



**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

Wingate University
Kelley Kish, Director of Athletics
211 E Wilson Street
Wingate, NC 28174
EMAIL: k.kish@wingate.edu

Rhett Brown, President
Stegall, 3rd Floor, 211 E Wilson Street
Wingate, NC 28174
EMAIL: president@wingate.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 Wingate University (“Wingate”) 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 Wingate’s website indicates that Wingate 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 but not limited to athletic recruitment funding.

4. In order to address these disparities, *Champion Women* requests that the Office for Civil Rights (“OCR”) investigate Wingate to determine whether it is discriminated against women in the provision of equal opportunities to participate in varsity sports, equal athletic scholarship dollars, and equivalent benefits and treatment, including, but not limited to 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 Wingate currently violates Title IX’s athletic equity requirements, this complaint is timely.

III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

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

9. Data submitted by Wingate 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 Wingate is discriminating against women; it is not currently and has not in the past been providing female athletes equal opportunities to participate in athletics under Title IX's three-part participation test.

Year	Undergraduate Enrollment				Athletic Participation				
	Men	Women	Total	Percent Women	Men	Women 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
2003-04	586	691	1277	54.11%	249	116	365	31.78%	178
2004-05	596	682	1278	53.36%	255	122	377	32.36%	170
2005-06	628	684	1312	52.13%	292	124	416	29.81%	194
2006-07	623	661	1284	51.48%	292	113	405	27.90%	197
2007-08	672	735	1407	52.24%	309	118	427	27.63%	220
2008-09	656	740	1396	53.01%	341	135	476	28.36%	250
2009-10	640	733	1373	53.39%	310	118	428	27.57%	237
2010-11	735	838	1573	53.27%	361	166	527	31.50%	246
2011-12	769	904	1673	54.03%	391	170	561	30.30%	290
2012-13	713	1001	1714	58.40%	351	204	555	36.76%	289
2013-14	798	1154	1952	59.12%	380	247	627	39.39%	303
2014-15	780	1109	1889	58.71%	406	246	652	37.73%	331
2015-16	786	1183	1969	60.08%	392	239	631	37.88%	351
2016-17	809	1235	2044	60.42%	403	242	645	37.52%	373
2017-18	984	1553	2537	61.21%	447	225	672	33.48%	480
2018-19	1058	1625	2683	60.57%	456	228	684	33.33%	472
2019-20	1057	1649	2706	60.94%	505	269	774	34.75%	519
2020-21	1026	1576	2602	60.57%	486	290	776	37.37%	457
2021-22	991	1417	2408	58.85%	514	259	773	33.51%	476

10. *Champion Women* has edited the EADA data on our website in just one instance: <https://titleixschools.com/> 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/>

11. Wingate 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 58.85% of the student body, but just 33.51% 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, Wingate's participation gap was 476 female athletes. In other words, Wingate must add 476 additional athletic opportunities for women in order to provide athletic opportunities substantially proportionate to enrollment. Assuming that athletic teams have an average squad size of 25 athletes – some more and some less – Wingate would need to add 19 new teams for women.

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

14. Over the 19 academic years covered by the available EADA data, Wingate added only 2 women's athletic opportunities through the first 7 years. Moving forward, Wingate went backwards in 2014, 2015 and 2017. In 2013 Wingate provided women with 247 athletic opportunities. It then slid backwards for the next 6 years, with losses for women up to 22 athletic opportunities, until 2019. *Champion Women* cannot know the 28-year history of adding women's 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.

15. When this public reporting was initiated in 2003, Wingate's male – female gap was 178, and the school went about watching that gap grow by hundreds. During these reportable years, Wingate added educational opportunities for men at double the rate, adding 265 athletic opportunities for men.

16. A review of Wingate's website did not cover 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. Wingate sponsors 9 men's varsity sports (Baseball, Basketball, Football, Golf, Lacrosse, Soccer, Swimming, Tennis, Track) serving 435 men, and 9 women's varsity sports (Basketball, Golf, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball, Swimming, Tennis, Track, and Volleyball) serving 200 women.

18. Information available on Wingate'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. Wingate is a member of the South Atlantic Conference. Other members come from South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina. As an NCAA Division II conference, Wingate will have many choices to add sports that women have demonstrated their interest and abilities, and that competition for these women's sports exists in the competitive geographic area.

20. Wingate does not sponsor women's Field Hockey even though the South Atlantic Conference sponsors the sport as a Championship sport. Championship sports are a unique type of educational experience. They also demonstrate that women are interested and athletically able to compete, and that there is competition in Wingate and the South Atlantic Conference's competitive geographic region.

21. Other schools that are members of the South Atlantic Conference sponsor women's teams in Beach Volleyball, Equestrian, Bowling, Triathlon and Wrestling. Women have therefore demonstrated their interest in these five sports, their athletic abilities and have demonstrated that competition for these women's sports exists in the competitive geographic area.

22. Wingate women participate in the club sports of equestrian and other fitness activities. The existence of these women's club teams indicates that there is unmet interest in women's athletics at Wingate.

23. Girls in high school in North Carolina play many sports that Wingate does not offer, including Badminton, Bowling, Fencing, Field Hockey, and Wrestling.

<https://www.nfhsnetwork.com/states/NC>

According to the NCAA,² in 2020, only 1.2% of these high school girls' basketball players were provided the opportunity to play in Division II. Just 1.4% of high school Field Hockey players, 1.9% of Golfers, 1.1% of Ice Hockey players, 3.7% of Lacrosse players, 1.9% of Soccer players, 1.7% of Softball players, 1.2% of Swimmers, 1% of Tennis players, 1.5% of Track & Field athletes, 1.1% of Volleyball players, and just 1.1% of high school Water Polo players in are provided opportunities to play their sport in Division II.

High school-age girls in North Carolina and the South Athletic Conference competitive geographic region also compete in club sports or travel teams; sports 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, Speedskating, Swimming & Diving, Skateboarding, Water Polo, Archery, Field Hockey, Rifle, Triathlon, Cycling, 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.

These metrics demonstrate that women are athletically ready, and they have expressed enormous demand to compete in sports, demand that is unmet.

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>

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. 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.³

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

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 Wingate provided its male and female students with the same opportunities to participate, Wingate would need to add **\$2,354,786 additional** athletic scholarship dollars, to balance out the amount Wingate provides to its male students.

28. If, for some reason, the OCR determines Wingate is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, then Wingate would still need to provide its

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.ncasports.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>

women students participating in sports with **\$869,106** more in athletic scholarship aid, to match the amount Wingate provides its male athletes.

29. Wingate's EADA data further indicates that the university provides inadequate and unequal funding for the recruitment of female athletes. In 2021-2022, Wingate spent \$35,545 on men's recruitment and only \$10,347 on women's recruitment; women were allocated only 22.55 percent of the recruiting budget even though they account for 33.51 percent of the athletic population and 58.85 percent of the full-time undergraduate population. If Wingate were to be providing women with equal opportunities to compete, it would need to provide women's teams – and women's coaches - with **\$40,477 additional** recruiting dollars.

30. If, for some reason, the OCR determines Wingate is, in fact, not discriminating against women in providing opportunities in sport, Wingate would still need to provide its women's sports teams – and women's coaches – with \$4,107 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).⁴

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.

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 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

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.”

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 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*.

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. Wingate’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 equal scholarship, treatment and benefits, as required by Title IX.

V. RELIEF REQUESTED

54. ***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 Wingate University to determine whether the school is discriminating against its female students with unequal participation opportunities to participate in varsity athletics, unequal athletic scholarship dollars, and unequal treatment and benefits, including but not limited to equal recruiting budgets.
- b. Take all necessary steps to remedy any unlawful conduct that it identifies in its investigation, as required by Title IX and its implementing regulations. Secure assurances of compliance with Title IX from Wingate University, that include full remedies for the violations found.
- c. Among other steps to achieve compliance with Title IX, require Wingate University to add more athletic opportunities for women, accord to additional teams and athletes the full range of benefits accorded to men's varsity teams and athletes, increase recruiting budgets and opportunities, and adopt and implement a plan to achieve compliance with Title IX.
- d. Monitor any resulting agreement with Wingate University to ensure that the school achieves compliance with Title IX, now and in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Nancy Hogshead, J.D., OLY
September 25, 2023