



**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**

University of Hawaii at Manoa  
David Lassner, President  
2500 Campus Road, Honolulu, HI 96822  
EMAIL: [david@hawaii.edu](mailto:david@hawaii.edu)

Craig Angelos, Director of Athletics  
2500 Campus Road, Honolulu, HI 96822  
EMAIL: [athdir@hawaii.edu](mailto:athdir@hawaii.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 University of Hawaii at Manoa (“Hawaii”) 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 Hawaii’s website indicates that Hawaii is discriminating on the basis of sex by providing women with unequal athletic participation opportunities, unequal athletic scholarship dollars, and unequal treatment and benefits, including athletic recruitment funding.

4. In order to address these disparities, *Champion Women* requests that the Office for Civil Rights (“OCR”) investigate Hawaii Manoa to determine whether it is discriminating against women; whether it is providing women equal opportunities to participate in varsity sports, equal athletic scholarships, equal treatment and benefits, including 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 Hawaii currently violates Title IX’s athletic equity requirements, this complaint is timely.

## **III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

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

9. Data submitted by Hawaii 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 Hawaii 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 Prong 2: This # should Rise Continuously and Steadily Over Time, Without Going Backwards	Total	Percent Women	Female Athletes Who Would Need to be Added to Achieve Equity
2003-04	4970	6491	11461	56.64%	249	304	553	54.97%	21
2004-05	5168	6640	11808	56.23%	249	275	524	52.48%	45
2005-06	5255	6602	11857	55.68%	244	246	490	50.20%	61
2006-07	5154	6319	11473	55.08%	243	272	515	52.82%	26
2007-08	5022	6027	11049	54.55%	242	289	531	54.43%	1
2008-09	5064	5901	10965	53.82%	240	275	515	53.40%	5
2009-10	5191	5926	11117	53.31%	241	300	541	55.45%	-25
2010-11	5190	5965	11155	53.47%	244	288	532	54.14%	-8
2011-12	5331	6104	11435	53.38%	249	327	576	56.77%	-42
2012-13	5382	6339	11721	54.08%	244	305	549	55.56%	-18
2013-14	5337	6485	11822	54.86%	254	312	566	55.12%	-3
2014-15	5128	6351	11479	55.33%	249	312	561	55.61%	-4
2015-16	5011	6201	11212	55.31%	232	288	520	55.38%	-1
2016-17	4759	5917	10676	55.42%	260	323	583	55.40%	0
2017-18	4647	5903	10550	55.95%	240	330	570	57.89%	-25
2018-19	4529	6032	10561	57.12%	241	305	546	55.86%	16
2019-20	4414	5970	10384	57.49%	242	313	555	56.40%	14
2020-21	4305	6276	10581	59.31%	234	293	527	55.60%	48
2021-22	4312	6828	11140	61.29%	239	291	530	54.91%	87

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>

Hawaii has one male it is counting as a “women” on its EADA form. Our charts cannot account for these men, but our narrative does.

<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. Hawaii 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 61.29% of the student body, but just 54.82% of the student-athletes.

12. In 2021-2022, the most recent academic year for which EADA data is available that is not corrupted by disruptions related to Covid-19, Hawaii's participation gap was 87 athletes. When the male practice player is removed from the total of women, the gap grows to 88. In other words, Hawaii must add 88 additional athletic opportunities for women in order to provide athletic opportunities substantially proportionate to enrollment; 88 additional opportunities is enough to add almost an entire athletic department; Hawaii currently only has 227 women athletes. (The Chart can only reflect EADA data, not flaws in the data. One male who helps the women in practice has been deducted that is currently being counted as a "women.")

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

14. Over the 19 academic years covered by the available EADA data, Hawaii barely budgeted. Hawaii started with over 300 women's opportunities. It achieved that again in 2009, 2011 with 327 women's opportunities, 2012, 2013. Since 2017, the total number of women athletes has decreased from a high of 330 to 290. *Champion Women* cannot know the 28-year history of adding sports between 1975 and 2003, but Hawaii at Manoa cannot show a history of continuous program expansion that is demonstratively responsive to women's growing interest in sports of all kinds.

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

16. Hawaii sponsors 7 men's varsity sports (Baseball, Basketball, Football, Golf, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, and Volleyball) serving 239 men, and 12 women's varsity sports (Basketball, Beach Volleyball, Cross Country, Golf, Sailing, Soccer, Softball, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Track & Field, Volleyball, Water Polo) serving 228 women.

17. Information available on Hawaii'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. Hawaii women participate in the club sports of Basketball, Beach Volleyball, Cross Country, Track & Field, Golf, Soccer, Softball, Tennis, Volleyball, Water Polo, Swimming & Diving, Sailing, *Campus Recreation*, Hawaii, 2023 (last visited July 31, 2023).

The existence of these women's club teams indicates that there is unmet interest in women's athletics at Hawaii.

19. Sport Governing Bodies and the NCAA make it easy to see other competitors' locations. The NCAA publishes the "NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report, 1956 - 2022" for schools to find competitors within the school's normal competitive region: NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report.<sup>2</sup>

20. Hawaii is a member of the Big West Conference, with members up and down the state of California and Hawaii. This big competitive geographic area will give Hawaii at Manoa many choices for new women's sports.

21. Members of the Big West Conference also sponsor Fencing, Field Hockey, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, and Rowing, five women's sports that Hawaii could add inside its normal competitive geographic area. Women have therefore demonstrated their interest in these sports and that competition for these women's sports exists in the competitive geographic area.

22. Hawaii competes in other athletic conferences for Sailing, Swimming & Diving, and Indoor Track & Field.

23. Hawaii's high school girls compete in Wrestling. Hawaii does not offer these sports. <https://www.nfhsnetwork.com/states/HI>

---

<sup>2</sup> See

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

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

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

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

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

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

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>

California's high school girls compete in Badminton, Field Hockey, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rugby, Weightlifting and Wrestling, 7 sports Hawaii does not offer. <https://www.nfhsnetwork.com/states/CA>

Both Hawaii and California high school female athletes have very few opportunities to compete in college sports, and even fewer opportunities in Division I. According to the NCAA,<sup>3</sup> in 2020, only 1.3% of high school girls basketball players were provided the opportunity to play in Division I, nationally. 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 nationally are provided opportunities to play their sport in Division I.

High school-age girls in Hawaii and the Big West Conference competitive geographic region are also active in club sports or travel teams that are not associated with their school, such as Basketball, Soccer, Golf, Tennis, Track & Field, Wrestling, Equestrian, Badminton, Table Tennis, Team Handball, Sailing, Surfing, Cycling, Rollerblading, Ice Hockey, Field Hockey, Fencing, Wrestling, Rugby, Swimming & Diving, Skateboarding, Water Polo, Archery, Field Hockey, Rifle, Triathlon, Sport Climbing, Artistic Swimming, Gymnastics, Rowing, and all sorts of combat sports, like Judo, Karate, and Taekwondo, to name a few.

These metrics demonstrate that women have expressed enormous demand to compete in sports; demand that is unmet.

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

25. A review of the Hawaii website does not reveal that Hawaii 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 Hawaii at Manoa provided its male and female students with the same opportunities to participate, Hawaii would need to add **\$3,461,026** additional athletic scholarship dollars, to balance out the amount Hawaii provides to its male students.

27. If the OCR determines that Hawaii is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, then Hawaii would still need to provide its women students

---

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

participating in sports with **\$221,634** more in athletic scholarship aid, to match the amount Hawaii provides its male athletes.

28. Hawaii's EADA data further indicates that the university provides inadequate and unequal funding for recruitment of female athletes. In 2021-2022, Hawaii spent \$450,445 on men's recruitment and only \$219,363 on women's recruitment; women were allocated only 32.75 percent of the recruiting budget even though they account for 54.82 percent of the athletic population and 61.29 percent of the full-time undergraduate population. Hawaii at Manoa would need to add **\$493,911** in its women's recruiting budgets for women's team and women's coaches to be equal to the amounts Hawaii provides men.

29. If the OCR determines that Hawaii is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, Hawaii would still need to provide its women's sports teams – and women's coaches – with **\$106,916** 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>4</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 institution has expanded participation opportunities for the underrepresented sex in a manner that

---

<sup>4</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.”



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. 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 (D.R.I. 1992) at 996 (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 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."

51. Hawaii'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 requirements under Title IX.

## V. RELIEF REQUESTED

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

- a. Investigate the University of Hawaii at Manoa to determine whether it is discriminating against women; whether it is providing female students with equal participation opportunities in varsity athletics, equal and proportionate athletic scholarship dollars, and receiving equal treatment, including 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. Secure assurances of compliance with Title IX from the University of Hawaii, that include full remedies for the violations found.
- c. Among other steps to achieve compliance with Title IX, require the University of Hawaii 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 the University of Hawaii at Manoa 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 Sex Discrimination Complaint.

Respectfully submitted,



Nancy Hogshead, J.D., OLY  
September 24, 2023

