



**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

The University of Alabama
Dr. Stuart R. Bell, President
739 University Blvd.
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487
EMAIL: president@ua.edu

The University of Alabama
Greg Byrne, Director of Athletics
739 University Blvd.
Tuscaloosa AL 35487
EMAIL: gbyrne@ia.ua.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 The University of Alabama, (“Alabama”) 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 Alabama’s website indicates that Alabama is discriminating on the basis of sex by providing unequal athletic participation opportunities, unequal athletic scholarship dollars, 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 Alabama to determine whether it is discriminating against women; whether it is providing women equal opportunities to participate in varsity sports, equal and proportionate scholarship dollars, and equivalent 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 Alabama currently violates Title IX’s athletic equity requirements, this complaint is timely.

III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

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

9. Data submitted by Alabama 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 Alabama 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

11. Alabama is counting 16 men as “women.” The chart cannot reflect these numbers, but it impacts the size of the athletic department and the gap between men’s and women’s athletic opportunities.

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	6598	7672	14270	53.76%	287	172	459	37.47%	162
2004-05	6975	7880	14855	53.05%	277	158	435	36.32%	155
2005-06	7421	8411	15832	53.13%	285	178	463	38.44%	145
2006-07	8341	9443	17784	53.10%	320	275	595	46.22%	87
2007-08	9121	10117	19238	52.59%	330	295	625	47.20%	71
2008-09	9632	10765	20397	52.78%	297	285	582	48.97%	47
2009-10	10232	11320	21552	52.52%	356	332	688	48.26%	62
2010-11	10747	11840	22587	52.42%	319	331	650	50.92%	20
2011-12	11048	12544	23592	53.17%	334	306	640	47.81%	73
2012-13	11721	13388	25109	53.32%	367	311	678	45.87%	108
2013-14	12160	14087	26247	53.67%	360	338	698	48.42%	79
2014-15	12590	14741	27331	53.94%	354	396	750	52.80%	18
2015-16	12929	15518	28447	54.55%	371	400	771	51.88%	45
2016-17	13038	16033	29071	55.15%	362	423	785	53.89%	22
2017-18	13351	16471	29822	55.23%	371	454	825	55.03%	4
2018-19	13265	16223	29488	55.02%	342	416	758	54.88%	2
2019-20	13112	15902	29014	54.81%	360	426	786	54.20%	11
2020-21	12336	15387	27723	55.50%	340	365	705	51.77%	59
2021-22	12366	15708	28074	55.95%	376	407	783	51.98%	71

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. Alabama 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 55.95% of the student body, but just 51.98% of the student-athletes.

13. In 2021-2022, the most recent academic year for which EADA data is available that is not corrupted by disruptions related to Covid-19, Alabama's participation gap was 71 athletes. When the 16 men are subtracted from the women's total of 407, the gap grows to 87. In other words, Alabama must add 87 additional athletic opportunities for women in order to provide athletic opportunities substantially proportionate to enrollment. With an average roster size of 25 women, 87 athletes is easily enough to add 3 more women's sports, depending on the sport.

14. The EADA data and evidence gathered on Alabama's website show that Alabama 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. Over the 19 academic years covered by the available EADA data, Alabama's numbers fluctuated. To account for the 16 men that Alabama is counting as "women" - Alabama currently has 391 opportunities, with 315 women. Opportunities for women declined in 2004, by 14 women's athletic opportunities. In 2008, women lost 10 opportunities, and 2011 women's opportunities declined by 25. Alabama's high of 454 in 2017 has not been matched since - a 63-woman opportunity decline. A determination cannot be made without considering the entire history of Alabama's record of adding sports. *Champion Women* cannot know the 28-year history of adding sports between 1975 and 2003, but it is unlikely to show a history of continuous program expansion that is demonstratively responsive to the growing interests of women in sport.

16. A review of Alabama'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. Alabama sponsors 7 men's varsity sports (Baseball, Basketball, Football, Golf, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Track & Field) serving 305 men, and 10 women's varsity sports (Basketball, Golf, Gymnastics, Rowing, Soccer, Softball, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Track and Field, and Volleyball) serving 315 women.

18. Information available on Alabama'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. Alabama women participate in the club sports of badminton, ballroom dance, baseball, boxing, clay shooting, crew, cricket, disc golf, esports, equestrian, fencing, field hockey, fishing, golf, gymnastics, hockey, kayak, lacrosse, roundnet, rugby, running, soccer, swimming, table tennis, tennis, triathlon, ultimate frisbee, volleyball, water polo, waterski, wrestling, *Campus Recreation*, Alabama, 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 Alabama.

20. 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

21. Alabama is a current member of the Southeastern Conference, the SEC. The SEC has an Eastern and Western Division.

In the Eastern Division, schools are in Tennessee, Louisiana, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, and South Carolina.

In the West Division, schools are from Arkansas, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas and Oklahoma.

Future members are coming from Oklahoma and Texas.

This large competitive geographic area will allow Alabama to pick almost any new sports for women.

22. The SEC sponsors women's Equestrian as a Championship sport, but Alabama does not offer Equestrian for its female students. These Championship sports are unique

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>

educational opportunities. They demonstrate women's interest and abilities in these sports and that competition for these women's sports exists in Alabama's competitive geographic area.

23. Members of the Southeastern Conference and within the competitive region sponsor Beach Volleyball, Bowling, Lacross, Rifle, and Stunt. Alabama does not offer any of these five sports for women. These sports demonstrate women's interest and abilities in these sports and that competition for these women's sports exists in Temple's competitive geographic area.

24. Alabama recruits its student body and its athletes nationally and internationally. High school-age girls in Alabama play Badminton, Basketball, Bowling, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball, Swimming & Diving, Track & Field, Volleyball, Weightlifting and Wrestling. <https://www.nfhsnetwork.com/states/AL>

High school-age girls in this competitive geographic region also compete in club sports or travel teams; sport that are not associated with a school. These include Basketball, Soccer, Golf, Tennis, Track & Field, Soccer, Volleyball, Wrestling, Equestrian, 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.

According to the NCAA,³ in 2020, only 1.3% of high school girls basketball players were provided the opportunity to play in Division I. Just 2.9% of high school Field Hockey players, 2.8% of Golfers, 8.9% of Ice Hockey players, 3.7% of Lacrosse players, 2.4% of Soccer players, 1.8% of Softball players, 3.3% of Swimmers, 1.5% of Tennis players, 2.8% of Track & Field athletes, 1.2% of Volleyball players in high school are provided opportunities to play their sport in Division I. These percentages do not include those girls and women who are competing on travel teams, club teams, or sports not associated with schools.

These metrics demonstrate that women have expressed enormous demand to compete in sports that is unmet. Girls and women have the interest and athletic ability to play additional sports. It cannot be said that there are not women interested and athletically able to compete in many additional sports at Alabama.

25. 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.

26. A review of the Alabama website does not reveal that Alabama 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.

³ NCAA: Estimated Probability of Competing in College Athletics:
<https://www.ncaa.org/sports/2015/3/2/estimated-probability-of-competing-in-college-athletics.aspx>

27. 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 Alabama provided its male and female students with the same opportunities to participate, Alabama would need to add **\$3,576,121 additional** athletic scholarship dollars, annually, to balance out the amount Alabama provides to its male students.

28. If, for some reason, the OCR determines that Alabama is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, then Alabama would still need to provide its women students participating in sports with **\$1,390,198.46** more in athletic scholarship aid, to match the amount Alabama provides its male athletes.

29. Alabama's EADA data further indicates that the university provides inadequate and unequal funding for the recruitment of female athletes. In 2021-2022, Alabama spent \$3,217,200 on men's recruitment and only \$606,889 on women's recruitment; women were allocated only 15.87 percent of the recruiting budget even though they account for 50.98 percent of the athletic population and 55.95 percent of the full-time undergraduate population. If Alabama respected women's sport equally with men's sport and provided proportionate recruiting dollars, Alabama would need to add **\$3,479,782.32 additional** recruiting dollars to its women's teams – and women's coaches.

30. If, for some reason, the OCR determines that Alabama is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, Alabama would still need to provide its women's sports teams – and women's coaches – with **\$1,335,994.93** more recruiting dollars in order to be consistent with the school's investment in men's sports.

IV. LEGAL ALLEGATIONS

31. 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).

32. 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).

33. 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).

34. 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*].

35. 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*].

36. 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).

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 somehow permissible, because the school is “improving.” Title IX's Prong 2 allows schools to provide girls and women with less.

37. 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

Champion Women, Sex Discrimination in Athletics in Violation of Title IX, 2023

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*.

38. 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.

39. 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.*

40. 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).

41. 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.*

42. 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.*

43. 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.*

44. 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.*

45. 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.*

46. 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.*

47. 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.

48. 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.*

49. 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*.

50. 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).

51. 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)”)

52. 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.”

53. Alabama’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 benefits, including recruitment requirements.

V. RELIEF REQUESTED

54. *Champion Women* expects OCR investigators will find additional violations of Title IX, the civil rights law guaranteeing women equal educational opportunities. *Champion Women* requests that OCR:

- a. Investigate the University of Alabama to determine whether it is discriminating against women; is it providing women with equal participation opportunities in varsity athletics, equal and proportionate athletic scholarship dollars, and are receiving equal benefits and treatment and benefits.
- b. Take all necessary steps to remedy any discriminatory and unlawful conduct that it identifies in its investigation, as required by Title IX and its implementing regulations. Secure assurances of compliance with Title IX from Alabama, that include full remedies for all the violations found.
- c. Among other steps to achieve compliance with Title IX, require Alabama to elevate interested existing women's club teams to varsity status, 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 the University of Alabama 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 Sex Discrimination Complaint.



A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Nancy Hogshead". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

Nancy Hogshead, J.D., OLY
September 20, 2023