



**U.S. Department of Education  
Office for Civil Rights**

Dr. Miguel Cardona  
Secretary of Education, Office for Civil Rights  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202  
Phone (202) 401 – 3000  
[ocr@ed.gov](mailto:ocr@ed.gov)

Catherine Lhamon, J.D.  
Ass't Secretary, Office for Civil Rights  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20202 - 1100  
[Catherine.lhamon@ed.gov](mailto:Catherine.lhamon@ed.gov)

Suzanne B. Goldberg, J.D.  
Acting Ass't Secretary, Office for Civil Rights  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202 - 1100  
[Suzanne.goldberg@ed.gov](mailto:Suzanne.goldberg@ed.gov)

**ADMINISTRATIVE CLASS COMPLAINT**

**COMPLAINANT**

*Champion Women*  
Nancy Hogshead, J.D., OLY, CEO  
EMAIL: [Hogshead@ChampionWomen.org](mailto:Hogshead@ChampionWomen.org)

**RECIPIENT**

Kent State University  
Randale Richmond, Director of Athletics  
MAC Center, P.O. Box 5190,  
Kent, OH 44242  
EMAIL: [ksuad@kent.edu](mailto:ksuad@kent.edu)

Todd Diacon, President  
800 E Summit St.  
Kent, OH 44242  
EMAIL: [dboldon@kent.edu](mailto:dboldon@kent.edu)

## **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

1. This complaint is filed by *Champion Women*, pursuant to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 *et seq.* (“Title IX”) and the regulations and policies promulgated thereunder. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 106 *et seq.* Title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in federally funded education programs and activities, including athletics.

2. *Champion Women* is a 501(c)(3) that provides legal advocacy for girls and women in sports.

3. As detailed in the Factual and Legal Allegations below, data submitted by Kent State University, (“Kent”) to the Office of Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education pursuant to the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (“EADA”), 20 U.S.C. § 1092, as well as information collected from Kent’s website indicates that Kent is discriminating on the basis of sex by providing women with unequal athletic participation opportunities, unequal athletic scholarship dollars, and unequal treatment and benefits, including athletic recruitment funding.

4. In order to address these disparities, *Champion Women* requests that the Office for Civil Rights (“OCR”) investigate Kent to determine whether it is discriminating against women; whether it is providing women equal opportunities to participate in varsity sports and equivalent recruitment funding as required by Title IX and, if not, to remedy any unlawful conduct.

## **II. JURISDICTION**

5. The OCR is responsible for ensuring compliance with Title IX and receiving information about, investigating, and remedying violations of Title IX and its implementing regulations and guidelines. 34 C.F.R. §§ 106.71, 100.7.

6. *Champion Women* has not filed this complaint with any other agency or institution.

7. As Kent currently violates Title IX’s athletic equity requirements, this complaint is timely.

## **III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

8. Kent receives federal financial assistance and is therefore prohibited from discriminating on the basis of sex pursuant to Title IX.

9. Data submitted by Kent to the U.S. Department of Education pursuant to the EADA that is publicly available on the Office of Postsecondary Education website for academic years 2003-04 through 2021-2022 indicates that Kent is not currently and has not in the past been providing female athletes equal opportunities to participate in athletics under Title IX’s three-part participation test.

Year	Undergraduate Enrollment				Men	Women Prong 2: This # should Rise Continuously and Steadily Over Time, Without Going Backwards	Athletic Participation		
	Men	Women	Total	Percent Women			Total	Percent Women	Female Athletes Who Would Need to be Added to Achieve Equity
2003-04	6443	9539	15982	59.69%	272	249	521	47.79%	154
2004-05	6415	9510	15925	59.72%	215	167	382	43.72%	152
2005-06	6263	9565	15828	60.43%	227	164	391	41.94%	183
2006-07	7429	10661	18090	58.93%	232	181	413	43.83%	152
2007-08	8497	12165	20662	58.88%	230	169	399	42.36%	160
2008-09	6476	9299	15775	58.95%	236	176	412	42.72%	163
2009-10	7246	10147	17393	58.34%	185	138	323	42.72%	121
2010-11	7716	10570	18286	57.80%	269	217	486	44.65%	151
2011-12	7436	10427	17863	58.37%	305	191	496	38.51%	237
2012-13	7506	10440	17946	58.17%	325	235	560	41.96%	217
2013-14	7526	10632	18158	58.55%	275	203	478	42.47%	185
2014-15	7555	10984	18539	59.25%	280	217	497	43.66%	190
2015-16	7546	11343	18889	60.05%	297	272	569	47.80%	174
2016-17	7337	11697	19034	61.45%	274	250	524	47.71%	187
2017-18	7303	11623	18926	61.41%	274	250	524	47.71%	186
2018-19	6976	11460	18436	62.16%	287	274	561	48.84%	197
2019-20	6880	11396	18276	62.36%	307	268	575	46.61%	241
2020-21	6420	10841	17261	62.81%	298	270	568	47.54%	233
2021-22	6188	10674	16862	63.30%	303	255	558	45.70%	268

10. *Champion Women* has edited the EADA data on our website <https://titleixschools.com/> in just one instance: to remove male practice players who are counted up in the tally as “women”. These male practice players are not female athletes and have therefore been subtracted from the totals in the EADA.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *Champion Women* website for every college and university receiving federal funds: <https://titleixschools.com/2023/05/20/eada-data/> High school data for these schools receiving federal funds is available here: <https://titleixschools.com/2023/06/06/check-your-high-school/>

11. Kent does not and has not provided athletic opportunities to female students in numbers substantially proportionate to their enrollment pursuant to part one of the Title IX participation test. Women are 63.33% of the student body, but just 45.7% of the student-athletes.

12. In 2021-2022, the most recent academic year for which EADA data is available that is not corrupted by disruptions related to Covid-19, Kent's participation gap was 268 athletes. In other words, Kent must add 268 additional athletic opportunities for women in order to provide athletic opportunities substantially proportionate to enrollment. To put this number into perspective, 268 additional opportunities is enough to add almost an entire athletic department; Kent currently only has 208 women athletes. Assuming that the average roster is 25 women – some more, some less – Kent will need to add almost 11 more women's teams.

13. The EADA data and evidence gathered on Kent's website show that Kent does not have a history and continuing practice of expanding athletic participation opportunities for women pursuant to Prong 2 of the Title IX participation test. See column "Women" under "Athletic Participation" above. The number of women athletes does not consistently increase over time.

14. Over the 19 academic years covered by the available EADA data, Kent achieved a total net gain of only 6 women's athletic opportunities. The number of opportunities fluctuates; in 2003, Kent provided women with 249 opportunities to compete in sports. The next several years, Kent cut that high by 85 women. Kent did not match its 2003 level of the 249 opportunities until 2015, or 12 years later. The next two years saw Kent State cut 22 opportunities for women.

*Champion Women* cannot know the 28-year history of adding sports between 1975 and 2003, but Kent cannot show a history of continuous program expansion that is demonstratively responsive to the growing interests of women in sport.

15. A review of Kent's website did not show any policy or procedure for adding new sports or elevating existing club sports to varsity status. Nor did it reveal any athletic gender equity plan or any gender equity committee.

16. Kent sponsors 6 men's varsity sports (Baseball, Basketball, Track & Field, Football, Golf, and Wrestling) for 260 men and 9 women's varsity sports (Basketball, Track & Field, Field Hockey, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball and Volleyball) for 208 women.

17. Information available on Kent's website suggests that the university is not accommodating the interests and abilities of female athletes as required by part three of the Title IX participation test.

18. Kent women participate in the club sports of baseball, basketball, bowling, dodgeball, equestrian, softball, figure skating, gymnastics, ice hockey, lacrosse, rugby, soccer, tennis, ultimate frisbee, volleyball, badminton, karate, swimming, fencing, *Campus Recreation*,

Kent, 2023 (last visited July 27, 2023). The existence of these women’s club teams indicates that there is unmet interest in women’s athletics at Kent.

19. Kent State University is a member of the Mid-American Conference, with members in Ohio, New York, Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana. Affiliated members are in North Carolina, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Missouri. In this expansive competitive geographic region, Kent will find plenty of new teams to provide competition for its women athletes.

20. The Mid-American Conference sponsors Swimming and Tennis as Championship sports, while Kent does not offer these sports. These championship teams are unique educational experiences. Their existence demonstrates women’s interest and athletic ability in these sports and that competition for these women’s sports exists in Kent State’s competitive geographic area.

21. Members of the Mid-American Conference sponsor women’s Rifle, Rowing, and Synchronized Skating, sports that Kent does not offer. These peer-sponsored teams demonstrate women’s interest in these sports, their athletic abilities to compete, and that competition for these women’s sports exists in Kent State’s competitive geographic area.

22. Ken State University recruits its student body and its athletes from the whole country and internationally. High school-age girls in this competitive geographic region compete in both school and club sports, some traditional sports, like Basketball, Soccer, Golf, Tennis, Track & Field, Soccer, Volleyball, and other sports like Wrestling, Badminton, Table Tennis, Team Handball, Sailing, Field Hockey, Fencing, Swimming & Diving, Skateboarding, Water Polo, Archery, Field Hockey, Rifle, Triathlon, Ice Hockey, Sport Climbing, Artistic Swimming, Skiing, Snowboarding, Gymnastics, Rowing, Rugby, and all sorts of combat sports, like Judo, Karate, and Taekwondo, to name a few.

The Ohio High School Athletic Association sponsors girls’ Ice Hockey, Softball, and Wrestling. Kent State does not offer any of these sports. These high school feeder-school teams demonstrate women’s interest in these sports who have the athletic ability to compete, and that competition for these women’s sports exists in Kent State’s competitive geographic area.

23. Sport Governing Bodies and the NCAA, for member schools, make it very easy to see where other competitors are located. The NCAA publishes the “NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report, 1956 - 2022” for schools to find competitors within the school’s normal competitive region: NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report.<sup>2</sup>

---

See

[https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/sportpart/2022RES\\_SportsSponsorshipParticipationRatesReport.pdf](https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/sportpart/2022RES_SportsSponsorshipParticipationRatesReport.pdf)

See individual sports’ governing bodies for more, e.g.,

Women’s College Rugby: <https://www.urugby.com/teams/womens-teams>

Collegiate Equestrian: <https://collegiateequestrian.com/sports/2020/5/6/schools.aspx>

Women’s Collegiate Wrestling: <https://wrestlelikeagirl.org/college-opportunities>

Collegiate Competitive Cheer Teams: <https://www.ncsasports.org/cheerleading/colleges> (not to be confused with sideline cheerleading)

24. Wrestling, Rugby, Equestrian, and Triathlon are NCAA emerging sports. There are 163 college women's Wrestling programs, 42 NCAA schools sponsor Triathlon, 26 colleges sponsor women's varsity Equestrian, and at least 32 colleges currently sponsor women's varsity Rugby.

25. A review of the Kent website does not reveal that Kent undertook any athletic interest surveys or other research into interest and competition to support the addition of women's varsity sports. While surveys are never sufficient to deny women sports opportunities, they are often helpful in determining *which sports* the school should add.

26. The failure to provide women with equal opportunities to play impacts the availability of athletic scholarship dollars for women. These are important sources of funding for educational attainment that women are being denied because of their sex. If Kent provided its male and female students with the same opportunities to participate, Kent would need to add **\$4,060,956 additional** athletic scholarship dollars, to balance out the amount Kent provides to its male students.

27. If, for some reason, the OCR determines that Kent is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, then Kent would still need to provide its women students participating in sports with **\$88,916** more in athletic scholarship aid, to match the amount Kent provides its male athletes.

28. Kent's EADA data further indicates that the university provides inadequate and unequal funding for the recruitment of female athletes. In 2021-2022, Kent spent \$424,671 on men's recruitment and only \$161,776 on women's recruitment; women were allocated only 27.59 percent of the recruiting budget even though they account for 45.7 percent of the athletic population and 63.3 percent of the full-time undergraduate population. If Kent treated women like it does men, women's teams – and women's coaches – would have an **additional \$570,760** in recruiting dollars.

---

Women's Collegiate Triathlon: <https://www.usatriathlon.org/multisport/ncaa-triathlon>  
Collegiate Sailing is governed by the Inter-Collegiate Sailing Association (ICSA) with 220 schools:  
<https://www.collegesailing.org/about/overview>  
Women's Collegiate Ice Hockey: <https://www.uscho.com/teams/#d1women>  
Collegiate Field Hockey: <https://www.teamusa.org/USA-Field-Hockey/PLAYERS/College/Team-Websites>  
Collegiate Synchronized/ Artistic Swimming: <https://www.collegexpress.com/lists/list/colleges-with-notable-synchronized-swimming-teams/581/>  
Collegiate Bowling - <https://collegebowling.bowl.com/teams>  
Collegiate Rifle - <https://competitions.nra.org/competitions/nra-national-matches/collegiate-championships/collegiate-shooting-sports-directory/>  
Collegiate Skiing – <https://www.uscsa.org/>  
Collegiate Water Polo - <https://collegiatewaterpolo.org/>  
Collegiate Women's Gymnastics <https://www.ncaa.com/sports/gymnastics-women>

29. If, for some reason, the OCR determines that Kent is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, Kent would still need to provide its women's sports teams – and women's coaches – with **\$98,867** more recruiting dollars in order to be consistent with the school's investment in men's sports.

#### IV. LEGAL ALLEGATIONS

30. Title IX provides that “[n]o person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” 20 U.S.C. §1681(a).

31. Title IX regulations prohibit athletic programs from discriminating on the basis of sex in interscholastic, intercollegiate, club or intramural athletics offered by the institution. 34 C.F.R. §106.41(a) (2000).

32. Title IX regulations require institutions that offer athletics programs to provide equal athletic opportunities to members of both sexes to participate in athletics. 34 C.F.R. §106.41(c)(1).

33. Pursuant to the 1979 Title IX Policy Interpretation, compliance with Title IX's equal athletic participation requirement is measured by determining whether the educational institution meets one part of the following three-part test:

1. Prong 1: Whether intercollegiate level participation opportunities for male and female students are provided in numbers substantially proportionate to their respective enrollments; or
2. Prong 2: Where the members of one sex have been and are underrepresented among intercollegiate athletes, whether the institution can show a history and continuing practice of program expansion which is demonstrably responsive to the developing interests and abilities of the members of that sex; or
3. Prong 3: Where the members of one sex are underrepresented among intercollegiate athletes, and the institution cannot show a history and continuing practice of program expansion, as described above, whether it can be demonstrated that the interests and abilities of the members of that sex have been fully and effectively accommodated by the present program.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Policy Interpretation; Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics*, 44 Fed. Reg. 71413 (Dec. 11, 1979) [hereinafter *Policy Interpretation*].



34. In determining substantial proportionality under part one of the three-part test, OCR considers the number of opportunities that would have to be added to achieve proportionality and whether it would be sufficient to support another team. If there are a significant number of unaccommodated women, it is likely that a viable sport could be added and therefore the institution has not satisfied part one of the three-part test. United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, *Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Guidance: the Three-Part Test* (Jan. 16, 1996) [hereinafter *1996 Clarification*].

35. In 1975, schools were given three years to be in compliance with the equal participation mandate under Title IX. Schools had only one year to end sex-discrimination in all other areas of Title IX's non-discrimination mandate. Only athletics gave schools three years to add athletic opportunities and to stop discriminating against women – or until 1978. That deadline passed 45 years ago. 34 C.F.R. §106.41(d).<sup>3</sup>

It is worth noting how odd Prong 2 is as a legal test, in comparison to any other non-discrimination civil right. For a school to be able to argue that its current treatment of women is “non-discriminatory” because it is still playing catch-up – exists nowhere else in law. This is especially true 51 years after the passage of Title IX, and 48 years after the passage of the regulations OCR depends on, regulations that were passed by Congress. When a school uses Prong 2, it is admitting that it not providing women with equal educational opportunities, but that their discrimination is acceptable, because the school is “improving.” Title IX's Prong 2 allows schools to provide girls and women with less.

36. Therefore, it is understandable that Prong 2 is a strict legal test. In determining whether an institution has a history and continuing practice of expansion under Prong 2 of the three-part test, OCR reviews the entire history of the athletic program and evaluates whether the institution has expanded participation opportunities for the underrepresented sex in a manner that was demonstrably responsive to their developing interests and abilities, considering a number of factors, including:

- an institution's record of adding intercollegiate teams, or upgrading teams to intercollegiate status, for the underrepresented sex;
- an institution's record of increasing the numbers of participants in intercollegiate athletics who are members of the underrepresented sex;
- an institution's affirmative responses to requests by students or others for addition or elevation of sports; and
- whether the institution has effective ongoing procedures for collecting, maintaining and analyzing information on the interest and abilities of students of

---

<sup>3</sup> 34 C.F.R. §106.41(d) “*Adjustment period.* A recipient which operates or sponsors interscholastic, intercollegiate, club or intramural athletics at the elementary school level shall comply fully with this section as expeditiously as possible but in no event later than one year from the effective date of this regulation. A recipient which operates or sponsors interscholastic, intercollegiate, club or intramural athletics at the secondary or post-secondary school level shall comply fully with this section as expeditiously as possible but in no event later than three years from the effective date of this regulation.”



the underrepresented sex, including monitoring athletic participation, and assessing interest and ability on a periodic basis.

United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, *Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Clarification: The Three-Part Test- Part Three* (Apr. 20, 2010) [hereinafter *2010 Clarification*]; *1996 Clarification*.

37. In determining whether an institution has a continuing practice of program expansion under Prong 2, OCR will consider a number of factors, including:

- an institution's current implementation of a non-discriminatory policy or procedure for requesting the addition of sports (including the elevation of club or intramural teams) and the effective communication of the policy or procedure to students;
- an institution's current implementation of a plan of program expansion that is responsive to developing interests and abilities; and
- an institution's efforts to monitor developing interests and abilities of the underrepresented sex, for example, by conducting periodic nondiscriminatory assessments of developing interests and abilities and taking timely actions in response to the results.

*2010 Clarification, 1996 Clarification.*

38. OCR will not find a history and continuing practice of program expansion where an institution increases the proportional participation opportunities for the underrepresented sex by reducing opportunities for the overrepresented sex alone or by reducing participation opportunities for the overrepresented sex to a proportionately greater degree than for the underrepresented sex. *2010 Clarification, 1996 Clarification.*

39. Courts have found that schools must have both a history *and* continuing practice of expanding opportunities for women for Prong 2 compliance. *Mansourian v. Bd. Of Regents of Univ. of Cal.*, 594 F. 3d 1095, 1108. (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. Cal. 2010).

40. Prong 3 of the three-part test requires an examination of whether there is an unmet interest in a particular sport, a sufficient ability to sustain a team in the sport, and a reasonable expectation for competition for a team in the sport. *2010 Clarification, 1996 Clarification.*

41. Whether there is unmet interest and ability will be determined by examining a broad range of indicators, including whether the institution uses non-discriminatory methods of assessing interest and ability, the elimination of a viable team for the unrepresented sex, multiple indicators of interest and ability, and frequency of conducting assessments. *2010 Clarification.*

42. Sufficient interest can be established by student requests to add a sport or elevate a club sport, increases in club or intramural sport participation, responses to interviews and

interest surveys, assessments of student athletic participation before entering the institution or in the secondary schools from which the university draws its students, and assessments of participation in intercollegiate sports in the institution's normal competitive regions. *Id.*

43. Ability may be established by the athletic accomplishments and competitive experience of club sports and admitted students, the opinions of coaches, administrators, and athletes, and student participation in other sports. *Id.*

44. Expectation of competition may be established through athletic opportunities offered by other schools with which the school competes or opportunities at other schools in the school's geographic area, including those against which the institution does not compete. *Id.*

45. Under Prong 3 of the three-part test, OCR will also examine an institution's recruitment practices. If an institution recruits potential student-athletes for its men's teams, OCR will examine whether the institution is providing women's teams with substantially equal opportunities to recruit potential student-athletes. *Id.*

46. Title IX also requires schools to provide equal scholarship dollars, in proportion to the number of students of each sex participating in athletics. 34 C.F.R. §106.37(c) (2000). NCAA limits on scholarships per team is not a legal defense; schools cannot blame a third-party for sex discrimination; recipients are responsible for equality. Schools choose which sports to sponsor, and some schools have chosen scholarship-dense sports for men, such as football and basketball, and scholarship-light sports for women, such as track.

47. Title IX also requires equal opportunity in the recruitment of student-athletes where equal athletic opportunities are not present for male and female students. Compliance will be assessed by examining the recruitment practices of the athletic programs for both sexes and evaluating whether the financial and other resources made available for recruitment in male and female athletic programs are equivalently adequate to meet the needs of each program. *1979 Policy Interpretation.*

48. Title IX requires schools to provide women with equal treatment, including equipment and supplies; game and practice times; travel and per diem allowances; coaching and academic tutoring; assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors; locker rooms, practice and competitive facilities; medical and training facilities and services; housing and dining facilities and services; and publicity. 34 C.F.R. §106.41(a) (2000), *Policy Interpretation.*

49. Lack of money is not a legal defense to sex discrimination. *See, e.g., Roberts Colorado State Univ.*, 814 F. Supp. 1507, 1518 (D. Colo. 1993) (“[A] financial crisis cannot justify gender discrimination.”); *Favia v Indiana University of Pennsylvania*, 812 F. Supp. 578, 585 (W.D. Pa. 1993) (finding that financial concerns alone cannot justify gender discrimination); *Cook v. Colgate University*, 802 F. Supp. 737, 750 (1992) (“[I]f schools could use financial concerns as a sole reason for disparity of treatment, Title IX would become meaningless.”); *Haffer v. Temple*, 678 F. Supp. 517, 520 (1987) (finding that financial concerns alone cannot justify gender discrimination).

50. Monies and in-kind benefits from third-party sources, such as donors, sponsorships, television rights, ticket sales, and student fees, are not a defense to a sex discrimination charge, whether those resources were used to build facilities, fund scholarships, provide equipment and uniforms, or any other benefit of sports participation. None of those sources of money creates a legal defense against sex discrimination. Schools must ensure that their students are not receiving second-class educational opportunities because they are female. See 20 U.S.C. § 1687 (2005); See Office for Civil Rights, *Department of Education, Further Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Guidance Regarding Title IX Compliance* (June 11, 2003), *Cohen v. Brown Univ.*, 809 F. Supp. 978, 996 (D.R.I. 1992) (concluding that “all monies spent by Brown’s Athletic Department, whether originating from university coffers or from the Sports Foundation [booster club] must be evaluated as a whole under § 106.41(c)”)

51. It is *Champion Women’s* experience that most athletes and former athletes are acutely aware of all the ways they are treated as second-class within their athletics department, because they are women. As NIL monies become more available, equal promotion and publicity will be important for female athletes. *Champion Women* asked current collegiate athletes what equality would look like under this list. Here’s what the athletes came up with:

- i. Men’s and Women’s sports would be equally featured, with equal prominence, on school and Athletic Department websites and social media.
- ii. Schools would invest equally in cameras and production equipment for Women’s and Men’s sports.
- iii. Schools would optimize Google searches for their Men’s and Women’s teams to receive equal search results.
- iv. Women’s and Men’s sports would employ an equal caliber of talent in their sports information and marketing departments, and they would be paid and promoted equally.
- v. Women’s and Men’s sports jerseys, apparel, and memorabilia would be equally and easily accessible.
- vi. The needs of Women’s teams would not revolve around Men’s football and men’s basketball teams.
- vii. The Women’s and Men’s teams would have equal access to dining halls, nutrition, etc. at times equally convenient to both teams.
- viii. Men’s and Women’s teams would have equal access to optimal practice times when they share facilities.
- ix. Men’s and Women’s sports marketing efforts would focus on performance; Broadcasters and schools would not focus on a woman athlete’s appearance or sexuality.
- x. Women’s and Men’s medical care and athletic training access would be equal; Neither male nor female athletes would have priority accessing these resources.

- xi. Schools would hire competition officials of the same quality, with equal compensation, for the Women's and Men's teams.
- xii. Men's and Women's sports performance staff would be equal and would be paid and promoted comparably.
- xiii. Schools would intentionally use language that equally prioritizes Men's and Women's sports.
  - 1. Teams would be referred to as "Women's Basketball" and "Men's Basketball."
  - 2. "Basketball" would not be used to refer to Men's Basketball.
  - 3. Schools would have Social Media handles that referred to men's and women's teams; "Oregon Soccer" would be changed to "Oregon Men's Soccer."

52. Kent's own data, as outlined in the Factual Allegations above, demonstrate that it is not providing equal opportunities for its female students to participate in sports under Title IX's three-part participation test, in addition to scholarship, treatment, and recruitment requirements.

## V. RELIEF REQUESTED

53. *Champion Women* requests that OCR:

- a. Investigate Kent State University to determine whether it is discriminating against women; is it providing female students with equal participation in athletics, equal and proportionate athletic scholarship dollars, equal treatment, including equal recruiting budgets.
- b. Take all necessary steps to remedy any unlawful conduct that it identifies in its investigation, as required by Title IX and its implementing regulations.
- c. New violations are expected to be found. We ask the OCR to secure assurances of compliance with Title IX from Kent, that include full remedies for all the violations found.
- d. Among other steps to achieve compliance with Title IX, require Kent to add more athletic opportunities for women, accord to additional teams and athletes the full range of benefits accorded to men's varsity teams and athletes, increase recruiting budgets and opportunities, and adopt and implement a plan to achieve compliance with Title IX.
- e. Monitor any resulting agreement with Kent State University to ensure that the school is not engaged in sex discrimination and achieves full and complete compliance with Title IX throughout its athletic department, now and in the future.

I give the OCR my consent to disclose my name and *Champion Women's* name contained in this letter to others for OCR's investigation of, and enforcement activities related to, the Discrimination Complaint.



Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Nancy Hogshead".

Nancy Hogshead, J.D.

Date: September 16, 2023