in athletics. Increasing numbers of female athletes over the years has indeed changed the Title IX landscape, and the finer points of compliance are now emerging. Females might participate in athletics in numbers equal to males, but some minority groups are underrepresented; interests of males might not be met in some cases; and—even with equal proportions or numbers—some students or sports might be underserved by the athletic program. Applying a standard that relies primarily on assessing proportional numbers (Prong 1) will not resolve these issues.

Some universities might benefit from applying Prongs 2 or 3 to measure their Title IX participation compliance and better serve students. University females might not be interested in athletic participation in the same proportion as their enrollment, and to continue emphasizing this standard of compliance might be fruitless. Current issues in Title IX compliance might stem from reliance on an old model of compliance (i.e., increasing numbers of females participating in athletics) in times that are calling for new models of compliance.

The Title IX regulations do present a model for the future as gender equity in athletics moves to the next level of compliance. Prong 3—fully and effectively meeting student interest in athletic participation—is that model. Perhaps effective future implementation of gender equity in athletics and assessment of Title IX

compliance should place more emphasis on Prong 3—that is, all university students who have athletic ability and interest should have the opportunity to develop their skills and play competitively as part of their university experience.

Gender Equity Training

- **Findings:** Less than a third of the coaches and less than half of the administrators received Title IX training in the past three years.
 - **Conclusion:** University athletic administrators and coaches are not receiving regular training on gender equity issues.
 - **Recommendation 17:** The California Legislature should request that the University of California Office of the President and the Chancellor’s Office of the California State University ensure that annual equity training is provided to coaches and athletic administrators at their respective campuses. The training should include Title IX requirements, sexual harassment, and other nondiscrimination issues. The California Legislature should provide resources to implement this recommendation.
-

Analysis of Gender Equity Training

Lack of training or insufficient participation in existing training opportunities may be a critical factor affecting Title IX compliance in athletic programs. Only 46% of schools had athletic administrators who had attended training in Title IX and only 29% of schools had full time coaches who had attended training (see Exhibit C-1). Important topics for training include a better understanding of how to effectively implement each option of the 3-pronged test and how to identify and implement strategies that work to promote and maintain gender equity.

Coaching

- **Findings:** Salaries for men’s team head coaches and assistant coaches were significantly higher overall than salaries for women’s team coaches. This finding may reflect that coaches for women’s teams are less experienced or less qualified than coaches for men’s teams.
 - **Conclusion:** Compensation for coaches of men’s and women’s teams is not equitable.
 - **Recommendation 18:** The California Legislature should request that the University of California Office of the President and the Chancellor’s Office of the California State University institute stronger policy directives and monitoring systems to ensure that female and male students receive comparable coaching. In addition, further study of university coaching should be conducted to determine if compensation is related to quality of coaching.
-

Analysis of Coaching

Exhibit 17 shows that men’s teams had significantly fewer FTE for head coaches on average than did women’s teams (6.60 and 7.70 FTE, respectively). Assuming that each varsity team had an allocation for one head coach (i.e., one FTE), these figures indicate that California universities typically have about six or seven men’s sports and seven or eight women’s sports in their athletic programs. This situation is not unusual because universities are striving to increase opportunities for women and generate higher numbers of female participants. Universities with football teams often need to offer more women’s teams than men’s teams in order to accommodate a sufficient number of female athletes.

Coaches of men’s teams in the UC and CSU systems had significantly higher average salaries than coaches of women’s teams (see Exhibit 17). If men’s team head coaches earn more because they have more experience or qualifications, then women’s teams are at a disadvantage because their coaches are less qualified. Detailed analysis of coaches’ qualifications, experience, and

compensation was beyond the parameters of this study, but these factors should be examined further.

Exhibit 17 University Coaching Data

Coach/Characteristic	Men's Teams	Women's Teams
Head		
Average per person salary ^b	\$63,231	\$49,307
Number of coaches ^b	6.60	7.70
Average per FTE salary ^a	\$93,457	\$73,967
Number of FTE ^b	5.31	6.27
Assistant		
Average per person salary ^b	\$23,564	\$17,267
Number of coaches	13.90	13.37
Average per FTE salary ^c	\$57,344	\$51,739
Number of FTE ^c	8.26	7.26

Note. Data are from 30 universities.

^a Differences between men's and women's teams statistically significant at $p < .001$.

^b Differences between men's and women's teams statistically significant at $p < .01$.

^c Differences between men's and women's teams statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Operating and Recruiting Expenditures

Financial data obtained from universities' EADA reports included total and per capita operating expenditures, recruiting expenditures, student athletic aid, and total revenue.

-
- **Findings:** Total operating expenses and recruiting expenses were higher for men's teams than for women's teams. These differences are true both for total team and per athlete expenditures.
 - **Conclusion:** Operating expenditures and recruiting expenditures are higher for men's teams than for women's teams.
 - **Recommendation 19:** The California Legislature should institute stronger policy directives and monitoring systems to ensure that universities are meeting the federal requirements of Title IX, especially in the areas of operating and recruiting expenses.

Analysis of Operating and Recruiting Expenditures

Operating expenses include team transportation, lodging, and meals; uniforms and equipment; and compensation for game officials. The mean total operating expense for the 30 California universities in 2002–2003 was \$658,395 for men’s teams and \$459,933 for women’s teams. Average per athlete expenditures were \$2,745 and \$2,070 for men’s and women’s teams, respectively.

Recruiting expenses include transportation, lodging, and meals for recruits and institutional personnel engaged in recruiting; expenditures for official and unofficial visits; and other major expenses related to recruiting. Men’s teams spent significantly more on recruiting than did women’s teams. The average recruiting expenditure was \$72,255 for men’s teams and \$47,092 for women’s teams.

Areas With Ambiguous Findings

This section discusses student academic outcomes, publicity and promotion, and athletics participation by race/ethnicity.

Academic Outcomes

Although only half of the universities provided grade and graduation rate data for athletes and all students, analyses for these 15 schools revealed that male athletes’ average GPA was significantly lower than male students’ average GPA. Male athletes did, however, maintain GPAs high enough to graduate. No significant GPA differences were evident between female athletes and the female student population. Females, both athletes and general students, graduated at higher rates than men. (Data tables for academic outcomes appear in Exhibits C-2 and C-3).

Publicity and Promotion

The assessment of publicity and promotion included a review of on-campus publicity for athletics, promotion for and at events (e.g., programs, rosters), and publicity in the community (e.g., press kits, news releases). Analyses revealed

that men’s teams did not receive significantly more campus publicity or publicity at events than women’s teams (see Exhibit C-14). Community coverage of athletic events was not equal in some situations, but such coverage is outside the control of the university and is thus not an issue of Title IX compliance. Exhibit 18 summarizes the total and per athlete expenditures for publicity for the eight common sports. The largest per athlete publicity expenditures were incurred for men’s and women’s basketball, although publicity expenditures for men’s basketball exceeded publicity expenditures for women’s basketball. Across all sports, the greatest average expenditures were for football (with five schools reporting).

Exhibit 18
University Expenditures for Community Publicity

Sport	n	Mean Expenditure for Community Publicity	
		Total	Per Athlete
Softball (Women)	12	\$2,450	\$126
Baseball (Men)	13	\$3,526	\$99
Basketball (Women)	15	\$7,992	\$559
Basketball (Men)	15	\$10,774	\$654
Soccer (Women)	14	\$2,480	\$99
Soccer (Men)	13	\$2,553	\$96
Volleyball (Women)	15	\$3,847	\$246
Football (Men)	5	\$32,135	\$303

Participation in Athletics by Race/Ethnicity

- **Findings:** Hispanic and Asian females as well as Asian males were underrepresented in university athletics. African Americans and Whites (non-Hispanic) of both genders were overrepresented.
- **Conclusion:** Hispanic and Asian females and Asian males do not participate in athletics in proportion to their enrollment.
- **Recommendation 20:** Universities should administer student interest surveys that include a racial/ethnic identifier to determine

whether racial/ethnic underrepresentation is a problem and to address any participation concerns.

Analysis of Participation by Race/Ethnicity

Exhibit 19 summarizes the differences in participation and enrollment for each race/ethnic group. Demographic breakdowns for each UC or CSU campus may show different proportions for each race/ethnic group. (See Exhibits C-5 and C-6 for breakdowns by sport, gender, and race/ethnicity).

Exhibit 19
University Enrollment and Athletics Participation
by Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Percent of Student Population		Percent of Athlete Population		Difference	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
American Indian	1	1	1	1	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	29	25	5	7	24	18
African American	4	5	17	10	-13	-5
Hispanic	17	21	13	11	4	10
White (non-Hispanic)	42	41	56	64	-14	-23
Mixed/Other	3	3	9	9	-6	-6
Total	96	96	100	100		

Note. Student population percentages do not add up to 100 because 4% of males and 3% of females were identified as nonresidents. Negative differences indicate overrepresentation.

Areas With No Significant Gender Disparities

No significant differences were noted in the areas of scheduling of games and practices, locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities; medical and training facilities and services; support services; and student athletic scholarships.

Scheduling of Games and Practices

Data on numbers of conference and pre-conference competitions for each sport and the scheduling of games and practice times are included in Exhibits C-7 and

C-8. There were no significant differences in the number of competitions for similar men's and women's sports and no differences in the practice times for men's and women's sports.

Locker Rooms, Practice, and Competitive Facilities

Most universities rated the locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities for each sport as adequate or very good. Almost all of the universities reported some form of athletics facilities improvement or construction in recent years. In many cases the construction or renovation of other university facilities had a temporary impact on athletics facilities. Survey respondents reported a wide variety of improvements ranging from the resurfacing of gym floors to the building of a new sports complex. Almost all sports were mentioned, and no particular sport or type of improvement appeared to dominate. Ratings of the quality and availability of locker room facilities and practice and competitive facilities are summarized in Exhibits C-9 through C-11.

Medical and Training Facilities and Services

The quality of trainers and medical personnel were rated adequate or very good for all sports. Both in-season and off-season, scheduling for the weight room or conditioning facilities was generally rated as adequate or very good for all sports. Ratings of university trainers and medical personnel and weight room or conditioning room availability are provided in Exhibits C-12 and C-13.

Support Services

The majority of the universities rated tutoring services for athletes, coaches' office space, and facilities maintenance as adequate or very good (see Exhibit C-14). There were no gender differences evident in any of the support service ratings. Although not all universities had booster club support, for those that did neither the total contributions per team or per athlete were significantly different for men's and women's teams (see Exhibit C-15).

Student Athletic Scholarships

Athletic student aid across UC and CSU campuses was similar for men's and women's teams. Male athletes received an average of \$575,649 per university and female athletes received an average of \$582,421 per university.

Strategies Used to Achieve Gender Equity

The evaluators observed several effective strategies during site visits that universities had used to achieved gender equity in athletics. Survey respondents also were asked to list strategies that their university had used to achieve gender equity in athletics. The University of California Office of the President and the Chancellor's Office of the California State University might wish to consider the following practices when planning training activities for administrators, athletic directors, and coaches. These practices include:

- Changing to an athletics conference with a strong representation of women's programs.
- Managing roster numbers for men's and women's teams.
- Holding regular meetings and communication among athletics administrators and coaches.
- Providing training and support to coaches and athletes.
- Committing to gender equity at the university level.
- Developing and implementing plans to increase gender equity in athletics.
- Adhering to the requirements of the California NOW/California State University decree with the regarding athletic participation.