



**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**

Samford University  
Martin Newton, Director of Athletics  
800 Lakeshore Drive  
Homewood, AL 35229  
EMAIL: [cnewton@samford.edu](mailto:cnewton@samford.edu)

Beck A. Taylor, President  
201 Samford Hall, 800 Lakeshore Drive  
Homewood, AL 35229  
EMAIL: [president@samford.edu](mailto:president@samford.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 Samford University (“Samford”) 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 Samford’s website indicates that Samford is discriminating on the basis of sex by providing unequal athletic participation opportunities, unequal athletic scholarships, and unequal treatment and benefits, including 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 Samford to determine whether it is providing women equal opportunities to participate in varsity sports, equal and proportionate athletic scholarship dollars, and equivalent benefits and treatment, including 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 Samford currently violates Title IX’s athletic equity requirements, this complaint is timely.

## **III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

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

9. Data submitted by Samford to the U.S. Department of Education pursuant to the EADA that are publicly available on the Office of Postsecondary Education website for academic years 2003-04 through 2021-2022 indicate that Samford is discriminating against

women; it 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				Athletic Participation				
	Men	Women	Total	Percent Women	Men	Women	Total	Percent Women	Female Athletes Who Would Need to be Added to Achieve
2003-04	978	1688	2666	63.32%	186	132	318	41.51%	189
2004-05	944	1708	2652	64.40%	177	125	302	41.39%	195
2005-06	978	1764	2742	64.33%	214	136	350	38.86%	250
2006-07	1038	1824	2862	63.73%	195	134	329	40.73%	209
2007-08	978	1697	2675	63.44%	233	147	380	38.68%	257
2008-09	954	1683	2637	63.82%	269	147	416	35.34%	328
2009-10	984	1713	2697	63.52%	249	164	413	39.71%	269
2010-11	1013	1739	2752	63.19%	265	162	427	37.94%	293
2011-12	1009	1741	2750	63.31%	239	157	396	39.65%	255
2012-13	968	1795	2763	64.97%	280	162	442	36.65%	357
2013-14	996	1848	2844	64.98%	246	157	403	38.96%	299
2014-15	1025	1884	2909	64.76%	250	157	407	38.57%	303
2015-16	1087	1948	3035	64.18%	271	172	443	38.83%	314
2016-17	1114	2090	3204	65.23%	262	179	441	40.59%	313
2017-18	1100	2163	3263	66.29%	293	188	481	39.09%	388
2018-19	1145	2307	3452	66.83%	281	184	465	39.57%	382
2019-20	1168	2340	3508	66.70%	242	144	386	37.31%	341
2020-21	1121	2380	3501	67.98%	317	196	513	38.21%	477
2021-22	1185	2364	3549	66.61%	298	185	483	38.30%	409

10. *Champion Women* has edited the EADA data on its 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. Samford 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 66.61% of the student body, but just 38.3% of the student-athletes.

12. In 2021-2022, the most recent academic year for which EADA data are available that are not corrupted by disruptions related to Covid-19, Samford's participation gap between men and women was 409 athletes. In other words, Samford must add 409 additional athletic opportunities for women in order to provide athletic opportunities substantially proportionate to enrollment. If the average squad size for a new team is 25 athletes – some more, some less – Samford would need to add over 16 new women's athletic teams. Samford has just 148 in its athletic department.

13. The EADA data and evidence gathered on Samford's website show that Samford 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. The number of women athletes does not consistently increase over time in proportion to female student enrollment.

14. Over the 19 academic years covered by the available EADA data, Samford's numbers fluctuated, contracting in 2004, 2006, 2010, 2011, 2013, and 2019. In 2019, Samford provided women with 40 fewer athletic opportunities than earlier years.

Meanwhile, the gap between men's and women's athletic opportunities grew at a steady pace. (See the column on the far right.)

Samford increased the number of men's opportunities by 112.

*Champion Women* cannot know the history of adding sports since 1975, but it is unlikely to show a history of continuous program expansion that is demonstratively responsive to the growing interests of women in sport.

15. A review of Samford's website did not cover any policy or procedure for adding new sports or elevating existing club sports to varsity status. There is a designated Director of Diversity and Intercultural Initiatives for Athletics within the athletics department's senior leadership team, but the priorities seem focused on minority and racial concerns. Available materials did it reveal any athletic gender equity plan, or any gender equity committee.

16. Samford sponsors 6 men's varsity sports (Baseball, Basketball, Football, Golf, Track, and Tennis) for 257 men, and 7 women's varsity sports (Basketball, Golf, Soccer, Softball, Track, Tennis, and Volleyball) for 148 women.

17. Information available on Samford'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. Samford women participate in the club sports of soccer, basketball, tennis, volleyball, ultimate frisbee, lacrosse, golf, swimming, rugby, softball, cross country, track and field, equestrian, martial arts. The existence of these women's club teams indicates that there is

unmet interest in women's athletics at Samford.

19. Samford is an NCAA Division I school that belongs to the Southern Conference. Members compete in an enormous geographic region; in the states of Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. Almost every women's sport will have a reasonable expectation of competition within this competitive geographic region.

20. Moreover, the Southern Conference currently sponsors women's Rifle as a women's championship sport, and Samford does not sponsor a rifle team for women. Championship sports are a unique educational experience. Women's championship status demonstrates women's interest in these sports and that competition for these women's sports exists in the competitive geographic area.

21. Members of the Southern Conference sponsor four teams that Samford does not. These include Beach Volleyball, Lacrosse, Swimming and Diving, and Water Polo. Women have therefore demonstrated their interest in these sports and that competition for these women's sports exists in the competitive geographic area.

22. Girls in Alabama high schools compete in Badminton, Bowling, Flag Football, Bass Fishing, Wrestling, Swimming & Diving, Water Polo, Weightlifting, and Lacrosse. These high school programs will provide Samford with many women interested and able to compete.

High school-age girls in the Southern Conference competitive region compete in numerous club sports, including Wrestling, Badminton, Table Tennis, Team Handball, Sailing, Field Hockey, Fencing, Swimming & Diving, Water Polo, Archery, Field Hockey, Rifle, Triathlon, Ice Hockey, Sport Climbing, Artistic Swimming, Gymnastics, Rowing, and Rugby, and all sorts of combat sports, like Judo, Karate, and Taekwondo, to name a few.

According to NFHS data, girls participate in sports in high numbers across the country: Track and Field leads the way for girls with 486,355 participants, followed by Volleyball (470,488), Basketball (373,366), Soccer (377,838), Softball (377,838), Tennis (191,036), Swimming & Diving (191,036), and Lacrosse (98,014).<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile, NCAA schools sponsor far fewer opportunities, roughly less than a tenth of the athletic opportunities: Track and Field (30,425), Volleyball (17,610), Basketball (16,090), Soccer (27,986), Softball (21,478), Tennis, (21,478), Swimming & Diving (12,889), Lacrosse (12,921)<sup>3</sup>

All these metrics demonstrate that there is enormous unmet demand for women to compete in sports and that girls and women have expressed the interest and athletic ability to play.

---

<sup>2</sup> See, NFHS, High School Athletics Participation Survey, Conducted By the National Federation of State High School Associations; Based on Competition at the High School Level in the 2022-23 School Year [https://www.nfhs.org/media/7212351/2022-23\\_participation\\_survey.pdf](https://www.nfhs.org/media/7212351/2022-23_participation_survey.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> See, *NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report (1956-57 through 2020-21)* [https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/sportpart/2021RES\\_SportsSponsorshipParticipationRatesReport.pdf](https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/sportpart/2021RES_SportsSponsorshipParticipationRatesReport.pdf)  
Page 86.

23. Rugby, Equestrian, Triathlon, and Competitive Cheer 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.

24. 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>4</sup>

25. A review of the Samford website does not reveal that Samford 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 Samford provided its male and female students with the same opportunities to participate, Samford would need to add **\$7,054,636** additional athletic scholarship dollars, to balance out the amount Samford provides to its male students.

27. If, for some reason, the OCR determines that Samford is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, then Samford would still need

---

<sup>4</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)

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>

to provide its women students participating in sports with **\$788,744** more in athletic scholarship aid, to match the amount Samford provides its male athletes.

28. Samford's EADA data further indicates that the university provides inadequate and unequal funding for recruitment of female athletes. In 2021-2022, Samford spent \$183,009 on men's recruitment and only \$75,060 on women's recruitment; women were allocated only 29.09 percent of the recruiting budget even though they account for 38.30 percent of the athletic population and 66.61 percent of the full-time undergraduate population. If Samford provided its male and female students with the same opportunities to participate, Samford would need to add **\$290,031** additional recruiting dollars to women's teams, to balance out the amount Samford provides to for its men's teams.

29. If, for some reason, the OCR determines that Samford is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, Samford would still need to provide its women's sports teams – and women's coaches – with **\$19,246.70** 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>5</sup>

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 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.

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

---

<sup>5</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.”



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*.

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 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.*

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 the 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.”

52s. Samford’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* expects OCR investigators will find additional violations of the law. *Champion Women* requests that OCR:

- a. Investigate Samford University to determine whether it is discriminating against women; whether it is providing female students with equal participation opportunities in athletics, equal athletic scholarship dollars, and equal treatment and benefits.
- 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. If any violations are found, secure assurances of compliance with Title IX from Samford, that include full remedies for the violations found.
- c. Among other steps to achieve compliance with Title IX, require Samford 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.
- d. Monitor any resulting agreement with Samford University to ensure that the school achieves compliance with Title IX, 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.



A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Nancy Hogshead". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Nancy Hogshead, J.D., OLY  
September 17, 2023