



**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

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

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

ADMINISTRATIVE CLASS COMPLAINT

COMPLAINANT

Champion Women
Nancy Hogshead, J.D., OLY, CEO
EMAIL: Hogshead@ChampionWomen.org

RECIPIENT

Long Island University
Ryan Kelly, Deputy of Athletic Director
1 University Plaza
Brooklyn, NY 11201
EMAIL: ryan.kelly@liu.edu

Kimberly R. Cline, President
1 University Plaza
Brooklyn, NY 11201
EMAIL: Nancy.Gessner@liu.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 Long Island University, (“Long Island”) 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 Long Island’s website indicates that Long Island is discriminating on the basis of sex by providing unequal athletic participation opportunities, unequal athletic scholarship dollars, and unequal athletic recruitment funding for its female students.

4. In order to address these disparities, *Champion Women* requests that the Office for Civil Rights (“OCR”) investigate Long Island to determine 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 remediating 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 Long Island currently violates Title IX’s athletic equity requirements, this complaint is timely.

III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

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

9. Data submitted by Long Island 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 Long Island 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.

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.¹

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
2003-04	1575	2416	3991	60.54%	269	176	445	39.55%	237
2004-05	1587	2549	4136	61.63%	307	204	511	39.92%	289
2005-06	1775	2702	4477	60.35%	207	158	365	43.29%	157
2006-07	2071	3505	5576	62.86%	309	209	518	40.35%	314
2007-08	1727	2863	4590	62.37%	230	147	377	38.99%	234
2008-09	1658	2639	4297	61.41%	226	151	377	40.05%	209
2009-10	1642	2392	4034	59.30%	217	139	356	39.04%	177
2010-11	1500	2235	3735	59.84%	243	148	391	37.85%	214
2011-12	1600	2363	3963	59.63%	229	157	386	40.67%	181
2012-13	1440	2493	3933	63.39%	244	155	399	38.85%	267
2013-14	1442	2178	3620	60.17%	236	152	388	39.18%	204
2014-15	1317	2038	3355	60.75%	277	169	446	37.89%	260
2015-16	1221	1839	3060	60.10%	289	194	483	40.17%	241
2016-17	1156	1682	2838	59.27%	315	235	550	42.73%	223
2017-18	1133	1668	2801	59.55%	331	273	604	45.20%	214
2018-19	1896	3744	5640	66.38%	398	489	887	55.13%	297
2019-20	1835	3699	5534	66.84%	308	352	660	53.33%	269
2020-21	1745	3615	5360	67.44%	387	444	831	53.43%	358
2021-22	1759	3574	5333	67.02%	477	471	948	49.68%	498

11. 67.02% of the Long Island student-body is female, but women are only allocated 49.68% of the athletic opportunities. Long Island 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.

¹ 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/>

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, Long Island's participation gap was 498 women athletes. In other words, Long Island must add 498 additional athletic opportunities for women in order to provide athletic opportunities substantially proportionate to enrollment. To put this number in perspective, 498 additional opportunities is enough to add almost an entire athletic department; Long Island currently only has 459 women athletes. Assuming a new team would have an average of 25 athletes – some more, some less – Long Island would need to add over 19 new women's sports teams.

13. Women's participation in the student body has been consistently growing, from 60% to 67%. These women deserve to have the same educational opportunities provided to men.

14. The EADA data and evidence gathered on Long Island's website show that Long Island 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.

15. Long Island had a high of 209 women athletes in 2006 and didn't reach this milestone again for a decade in 2016; ten years of no growth; not a continuous history of expansion that is demonstratively responsive to women's growing interest in sport. *Champion Women* cannot know the 28-year history of adding sports between 1975 and 2003, but Long Island cannot show a history of continuous program expansion that is demonstratively responsive to the growing interests of women in sport. Women have repetitively showed their interest in competitive sports.

16. A review of Long Island'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.

17. Long Island sponsors 13 men's varsity sports (Baseball, Basketball, Track, Football, Golf, Ice Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Volleyball, Water Polo and Wrestling) serving 462 athletes, and 16 women's varsity sports (Basketball, Bowling, Equestrian, Fencing, Field Hockey, Golf, Track, Gymnastics, Ice Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Volleyball and Water Polo), serving 459 women.

18. Information available on Long Island'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.

19. Long Island women participate in the club sports of badminton, rugby, flag football, soccer, equestrian, and water polo. The existence of these women's club teams indicates that there is unmet interest in women's athletics at Long Island.

20. Long Island competes in the Northeast Conference, where some of the most college-dense areas compete. The conference spans New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and New Jersey. This competitive geographic region will provide Long Island with plenty of competitors for those new women's teams.

21. Some of the Northeast Conference members sponsor women's teams in Rowing, Rugby, and Triathlon. Long Island does not sponsor any of these 3 teams. Women have therefore demonstrated their interest in these sports and that competition for these women's sports exists in Long Island's competitive geographic area.

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

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.²

24. A review of the Long Island website does not reveal that Long Island 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.

² See

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)

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>

25. 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 Long Island provided its male and female students with the same opportunities to participate, Long Island would need to add **\$6,668,372** *additional* athletic scholarship dollars, to balance out the amount Long Island provides to its male students.

26. If, for some reason, the OCR determines that Long Island is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, then Long Island would still need to provide its women students participating in sports with **\$1,337,455** more in athletic scholarship aid, to match the amount Long Island provides its male athletes.

27. Long Island's EADA data further indicates that the university provides inadequate and unequal funding for the recruitment of female athletes. In 2021-2022, Long Island spent \$205,679 on men's recruitment and only \$111,114 on women's recruitment. If Long Island had provided women's teams – and women's coaches - with equal opportunities with equal recruiting funds, it would need to allocate its female students with an *additional* **\$306,792**.

28. If, for some reason, the OCR determines that Long Island is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, Long Island would still need to provide its women's sports teams – and women's coaches – with **\$46,766** more recruiting dollars in order to be consistent with the school's investment in men's sports.

IV. LEGAL ALLEGATIONS

29. 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).

30. 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).

31. 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).

32. 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*].

33. 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*].

34. 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).³

It is worth noting how odd Prong 2 is as a legal test, in comparison to other non-discrimination civil rights. For a school to be able to argue that it is still playing catch-up with non-discrimination – 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

³ 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.”

were passed by Congress. When a school uses Prong 2, it is admitting that it is not providing women with equal educational opportunities, but that their actions are acceptable, because the school is “improving.” Title IX’s Prong 2 allows schools to provide girls and women with less.

35. 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 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*.

36. 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 nondiscriminatory 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.

37. 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.*

38. 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. (9th Cir. Cal. 2010).

39. 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.*

40. Whether there is unmet interest and ability will be determined by examining a broad range of indicators, including whether the institution uses nondiscriminatory 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.*

41. 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.*

42. 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.*

43. 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.*

44. 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.*

45. 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.

46. 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*.

47. 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*.

48. 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).

49. 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)”)

50. 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 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."

51. Long Island'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

52. *Champion Women* requests that OCR:

- a. Investigate Long Island University to determine whether it is discriminating against women; is it providing female students with equal participation opportunities in varsity athletics, equal and proportionate athletic scholarship dollars, and are receiving equal treatment and benefits, including but not limited to equal recruiting budgets.
- b. Take all necessary steps to remedy any unlawful conduct that you identify in your investigation, as required by Title IX and its implementing regulations.
- c. If any violations are found, secure assurances of compliance with Title IX from Long Island University, that include full remedies for the violations found.
- d. Among other steps to achieve compliance with Title IX, require Long Island University 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 maintain compliance with Title IX moving forward.
- e. Monitor any resulting agreement with Long Island University to ensure that the school achieves compliance with Title IX, now and in the future.

I give 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.



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

Nancy Hogshead, J.D., OLY
September 5, 2023