



**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

University of Michigan
Santa J. Ono, Ph.D., President
500 S. State Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
EMAIL: presoff@umich.edu

Warde Manuel, Director of Athletics
1000 S. State Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
EMAIL: WardeManuelAD@umich.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 Michigan (“Michigan”) 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 Michigan’s website indicates that Michigan 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 Michigan to determine whether it is discriminating against women in athletics; whether it is providing women equal opportunities to participate in varsity sports, equal opportunities to earn athletic scholarships, and equivalent treatment and benefits, 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 remedying violations of Title IX and its implementing regulations and guidelines. 34 C.F.R. §§ 106.71, 100.7.

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

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

III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

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

9. Data submitted by Michigan 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 Michigan is discriminating against its women students; 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				Men	Women Prong 2: This # should Rise Continuously and Steadily Over Time, Without Going Backwards	Athletic Participation		
	Men	Women	Total	Percent Women			Total	Percent Women	Female Athletes Who Would Need to be Added to Achieve
2003-04	11340	11972	23312	51.36%	362	400	762	52.49%	-18
2004-05	11676	12097	23773	50.89%	394	423	817	51.77%	-15
2005-06	12074	12372	24446	50.61%	378	407	785	51.85%	-20
2006-07	12218	12413	24631	50.40%	379	384	763	50.33%	1
2007-08	12556	12623	25179	50.13%	371	382	753	50.73%	-9
2008-09	12587	12515	25102	49.86%	402	395	797	49.56%	5
2009-10	12812	12449	25261	49.28%	400	365	765	47.71%	24
2010-11	13255	12841	26096	49.21%	399	381	780	48.85%	6
2011-12	13441	13019	26460	49.20%	500	511	1011	50.54%	-27
2012-13	13745	13209	26954	49.01%	511	516	1027	50.24%	-25
2013-14	13814	13414	27228	49.27%	518	509	1027	49.56%	-6
2014-15	13789	13508	27297	49.49%	528	511	1039	49.18%	6
2015-16	13642	13519	27161	49.77%	531	556	1087	51.15%	-30
2016-17	13891	13942	27833	50.09%	547	575	1122	51.25%	-26
2017-18	14205	14314	28519	50.19%	555	586	1141	51.36%	-27
2018-19	14503	14581	29084	50.13%	558	564	1122	50.27%	-3
2019-20	14934	15123	30057	50.31%	577	573	1150	49.83%	11
2020-21	14688	15125	29813	50.73%	550	500	1050	47.62%	66
2021-22	14819	15835	30654	51.66%	544	488	1032	47.29%	93

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.¹

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/>

Michigan takes advantage of this practice; in its current EADA submission, it counts 16 men as “women.” The chart below cannot take this 16-athlete discrepancy into account, but we have in the narrative. It will impact the gap between men and women and the number of women that are currently in the athletic department.

11. Michigan 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. The participation gap from 2003-04 to 2021-2022 for women at Michigan ranged from 15.69 percent in 2003-04, to 15.00 percent in 2018-19, averaging 13.36 percent over the past 16 academic years. Women at Michigan are 51.66% of the student body, but just 47.29% 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, Michigan’s participation gap was 93 athletes. But as described in #10, the true gap is 109 when the men Michigan is counting as “women” are factored in. In other words, Michigan must add 109 additional athletic opportunities for women in order to provide athletic opportunities substantially proportionate to enrollment. *Champion Women* does not have access to data on prior years Michigan counted men as “women” but 109 women athletes equate to about three or five new teams, assuming teams are between 20 and 25 athletes, depending on the size of the team.

13. The EADA data and evidence gathered on Michigan’s website show that Michigan 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 publicly available EADA data, Michigan’s numbers have gone up and down; losing opportunities in 2005, 2009, and 2013. In 2017, Michigan provided 586 women with a sports experience, a high for the school. Now, however, women’s opportunities are down to 488 – a 98-athlete drop. When the men that are counted as “women” are factored in, it is a 114-female athlete drop.

Meanwhile, Michigan has increased men’s opportunities to play competitive sports by 182.

Champion Women cannot know the 28-year history of adding sports between 1975 and 2003, but even with this limited data set, Michigan cannot show a history of continuous program expansion that is demonstratively responsive to the growing interests of women in sport.

15. A review of Michigan’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. Michigan sponsors 12 men’s varsity sports (Baseball, Basketball, Track, Football, Golf, Gymnastics, Ice Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, and Wrestling) serving 475 men, and 13 women’s varsity sports (Basketball, Track, Field Hockey, Golf,

Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rowing, Soccer, Softball, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Volleyball and Water Polo), serving 411 women.

17. Information available on Michigan'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. Michigan women participate in the club sports of artistic swimming, badminton, cycling, gymnastics, ice hockey, lacrosse, rifle, rowing, rugby, sailing, soccer, softball, synchronized skating, Taekwondo, tennis, triathlon, ultimate frisbee, volleyball, water polo. <https://recsports.umich.edu/clubs/>. The existence of these women's club teams indicates that there is unmet interest in women's athletics at Michigan.

19. Michigan is a member of the Big Ten (B1G). The competitive region of the B1G is enormous. In their East Division, schools are from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, Indiana, Michigan, New York. In their West Division, schools come from Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Indiana, and Wisconsin. Future members will include schools from California, Oregon, and Washington. Almost all women's sports are within either of the Big 10's competitive regions.

20. Members of the Big 10 sponsor women's Bowling, Ice Hockey, Fencing, Lightweight Rowing, Rifle, Rowing, and Water Polo, Synchronized Swimming, Beach Volleyball and Wrestling -- all sports not sponsored by Michigan. The existence of women's sports within the conference demonstrates women's interest and ability to play, and a reasonable expectation within Michigan's and the Big 10 Conference's competitive geographic region.

21. As a member of the Big 10 and a Power 5 school, the student body and its athletes are recruited nationally and internationally.

Michigan high school girls compete in numerous sports that Michigan does not sponsor. Michigan girls compete in Badminton, Basketball, Bowling, Fencing, Field Hockey, Gymnastics, Ice Hockey, Lacrosse, Skiing, Soccer, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Track & Field, Volleyball, Water Polo, Weightlifting and Wrestling. <https://www.nfhsnetwork.com/states/MI>

High school-age girls in Michigan and in the competitive geographic region also compete on club sports or travel teams, or sports not associated with their school. These include: Basketball, Soccer, Golf, Tennis, and Track & Field, Wrestling, Badminton, Table Tennis, Team Handball, Sailing, Field Hockey, Fencing, Equestrian, Swimming & Diving, Skateboarding, Water Polo, Archery, Field Hockey, Rifle, Triathlon, Ice Hockey, Sport Climbing, Artistic Swimming, Skiing, Snowboarding, Gymnastics, Rowing, Wrestling, Rugby, and all sorts of combat sports, like Judo, Karate, and Taekwondo, to name a few.

According to the NCAA,² 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,

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

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 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 the University of Michigan.

22. 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.³

23. 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.

24. A review of the Michigan website does not reveal that Michigan 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 See

https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/sportpart/2022RES_SportsSponsorshipParticipationRatesReport.pdf

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

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

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

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

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

Women’s Collegiate Triathlon: <https://www.usatriathlon.org/multisport/ncaa-triathlon>

Collegiate Sailing is governed by the Inter-Collegiate Sailing Association (ICSA) with 220 schools: <https://www.collegesailing.org/about/overview>

Women’s Collegiate Ice Hockey: <https://www.uscho.com/teams/#d1women>

Collegiate Field Hockey: <https://www.teamusa.org/USA-Field-Hockey/PLAYERS/College/Team-Websites>

Collegiate Synchronized/ Artistic Swimming: <https://www.collegexpress.com/lists/list/colleges-with-notable-synchronized-swimming-teams/581/>

Collegiate Bowling - <https://collegebowling.bowl.com/teams>

Collegiate Rifle - <https://competitions.nra.org/competitions/nra-national-matches/collegiate-championships/collegiate-shooting-sports-directory/>

Collegiate Skiing – <https://www.uscsa.org/>

Collegiate Water Polo - <https://collegiatewaterpolo.org/>

Collegiate Women’s Gymnastics <https://www.ncaa.com/sports/gymnastics-women>

25. Michigan gives male athletes \$15,790,943 in scholarship dollars, but only gives women athletes \$11,873,750. 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 Michigan provided its male and female students with the same opportunities to participate, Michigan would need to add **\$4,999,830** *additional* athletic scholarship dollars, to balance out the amount Michigan provides to its male students.

26. If the OCR determined that Michigan is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, that Michigan was providing equal opportunities to women in sport, Michigan would still need to add **\$1,257,665** in athletic scholarships for women.

27. Michigan's EADA data further indicates that the university provides inadequate and unequal funding for recruitment of female athletes. In 2021-2022, Michigan spent \$3,387,305 on men's recruitment and only \$771,508 on women's recruitment. If Michigan were to provide its women's teams with scholarship dollars proportionate with women's enrollment, Michigan would need to add **\$2,848,032** in *additional* recruiting dollars to women's sports teams.

28. If, for some reason, the OCR determines that Michigan is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, Michigan would still need to provide its women's sports teams – and women's coaches – with **\$1,116,688** more recruiting dollars in order to be consistent with the school's investment in men's sports.

IV. LEGAL ALLEGATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

34. In 1975, schools were given three years to be in compliance with the equal participation mandate under Title IX. Schools had only one year to end sex discrimination in all other areas of Title IX's non-discrimination mandate. Only athletics gave schools three years to add athletic opportunities and to stop discriminating against women – or until 1978. That deadline passed 45 years ago. 34 C.F.R. §106.41(d).⁴

It is worth noting how odd Prong 2 is as a legal test, in comparison to any other non-discrimination civil right. For a school to be able to argue that 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, that were passed by Congress. When a school uses Prong 2, it is admitting it is not providing women with equal

⁴ 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.”

educational opportunities, but that providing women with less is acceptable, because the school is “improving”. Title IX’s Prong 2 allows schools to continue to provide women with less.

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

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

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

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

- an institution’s current implementation of a 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.

37. OCR will not find a history and continuing practice of program expansion where an institution increases the proportional participation opportunities for the underrepresented sex by reducing opportunities for the overrepresented sex alone or by reducing participation

opportunities for the overrepresented sex to a proportionately greater degree than for the underrepresented sex. *2010 Clarification, 1996 Clarification.*

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

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

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

41. Sufficient interest can be established by student requests to add a sport or elevate a club sport, increases in club or intramural sport participation, responses to interviews and interest surveys, assessments of student athletic participation before entering the institution or in the secondary schools from which the university draws its students, and assessments of participation in intercollegiate sports in the institution's normal competitive regions. *Id.*

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

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

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

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

46. Title IX also requires equal opportunity in the recruitment of student-athletes where equal athletic opportunities are not present for male and female students. Compliance will be assessed by examining the recruitment practices of the athletic programs for both sexes and

evaluating whether the financial and other resources made available for recruitment in male and female athletic programs are equivalently adequate to meet the needs of each program. *1979 Policy Interpretation*.

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

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

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

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

- i. Men’s and Women’s sports would be equally featured, with equal prominence, on school and Athletic Department websites and social media.
- ii. Schools would invest equally in cameras and production equipment for Women’s and Men’s sports.
- iii. Schools would optimize Google searches for their Men’s and Women’s teams to receive equal search results.

- iv. Women’s and Men’s sports would employ an equal caliber of talent in their sports information and marketing departments, and they would be paid and promoted equally.
- v. Women’s and Men’s sports jerseys, apparel and memorabilia would be equally and easily accessible.
- vi. The needs of Women’s teams would not revolve around Men’s football and men’s basketball teams.
- vii. The Women’s and Men’s teams would have equal access to dining halls, nutrition, etc. at times equally convenient to both teams.
- viii. Men’s and Women’s teams would have equal access to optimal practice times when they share facilities.
- ix. Men’s and Women’s sports marketing efforts would focus on performance; Broadcasters and schools would not focus on a woman-athlete’s appearance or sexuality.
- x. Women’s and Men’s medical care and athletic training access would be equal; Neither male nor female athletes would have priority accessing these resources.
- xi. Schools would hire competition officials of the same quality, with equal compensation, for the Women’s and Men’s teams.
- xii. Men’s and Women’s sports performance staff would be equal and would be paid and promoted comparably.
- xiii. Schools would intentionally use language that equally prioritizes Men’s and Women’s sports.
 - 1. Teams would be referred 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. Michigan’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 Title IX, the civil rights law guaranteeing women equal educational opportunities. *Champion Women* requests that OCR:

- a. Investigate the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor to determine whether it is discriminating against women; whether it is providing female students with equal participation opportunities in varsity athletics, equal athletic scholarship dollars, and equal treatment and benefits, 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 Michigan, that include full remedies for the violations found.
- c. Among other steps to achieve compliance with Title IX, require Michigan 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, provide equal scholarship dollars, provide equal 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 Michigan-Ann Arbor to ensure that the school achieves full and complete compliance with Title IX throughout its athletic department, now and in the future.



A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Nancy Hogshead". The signature is fluid and cursive, written in a professional style.

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