

## IAC REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY'S COUNTS OF FEMALE ATHLETES

As requested by the Senate, in this report and attachments are a few numbers pertaining to the count of female athletes. The questions addressed by this report arose in light of a New York Times article which focussed on universities which counted male practice team members as female participants and which counted women who did not really participate as participants.

Presumably, the counts referred to were supplied as part of EADA (Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act) reporting, administered by the federal Department of Education. Compliance with the gender-equity mandate Title IX is monitored by the federal government's Office of Civil Rights, not the NCAA, and would only be formally determined at the time of a lawsuit or an OCR investigation. EADA reporting does not immediately translate to a determination of Title IX compliance, in particular because these numbers are a one-size fits all report while Title IX compliance can rest on one (or more) of three possible prongs. Thus, any useful interpretation of numbers requires context, which we supply in part below.

**0.1. Number of male participants (in particular practice participants) counted as females for UO EADA reports:** Zero.

**0.2. Number of participants counted for EADA who only nominally participated:** Zero.

**0.3. Male and female participation numbers from EADA reports.** Current numbers at the team-by-team level can be found at: <http://ope.ed.gov/athletics/>

Total numbers are summarized as follows:

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Total participants - Female	185	199	163	167	168
Unduplicated count of participants - Female	168	155	163	167	168
Total participants - Male	284	323	244	222	239
Unduplicated count of participants - Male	257	253	238	218	238

In "Total participants," the count is by opportunities so student-athletes are counted more than once if they participate in more than one sport (just as a student who is enrolled in more than one course in a department is counted twice in their enrollment numbers). The unduplicated counts give the total number of the student-athletes. Duplicate counting happens most in cross country and indoor/ outdoor track. The university in 2007 decided to aggregate the number of participants on these teams without duplication, so that the total and unduplicated counts in recent years exactly agree for female athletes and nearly agree for male athletes.

For context the IAC would like to point out that the question of duplicate counting is a red herring for purposes of understanding Title IX and other matters related to women's sports on this campus. (It was also not a focus of the article which motivated these questions - rather, the focus was on counts (duplicate or not) *of unqualified participants*.) Roster counts, and comparison between male and female counts, are important at colleges and universities which strive for compliance through "Prong 1." Our University strives for compliance through "Prong 2," which asks whether an institution can demonstrate a history and continuing practice of program expansion for women. If desired, the IAC can report on our university's standing for Title IX compliance at another time, but addressing that substantive question was not requested for this report.

Since it is the expansion of opportunities not the comparison of male and female opportunities which are germane to the University's compliance in this area, there is little if any advantage to be had by counting male participants or by including unqualified female participants in a roster count.

Full numbers broken down by sport are attached. The one set of numbers which might get the attention of some are in women's basketball. There a change of coaching and philosophy has resulted in need for larger practice roster size, since multiple practice players taking turns are required to simulate the intensity expected of the regular players.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dev Sinha, Chair, on behalf of the  
Intercollegiate Athletics Committee