

TITLE IX COMPLIANCE VS. NCAA SCHOLARSHIP LIMITS

M. Kate Kantor

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters in Art in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science (Sport Administration).

Chapel Hill
2016

Approved by:

Barbara Osborne

Erienne Weight

Theresa Wenzel

© 2016
M. Kate Kantor
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

M. Kate Kantor: Title IX Compliance vs. NCAA Scholarship Limits
(Under the direction of Barbara Osborne)

Out of the 65 Power 5 schools, only 16 appear to be in numeric compliance with Title IX in regards to financial aid (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). There can be many reasons for this disparity, but research shows that one cause is the current structure of NCAA scholarship limits. With the current model, only 11 Power 5 institutions could fully-fund all its sports programs, but still not be in compliance with Title IX. Schools now face a dilemma—follow NCAA scholarship limits to stay competitive or comply with Title IX legislation.

Until today, there has been no research on the criteria or classifications for head-count or equivalencies sports. Some have speculated that head-count sports were defined by revenue generation, while others thought there were no criteria at all. Likewise, current scholarship limits have had many criticisms about the inequity between sports and the overall limits in general. Title IX has taken the brunt of the blame, but the limits were still thought of as arbitrary. However, primary sources shows that limits were actually adjusted for cost reduction and to offset the large number of football scholarships. This study created nine new scholarship models that are overall more pragmatic and cognizant to member schools' Title IX compliance and address the inequities in the current scholarship model.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of Purpose.....	1
Research Questions	2
Definition of Terms.....	2
Limitations	3
Delimitation.....	3
Assumptions	3
Significance of the Study	4
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.....	5
1975 Regulation.....	5
1979 OCR Policy Interpretation.....	7
Financial Aid	8
Current NCAA Rules	9
NCAA and Gender Equity.....	10
Financial Aid	11
NCAA Scholarship Limits.....	12

Current Studies	15
Theoretical Framework	18
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	19
Data Collection.....	19
Data Analysis	20
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	21
Research Question 1	21
Research Question 2.....	23
Research Question 3.....	27
Research Question 4.....	29
Model 1: NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on Average Roster Size	32
Model 2: NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on NCAA Travel Squad Size.....	35
Model 3: NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on Starting Line Up Size	38
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION.....	42
Summary	42
Research Question 1	43
Research Question 3.....	50
Research Question 4.....	52
Future Research.....	56
APPENDIX A.....	58
APPENDIX B	62
REFERENCES	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Current NCAA Head-Count Scholarship Limits Per Sport	13
2. Current NCAA Equivalency Scholarship Limits Per Sport.....	13
3. Maximum Awards Table— Division I	23
4. Description of Alternative Scholarship Models.....	30
5. New NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on Average Roster Size.....	33
6. New NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on NCAA Travel Squad Size.....	37
7. New NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on Starting Line Up Size.....	40

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 was introduced, a new era of college athletics emerged. Stating “no 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) collegiate athletic associations were called upon to offer equal participation and financial aid opportunities for all students. Although Title IX has been in effect for over forty years, most schools are still not in compliance in regards to financial aid requirements (George, 1999). One reason for this disparity— NCAA scholarship regulations.

Member schools of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) must adhere to NCAA scholarship limits and financial aid restraints or they risk losing eligibility to play. On the other hand, member schools that can fully fund its sports can lose competitiveness if they choose to restrict scholarship numbers in order to comply with Title IX. Schools that face this dilemma appear to adhere to NCAA rules rather than federal legislation. This research examines the interaction between NCAA financial aid and scholarship limits and institutional compliance with Title IX.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study has two prongs. First, the study examines how the NCAA decided to categorize teams as either head-count or equivalency, and ultimately how NCAA scholarship limits were initially decided. Second, the study examines whether there is a more

efficient, fair, and equitable model of implementing scholarship limits per sport that helps schools better comply with Title IX.

Research Questions

RQ1. Why are NCAA sports classified as Head-Count or Equivalency for financial aid purposes?

RQ2. How were the initial and current NCAA scholarship limits decided for each sport?

RQ3. How does the current NCAA scholarship model hinder schools from complying with Title IX financial aid regulations?

RQ4. Are there alternatives to the current scholarship model that could facilitate a more equitable division of scholarship allocation?

Definition of Terms

Counter: A student-athlete who receives institutional financial aid (NCAA, 2015).

Division I: The highest level of intercollegiate athletics sanctioned by the National Collegiate Athletic Association. In general, Division I schools have the biggest student bodies, manage the largest athletics budgets and offer the most generous number of scholarships (About NCAA, 2015).

Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act of 1994 (EADA): Statute which requires institutions of postsecondary education that receive federal funding, participate in federal student financial assistance programs, and have an intercollegiate athletic program, to produce and make readily available reports on men's and women's teams' athletic participation, staffing, and revenues and expenses on an annual basis (Higher Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. § 1092).

EADA Cutting Tool: A database consisting of athletics data that is submitted annually via a Web-based data collection, by all co-educational postsecondary institutions that receive Title IX funding (Equity, 2015).

Equivalency: A sport that has limits on the value of financial aid awards that an institution may provide in an academic year to counters (NCAA, 2015).

Head-Count: A sport that has limits to the total number of counters in an academic year (NCAA, 2015).

NCAA (National Collegiate Athletic Association): A national governing body for collegiate athletic associations.

Power 5 Conferences: Collegiate athletic conferences in the NCAA Division I FBS, which includes the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), the Big Ten Conference (Big Ten), the Big 12 Conference (Big 12), the Southeastern Conference (SEC), and the Pacific 12 Conference (PAC-12).

Limitations

1. The study is limited by the historical archives and information available.
2. This study is limited to the data provided from the EADA Cutting Tool for the 2013 – 2014 academic year.

Delimitation

1. The scope of this study is limited to only Division I Power 5 Conference institutions within the NCAA.

Assumptions

1. The researcher assumes that all NCAA archival evidence was truthfully and accurately recorded.

2. The researcher assumes that all Division I Power 5 schools accurately report their participation rates and athletically related student aid for the EADA.
3. The researcher assumes EADA Cutting Tool database is accurate for the 2013 – 14 academic year.

Significance of the Study

As college athletics goes through a revolutionary restructuring, gender-inequality should be addressed, corrected, and eliminated. Despite nearly forty-five years in practice, there are still remarkable gaps in Title IX compliance within college athletics—75% of Power 5 Conference schools are still not in numeric compliance in regards to financial aid today (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). With athletic spending increasing every year, lack of gender equity compliance and enforcement allows schools to continually under-fund female student-athletes and programs. This study will provide an understanding of NCAA scholarship limits, and generate proposals to enable NCAA members to provide gender equitable scholarship opportunities that comply with Title IX.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972

As the women's civil rights movement gained momentum in the late 1960's, sex bias discrimination within the education system was at the forefront of public concern. Females in the workplace were earning less than their male counterparts, while inequities in educational opportunities—such as athletics, academics, admissions, and hiring—were immense and obvious (Schwartz, 2014). Stating, “no 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,” Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 was the first legislation enacted to actively fight gender bias discrimination within education (20 U.S.C. § 1681).

1975 Regulation

Based on the legislation's broad scope and definition of gender bias, it was initially unclear whether or not Title IX would regulate college athletics (Schwarz, 2014). In 1975 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare promulgated Title IX regulations which comprised a section specific to intercollegiate athletics (34 C.F.R. §106).

Section 106.41 (a) reiterates the general language of Title IX as it relates to college athletics, stating

No person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be treated differently from another person or otherwise be discriminated against in any interscholastic, intercollegiate, club or intramural athletics offered by a recipient, and no recipient shall provide any such athletics separately on such basis (34 C.F.R. Part 106.41).

Section 106.41 (b) encourages institutions to maintain co-ed athletic teams, and discusses how co-ed and single-sex teams should operate in regard to try-outs. Interestingly, this subsection also includes specifics on contact sports—boxing, wrestling, rugby, ice hockey, football, and basketball (34 C.F.R. Part 106.41). Section 106.41 (c) gives the most guidance as to what is required for equal opportunity. It states,

A recipient which operates or sponsors interscholastic, intercollegiate, club or intramural athletics shall provide equal athletic opportunity for members of both sexes. In determining whether equal opportunities are available the Director will consider, among other factors:

- (1) Whether the selection of sports and levels of competition effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of members of both sexes;
- (2) The provision of equipment and supplies;
- (3) Scheduling of games and practice time;
- (4) Travel and per diem allowance;
- (5) Opportunity to receive coaching and academic tutoring;
- (6) Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors;
- (7) Provision of locker rooms, practice and competitive facilities;
- (8) Provision of medical and training facilities and services;

- (9) Provision of housing and dining facilities and services;
- (10) Publicity (34 C.F.R. Part 106.41).

1979 OCR Policy Interpretation

After issuing the 1975 Regulations, schools, teams, and individuals now had tangible guidelines for Title IX compliance, and OCR received over 100 complaints stemming from 50 universities within the first year (Elliott & Mason, 2001). In order to reduce the complaints and allow schools to be more self-compliant, OCR issued a Policy Interpretation of Title IX in 1979 specifically aimed at college athletics interpretations and compliance (Schwarz, 2014). In order for schools to measure whether they are in compliance, the Policy Interpretation requires—

- (1) athletically related financial assistance be allocated in proportion to the numbers of male and female students participating in intercollegiate athletics;
- (2) all other benefits, opportunities, and treatment afforded participants of each sex be equivalent; and
- (3) the interest and abilities of students be effectively accommodated to the extent necessary to provide equal athletic opportunity for members of both sexes (45 C.F.R. Part 26).

These three goals focus on what OCR hoped their 1975 Regulation would accomplish, and are now the foundation of how collegiate athletic associations evaluate their Title IX compliance.

The second requirement—benefits, opportunities, and treatment of students—focuses on what the 1975 Regulation stated as requirements for equal opportunity in section 106.41(c). For the third requirement— providing equal participation opportunities for male and female students— The Office for Civil Rights issued the Three-Part “Effective Accommodation Test” to

help schools determine if they were compliant. The test consists of three independent assessments—

- (1) Whether opportunities for male and female students are provided in numbers substantially proportionate to their respective enrollments; or
- (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 interest and abilities of the members of that sex; or
- (3) Where the members of one sex are underrepresented among intercollegiate athletes, and the institution cannot show a continuing practice of program expansion such as that cited 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 (45 C.F.R. Part 26).

If a school meets any one of these three requirements, then they are seen to have been proactively and effectively accommodating the participation needs of the underrepresented gender.

Financial Aid

For the first requirement of the 1979 Policy Interpretation, institutions are required to offer a proportionate amount of scholarship funding to its male and female student-athletes (34 C.F.R. Part 106.37). This rule is independent of any NCAA or athletic department rule that limits scholarships. The 1975 financial assistance regulation requires:

- (1) To the extent that a recipient awards athletic scholarship or grants-in-aid, it must provide reasonable opportunities for such award for member of each sex in

proportion to the number of students of each sex participating in interscholastic or intercollegiate athletics.

- (2) Separate athletic scholarships or grant-in-aid for members of each sex may be provided as part of separate athletic teams for members of each sex to the extent consistent with the paragraph and §106.41 (34 C.F.R. Part 106.37).

In 1998, OCR issued a policy interpretation for athletic scholarships that defined the term “substantially equal” as less than a 1% disparity in the ratio of financial aid dollars compared with the gender ratio of student-athletes, unless an acceptable nondiscriminatory reason for greater disparity exists (Office of Civil Rights, 1998). It also noted that the amount spent on male versus female student-athletes scholarships were measured in dollars, and not the number of scholarships offered. With a variance of only 1%, member schools must carefully calculate the exact scholarship dollar amount they provide to their student-athletes each year.

In general, if schools were to freely assign their scholarship dollars within their own specific discretion, financial aid allocation seems to be as straight-forward as the principle for proportionality rates. However, for NCAA member schools, financial aid allocation is constrained by NCAA scholarship limits, thus creating a new level of complexity and hindrance to Title IX compliance.

Current NCAA Rules

For most intercollegiate athletics programs, federal legislation is not the only regulatory requirement to which athletic associations must adhere. Many schools are members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and have over 400 pages of bylaws and guidelines to follow to be an eligible and competitive NCAA DI school. When a school chooses to belong to the NCAA, it voluntarily agrees to follow the association’s rules (NCAA, 2015).

While members must adhere to NCAA rules, compliance with these rules does not preclude compliance with federal legislation. Although the NCAA includes gender-equity legislation (NCAA, 2015), some mandates make it difficult for schools to comply with Title IX (George, 1999).

NCAA and Gender Equity

The NCAA does not evaluate Title IX compliance for its member institutions—the Office for Civil Rights is responsible for Title IX oversight in education. However, the NCAA does help facilitate Title IX compliance for its member institutions in some ways. Historically, the NCAA did not support the full implementation of Title IX in college sports, and initially fought against it (Carpenter & Acosta, 2006). In 1974, the NCAA leaders fully supported the Tower Amendment, which would exclude revenue-generating sports from the reach of Title IX; however, the amendment eventually died and was discarded (Elliott & Mason, 2001). In 1976, the NCAA membership then sued the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, claiming that OCR had exceeded its regulatory authority by issuing Title IX regulations in *NCAA v. Califano* (1980). The district court dismissed the case based on the standing requirements—the case was no longer pursued.

In 1992, the NCAA issued a survey on gender equity among its member-institutions, which indicated that women made up half of the undergraduate student-body but only one-third of student-athletes (Elliott & Mason, 2001). Following this survey, gender equity then became a priority for the NCAA, and a 16-member task force was formed to establish guidelines to help member institutions athletic programs become equitable (Elliott & Mason, 2001). At the 1993 NCAA Convention, a certification program was adopted requiring each member institution to establish a gender equity plan that included periodic self-assessments (Mota, 2006). Under this

certification program, member institutions had to actively improve their gender inequities, while the NCAA made strides to help enhance gender-equity compliance with Title IX. However, in 2011, the NCAA announced a two-year moratorium on its Certification process for member schools—it was never reinstated.

In 1994, Bylaw 2.3—The Principal of Gender Equity— was adopted into the NCAA Division I legislation. The three-part principle promotes gender-equity legislation and compliance within its member institutions. Bylaw 2.3.1—Compliance with Federal and State Legislation—states that “it is the responsibility of each member institution to comply with federal and state laws regarding gender equity (NCAA, 2015, p. 3). Bylaw 2.3.2 states that the NCAA “should not adopt legislation that would prevent member institutions from complying with applicable gender-equity laws, and should adopt legislation to enhance member institutions’ compliance with applicable gender-equity laws” (NCAA, 2015, p. 3). Bylaw 2.3.3—Gender Bias—states, “the activities of the Association should be conducted in a manner free of gender bias” (NCAA, 2015, p. 3). While these principles certainly encourage NCAA members toward Title IX compliance, there is still no requirement that members actually comply with federal law, nor are there NCAA sanctions for institutions that are not in compliance.

Financial Aid

The NCAA defines “financial aid” as “funds provided to student-athletes from various sources to pay or assist in paying their cost of education at the institution” (NCAA, 2014, p. 188). Financial aid includes all institutional financial aid and other permissible financial aid such as athletically related financial aid—which is “awarded on any basis that is related to athletic ability, participation or achievement” (NCAA, 2014, p. 188).

Historically, schools were not allowed to award financial aid that exceeds cost of attendance—the costs actually incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at the institution (NCAA, 2015). However, starting in August of 2015, member schools can now award up to the full cost of attendance to its student-athletes. This free allocation of funds could help with Title IX financial aid distribution and compliance; however, history shows that non-compliance is the “norm.”

Providing proportional amounts of financial aid to its male and female student-athletes is an integral piece to schools’ Title IX compliance, as well as NCAA legislation. NCAA bylaws allow member institutions to autonomously provide and restrict either scholarships or grants-in-aid to student-athletes. According to the NCAA Division I Manual, “a student-athlete may receive scholarships or educational grants-in-aid administered by an educational institution that do not conflict with the governing legislation of this Association” (NCAA, 2015, p. 187). However, there is no NCAA bylaw that mandates schools to provide financial aid at a gender-proportional rate.

NCAA Scholarship Limits

To ensure fairness and an even playing field, the NCAA designates a maximum number of scholarships that member schools may award for each men’s and women’s sport (Sutter & Winkler, 2003). These scholarships are categorized into two categories—head-count and equivalency. In head-count sports, each student-athlete counts as one full scholarship if they receive any kind of financial aid (NCAA, 2015). Table 1 illustrates the current NCAA head-count sports and scholarship limits.

Table 1

<u>Current NCAA Head-Count Scholarship Limits Per Sport</u>	
<u>Head-Count Sports</u>	
<u>Men's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>
Basketball	13
Football	85
<u>Women's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>
Basketball	15
Gymnastics	12
Tennis	8
Volleyball	12

The remaining NCAA sports are equivalency sports, meaning they can divide the total amount of scholarships funding up to the stated limit amongst multiple student-athletes in these sports (NCAA, 2015). Table 2 illustrates the current NCAA equivalency sports and their scholarship limits.

Table 2

<u>Current NCAA Equivalency Scholarship Limits Per Sport</u>	
<u>Equivalency Sports</u>	
<u>Men's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>
Baseball	11.7
Cross Country/Track and Field	12.6
Fencing	4.5
Golf	4.5
Gymnastics	6.3
Ice Hockey	18
Lacrosse	12.6
Rifle	3.6
Skiing	6.3
Soccer	9.9
Swimming and Diving	9.9
Tennis	4.5
Volleyball	4.5

Water Polo	4.5
Wrestling	9.9

<u>Women's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>
Bowling	5
Cross Country/Track and Field	18
Equestrian	15
Fencing	5
Field Hockey	12
Golf	6
Ice Hockey	18
Lacrosse	12
Rowing	20
Rugby	12
Sand Volleyball	6
Skiing	7
Soccer	14
Softball	12
Swimming and Diving	14
Triathlon	3.5
Water Polo	8

The NCAA did not have rules to limit the number of scholarships provided until 1975 (Sutter & Winkler, 2003). In response to the increased participation of football student-athletes, the NCAA restricted football programs to allow only 95 scholarships to student-athletes (Gibson, 2012). These scholarship limits were created to prevent top programs from stockpiling talented players and create a more evenly competitive sport (Sutter & Winkler, 2003). Theoretically, players who were not likely to play in a top program would instead sign with a “weaker” program, which would ensure a more competitive and balanced playing field. Scholarship limits also reduced the costs associated with the sport, at least for the top programs that had been fully funding more than 95 scholarships (Sutter & Winkler, 2003). These limits were adjusted only once, and in 1992 the football scholarship limit was reduced to 85 (Sutter & Winkler, 2003).

Like many other NCAA rules, assumptions initially made in regard to football were adopted for other sports, and in 1975, the first scholarship limits were also imposed on all NCAA recognized sports (Gibson, 2012). However, college athletics has since exploded, and female participation has drastically increased, leading one to question if the original scholarship model is still supporting the current condition.

Current Studies

There have been countless studies on Title IX compliance within collegiate athletic associations. These studies have assessed the history and effects of Title IX on college athletics, examined the reality of proportionality, and formed alternative models to achieving gender equity (Elliott & Mason, 2001; Schwarz, 2014; Villalobos, 1990). Similarly, there have been numerous studies on the NCAA's scholarship limitations—most questioning if the model is in direct violation with the Sherman Act (Gibson, 2012; Greene, 2000; Powell, 2013). However, there have been minimal studies on scholarship reformation in focus with Title IX. Current themes and findings from these studies include the history of NCAA scholarship limits, amendments to the current NCAA scholarship model, and recommendations for achieving gender equity of NCAA member schools (Elliott & Mason, 2001; George, 1990; Schwarz, 2014).

The history of NCAA scholarships is still very vague. When the NCAA was founded in 1906, compensation and eligibility for student-athletes had little-to-no restrictions. Schools devised and carried out any compensatory means they preferred to help attract talented players (Gibson, 2012). It wasn't until 40 years later that the NCAA and leaders of its member institutions started to become concerned with the escalating costs of college football's recruiting tactics (Sutter & Winkler, 2003), and convened to draft the "Principles of Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics" and the "amateur ideal" of the student-athlete (Gibson, 2012). In 1956

the NCAA finally took full responsibility for standardizing the guidelines and distribution of grants-in-aid (Gibson, 2012). Another cost-cutting amendment came when member schools complained of student-athletes accepting four-year grants-in-aid, but not competing every year, so in 1973 the NCAA adopted one-year renewable grants (Gibson, 2012). The last notable scholarship restriction came in 1975 when the NCAA placed an enforced cap on the total amount of scholarships offered. Schools now could only offer and fulfill the mandated amount of scholarships in each sport, while some sports had specific restrictions to the number offered in a year (Sutter & Winkler, 2003). Sports later became classified as head-count or equivalency, and scholarship numbers were adjusted according to Title IX compliance and sport participation, yet the exact reasoning or timeline was still unclear.

Studies have questioned the current NCAA scholarship model, and have contemplated reformation with roster and scholarship limits with a specific focus on Football-- which is awarded 85 scholarships (Elliott & Mason, 2001; George, 1990; Schwarz, 2014; Sutter & Winkler, 2003). In order for schools to be compliant with Title IX financial aid regulations, schools must offer a proportionate amount of scholarships to female student-athletes. Since most equivalency sports are capped at low scholarship limits, even more women's sports are needed to fulfill the female financial aid proportion for football to award all 85 full scholarships. Adding more women's teams or increasing the scholarship limits for women's sports is one solution, but a costly one (George, 1999). Proposals that sought to cut down cost and gender disparity included decreasing the football scholarship limit from 85 to 75, while also setting a roster cap at 75 student-athletes (Elliot & Mason, 2001). Depending on the amount of full grant-in-aid for each school, athletic associations could save hundreds of thousands of dollars in scholarship monies alone, while the reduction in student-athletes from an average of 100 to 75 student-

athletes could save just as much—if not more—in operation costs (Elliott & Mason, 2001). For scholarship limits relating to parity, a study done by Daniel Sutter and Stephen Winkler (2003) found that football scholarship limits were not a direct determinant of parity amongst schools, and were more in place due to cost cutting purposes. One suggestion from their study indicated that the current limit of 85 scholarships is too high for scholarship limits to weaken strong programs, and should be decreased to actually create greater parity amongst schools (Sutter & Winkler, 2003).

The last and most predominant theme in these studies is the lack of NCAA oversight or a mandate of Title IX compliance for its member schools. Many studies referenced the NCAA's gender equity plan, but also noticed the lack of enforcement the NCAA has with Title IX compliance and its member schools (Elliott & Mason, 2001; George, 1999; Mota, 2006). One recommendation called for the NCAA to adopt specific guidelines that enforce and impose sanctions for Title IX compliance violations with its member schools (Elliott & Mason, 2001). Noting that the most powerful sanction that the NCAA can impose is to not allow a school to compete, Elliott and Mason (2001) believe that schools may continue to lag behind in achieving the goal of Title IX until they are compelled to do so by the NCAA.

Since there is a lack of knowledge and understanding of current NCAA scholarships limits and the actual affect that the current model has on Title IX compliance of member schools, this study seeks to find and examine the missing pieces. Sue Ann Mota (2006) states, “while it is beyond the scope of this article, the NCAA and other researchers should study the effect of the existing scholarship limits, gender equity, and compliance with Title IX to see if the limits could be adjusted to help member institutions” (Mota, 2006, p. 135,). This is exactly what this study looks to find.

Theoretical Framework

This research utilizes a critical pragmatic examination of Title IX's financial aid equity. The interest in pragmatism as a theoretical framework is largely in response to a lack in legal theory (Brake, 2007). Led by Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, John Dewey, and Oliver Wendell Holmes, pragmatism developed in the late 19th century as an American philosophical movement. An alternative to foundational theory, pragmatism has a shared critique of normative, reasonable philosophy with an emphasis on the practical, experiential consequences of a concept (Brake, 2007). This study looks to research the historical reasoning for scholarship limits, while examining the practicalities of Title IX compliance in relation to the way student-athletes experience the current NCAA scholarship model.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study has two distinct purposes. First, it historically examines why the NCAA chose to categorize certain sports as head-count or equivalency, and how NCAA scholarship limits were initially decided. Second, the study determines whether there is a more efficient, fair, and equitable model of allocating scholarship limits to help schools better comply with the scholarship allocation elements of Title IX. A compilation and analysis of primary and secondary sources will be used to gather the necessary data.

Data Collection

To answer research questions 1 and 2, historical research was conducted by examining the NCAA manual and NCAA archives for rules proposals, intent, and justification on the development of current NCAA scholarship limits and implementation of the NCAA rules on head-count and equivalency scholarship sports. Sources included NCAA Annual Convention Proceedings that addressed scholarship limits and implementation.

To answer research questions 3 and 4, data was collected using the EADA Cutting Tool and NCAA manual to analyze current Title IX compliance with the current NCAA scholarship limits in place. Using the most current data, the EADA Cutting tool provided the number of participation opportunities, number of sports offered per school, number of participants per sports, and total amount of athletic financial aid for all Power 5 Conference schools. The NCAA Manual provided data on the current number of scholarships allowed per sport and whether the sport is a head-count or equivalency sport.

Data Analysis

In developing new models for NCAA scholarship limitations and allocations, the data collected from the EADA Cutting Tool and current NCAA legislation was examined from an equity perspective through a critical pragmatic lens. The fairness of head-count vs. equivalency designations will be examined by comparing average roster size, NCAA travel squad size, and starting lineup size and amount of financial aid awarded relative to equity in the student-athlete experience. Scholarship allocations by sport will also be compared to the football to scholarship ratio; a reallocation of scholarships based on their average roster size, NCAA travel squad size, and starting lineup size; and a contact sport consideration to statistically determine what inequities (if any) are present in the current limits. New scholarship models will be created that are statistically equitable as well as qualitatively equitable relative to the student-athlete experience.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Research Question 1

Why are NCAA sports classified as Head-Count or Equivalency?

The intent of this question was to gain understanding about why certain sports were classified as head-count or equivalency, and how the classifications were initially created. Using the Proceedings from the NCAA Conventions years 1970 to 2013, there are two distinct financial aid proposals that help answer these questions—Proposal No. 45 and No. 46.

When the first scholarship limits were imposed in 1973, Proposal No. 42 approved the establishment of limitations on the number of athletically related financial aid awards and athletically recruited participants in NCAA recognized sports (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1973). Each NCAA sport now had an annual scholarship limit that consisted of “maximum initial awards per year” and “maximum additional awards in effect the same year.”

That same year, legislation was passed that would allow teams to have as many student-athletes on financial aid given that the aggregated dollar amount of the recipients receiving financial aid did not exceed the aggregated dollar amount for both maximum initial awards and maximum additional awards (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1973, p. 129). However, football and basketball could only offer financial aid to a certain number of freshmen student-athletes; that number was defined by the number of maximum initial awards per year. For example, football was allowed 30 initial awards per year; therefore a team could have at most 30 freshmen student-athletes on scholarship. Having a maximum number of initial awards per year

safeguarded schools from bringing in a large number of freshmen and having a try-out once on campus. This issue—known as “runoff”—was prevalent and unruly in the sport of football and basketball at that time (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1973).

As the initial scholarship limit and counter debate ensued, Wade Stinson from the University of Kansas proposed to divide the two types of sports when he recommended, “to vote on football and basketball as one package and the other remaining sports as another package” (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1973, p. 126). That motion was approved, and unintentional or not, football and basketball would now be considered similar sports—separate from the rest—and two sport classifications started to form.

In 1974, Proposal No. 45 and 46 would simplify the counting procedure for basketball and football, respectively, by eliminating the equivalency-factor for their maximum initial awards (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1974). By placing both the initial and additional awards counting procedures on the same basis for football and basketball, this proposal provided overall head-count totals for the two sports, and thus the “head-count” term was created for this classification. Likewise, “equivalency” became the term established for the other sports (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1974).

In 1982, Proposal No. 75 was approved and the NCAA recognized and established financial aid limitations for women’s sports. Four were added to head-count classification that year—women’s basketball, gymnastics, tennis, and volleyball. Groupings of each sport in a head-count or equivalency classification were based on several factors, including “the need of a sport for team limit by position or event, the particular popularity of the sport in terms of visibility and the consequences of stockpiling” (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1982, p. 108). Head-count sports gained a standard definition that would separate them from equivalencies.

Sports that had a limited number of participant opportunities due to positions or events could be easily monitored with counter restrictions, while popular sports would be limited to a number of student-athletes on scholarships to help reduce top programs from hoarding student-athletes. Women’s golf was originally included in the head-count classification, but the Women’s Golf Committee recommended it be included as an equivalency since it would have operated with two less scholarships than recipients at the head-count classification (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1982).

Research Question 2

How were the initial and current NCAA scholarship limits decided for each sport?

Prior to 1973, NCAA legislation did not impose a limit on the number of financial aid awards a member institution could offer (NCAA Special Convention Proceedings, 1975). Proposal No. 41 from the 1973 NCAA Convention Proceedings created initial scholarship limits for all NCAA recognized sports. At the time, the NCAA only sponsored men’s sports. These basic scholarship limits came from a special committee comprised of college coaches and administrators—The Committee on Offers of Financial Aid and Costs—which was created to help reduce the spending of college athletics at the time (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1973). In that same year, Proposal No. 42 amended the initial table and created the first scholarship limits for NCAA recognized sports that would take effect in the 1975-76 year. Table 1 illustrates the maximum number of awards allowed by Proposal No. 41.

Table 3

Maximum Awards Table— Division I

<u>Sport</u>	<u>Maximum Initial Awards Per Year</u>	<u>Maximum Additional Awards in Effect the Same Year</u>	<u>Total Number of Awards Per Year</u>
--------------	--	--	--

Baseball	6	13	19
Basketball	6	12	18
Cross Country/Track	7	16	23
Fencing	3	5	8
Football	30	75	105
Golf	3	5	8
Gymnastics	4	8	12
Ice Hockey	7	16	23
Lacrosse	7	16	23
Skiing	4	8	12
Soccer	6	13	19
Swimming	6	13	19
Tennis	3	5	8
Volleyball	3	5	8
Water Polo	3	5	8
Wrestling	6	13	19
Total	104	229	333

In 1974, Proposal No. 43 approved the elimination of the maximum initial awards limitations for equivalency sports, and applied an overall limit on the number of awards that would be in effect at any one time for those sports (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1974). Since “runoff” was not a major practice or concern for these sports, cost reduction and ease of grant-in-aid quotas were the main reasons for the elimination of the initial awards limitations for sports other than football and basketball (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1974).

In the 1975 Special Convention, proposals were passed that created a major reduction in the number of financial aid awards for each sport. These new limits would take place in the 1977-78 year. Football and basketball’s limits were reduced to 95 and 15, respectively. At the time, the NCAA council felt that large football programs only needed 65 to 75 scholarships—not 105. This reduction would decrease financial aid costs, keep programs from stockpiling players, and create more accountability for coaches in retaining student-athletes (NCAA Special Convention Proceedings, 1975).

Equivalency sports had a much higher reduction (approximately 40%) in financial aid limitations that year. Proposal No. 78 called for the number of awards in equivalency sports to be reduced at the same percentages (approximately 10%) as the reduction in football and men's basketball. Daniel Miller from Indiana University argued "a percentage reduction in all sports, rather than heavy cuts only in the non-revenue sports, as No. 9 originally calls for, will maintain the breadth of the program required to convince these various contingencies that intercollegiate athletics is a proper part of an educational institution instead of a professional franchise" (NCAA Special Convention, 1975, p. 47). Proposal No. 78 was defeated, and equivalency sports were reduced by approximately 40%.

There were numerous proposals to increase and adjust the limits after the 1975 model change. In 1976, proposals tried to increase the gymnastics, swimming, and tennis awards, but all were defeated. In regard to the recent reductions, Bob McKinley from Trinity University stated, "we felt, however, that the cut back was made on a percentage basis without any regard to the individual sports and what it takes to hold each sport" (NCAA Special Convention and Annual Convention Proceedings, 1976, p. 154). For Proposal No. 117, which would have increased the gymnastic awards from seven to ten, Marcus Plant from the University of Michigan commented, "they require 12 people in their competitions and wrestling only has 10 weights. The wrestling maximum was set at 10. These coaches feel that they are handicapped" (NCAA Special Convention and Annual Convention Proceedings, 1976, p. 153). That year, basketball was the only sport that had an adjustment—the initial awards were eliminated, but still retained their 15 awards (NCAA Special Convention and Annual Convention Proceedings, 1976). The last major pushes for increasing equivalency scholarship limits were in 1977 and 1978—all proposals were defeated (NCAA Convention, 1977; NCAA Convention, 1978).

The scholarship model did not have any major changes again until 1982 when the NCAA recognized women's sports. The Special Committee on Legislative Review considered several combinations of scholarship numbers for these sports, and decided the initial limits based on four main rationales—"size of the prospective student-athlete pool, the inherent risk of injury in the sport, the competitive squad size, and/or the particular team scoring method" (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1982, p. 108). Some women's sports had higher financial aid limits than their comparable men's sports. This was intentional and mainly due to the financial impact and ability for member institutions to meet Title IX proportionality requirements (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1982). With football limited to 95 scholarships, the council wanted to give the member schools enough flexibility to arrive at their total women's program quota (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1982). The model had very little changes for the rest of the decade other than in 1987 and 1988 when both men's and women's basketball changed their awards count to 13 and then 15, respectively (NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1987; NCAA Convention Proceedings, 1988).

In 1991, Proposal No. 40 was adopted, and the number of permissible grant-in-aids for equivalency sports would reduce by 10% in 1993, while football would gradually reduce to 85 in a three-year period and basketball would reduce to 13 in a two-year period (NCAA Convention Proceedings 1989-2013, 2013). In 1992, Proposal No. 62 passed in delaying the women's sport reductions to 1994, however, 1993's Proposal No. 27 reinstated the scholarship limits back to the original limits for the 1994-95 year (NCAA Convention Proceedings 1989-2013, 2013). Women's sports scholarship limits were adjusted only two more times when the NCAA adopted 1994's Proposal No. 12, which established maximum financial aid limits in emerging sports, and in 1996 with Proposal No. 54, which increased the total number of counters in women's gymnastics

and the number of equivalencies in women's field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball, and track and field. Consequentially, women's badminton, squash and team handball equivalencies decreased (NCAA Convention Proceedings 1989-2013, 2013). Other than women's soccer increasing their equivalency number to 14 in 2006, and the addition of women's equestrian, rugby, sand volleyball, and triathlon in 2002, 2005, 2011, and 2014 respectively, the NCAA scholarship model has stayed constant since 1996. For men's sports, they have not seen any changes since 1992. See Appendix A for scholarship numbers for each sport throughout the years.

Research Question 3

How does the current NCAA scholarship model hinder schools from complying with Title IX financial aid regulations?

Currently for Division I, there is a maximum of 221.3 male scholarships and 234.5 female scholarships distributed throughout all NCAA recognized sports (NCAA, 2015). It is important to note that no institution offers every NCAA recognized sport. Additionally, men's head-count sports outweigh women's head-count sports 98 to 47 scholarships (NCAA, 2015). This means 85 (72%) out of approximately 118 football players and 13 (81.2%) out of 16 men's basketball players receive full athletic scholarships, while 15 (68.1%) out of approximately 22 women's basketball players, 12 (63.1%) out of 19 gymnasts, 8 (80%) out of 10 tennis players, and 12 (70.6%) out of 17 volleyball players receive full athletic scholarships (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). On the other hand women's equivalency sports outweigh men's equivalency sports 187.5 to 123.3, meaning that a significantly higher proportion of female student-athletes have only partial scholarships compared to male student-athletes. However, when examining all scholarships allowed for all NCAA recognized sports, the percentage breakdown comes to 48.60% male scholarships and 51.40% female scholarships.

Given the most recent EADA data, the 2014 breakdown for Power 5 schools undergraduate student body is 700,345 (50.10%) male undergraduates and 697,458 (49.90%) female undergraduates. Based on the proportionality prong of the Three-Part “Effective Accommodation Test,” the current NCAA scholarship model would be out of Title IX compliance with a disparity of 1.50% toward male students (assuming that all schools offer all sports at maximum scholarship levels). On its face, the current model has very little disparity in regards to Title IX compliance for participation opportunities relative to the current Power 5 student body, but no Power 5 institution offers all NCAA recognized sports.

Referring to the EADA data, the 2014 breakdown for Power 5 schools athletic participation comes to 20,124 (54.22%) male student-athletes and 16,994 (45.78%) female student-athletes (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). Once again, referring to the first-prong of the Three-Part “Effective Accommodation Test,” Power 5 schools are out of compliance in regards to female participation with a 4.12% disparity (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). However, assuming Power 5 schools awarded the maximum number of scholarships for each of their sports available, on average, they would be in compliance in regards to Title IX financial aid requirements since they would offer 9,744.2 (55.08%) male scholarships and 7,948.0 (44.92%) female scholarships. However, if schools were to increase their female student-athlete population to become compliant in regards to participation, then schools would be at a 4.92% disparity against females in regards to financial aid.

However, the aggregate Power 5 computation does not provide an accurate picture of current Title IX compliance, as Title IX is measured by comparing the men’s program as a whole to the women’s program as a whole at each individual institution. Assuming each scholarship is valued at the same amount, overall, 21 (32.31%) Power 5 schools would be out of compliance

with more than a 1.0% disparity towards males, while 29 (44.62%) Power 5 schools would have more than a 1.0% disparity towards females. Therefore only 15 (23.08%) Power 5 schools could fully fund all of their varsity programs and still be in compliance with Title IX, while the other 50 schools would not be able to provide scholarships at maximum award levels for each of the sports that institution offers. Therefore, potentially creating a competitive disadvantage, in order to comply with Title IX. A scholarship distribution and athletic participation breakdown of each individual Power 5 institution is provided in Appendix B.

If schools were to increase their female student-athlete population in order to become Title IX compliant with participation, the current scholarship model would only allow two (3.07%) schools to comply in regards to financial aid if all programs were fully funded. Five (7.69%) Power 5 schools would have at least a 1.0% disparity against males, while 58 (89.23%) Power 5 schools would have at least a 1.0% disparity against females. Schools would have to add more female sport programs to comply, or the scholarship limits must adjust.

Research Question 4

Are there alternatives to the current scholarship model that facilitate an equitable division of scholarship allocation?

A total of three scholarship models were created to help facilitate an equitable division of scholarship allocation. These models are based on the average roster size of each sport, NCAA travel squad size, and the starting line-up size for each sport. These models were chosen because they pragmatically represent the needs and recommendations of the coaches and teams, the NCAA, and the sport itself.

Within each model, three additional variants were created—football scholarship comparison, reallocation of current NCAA scholarships, and a contact sport consideration.

Considering a pragmatic lens, these variants were created to compare the ratio of football’s scholarships to other sports, reallocate scholarships in an equitable manner amongst all sports, and to consider the different scholarship needs of contact and noncontact sports. A description of each model can be found in Table 4.

Table 4

Description of Alternative Scholarship Models

Models

Based on Average Roster Size

Definition

M1V1	A scholarship allocation model based on average roster size. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on football’s ratio (.72) of numeric scholarship limit (85) to its average roster size (118.4).
M1V2	A scholarship allocation model based on average roster size. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on the ratio (.40) of total number men’s and women’s scholarships (440.3) to the total average roster sizes for men’s and women’s sports (1166.1).
M1V3	A scholarship allocation model based on average roster size. Scholarship allocations for contact sports would be assigned based on the ratio (.65) of total number of contact scholarships (158.9) to the total number of contact student athletes (242.4). Scholarship allocations for noncontact sports would be assigned based on the ratio (.31) of total number of noncontact scholarships (281.4) to the total number of noncontact student-athletes (921.9).

Based on NCAA Travel Squad Size

Definition

M2V1	A scholarship allocation model based on NCAA travel squad size. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on football’s ratio (1.42) of numeric scholarship limit (85) to its average roster size (60).
M2V2	A scholarship allocation model based on NCAA travel squad size. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on the ratio (.66) of total number men’s and women’s scholarships (380.3) to the total average roster sizes for men’s and women’s sports (578).

M2V3 A scholarship allocation model based on average roster size. Scholarship allocations for contact sports would be assigned based on the ratio (1.06) of total number of contact scholarships (149) to the total number of contact student athletes (141). Scholarship allocations for noncontact sports would be assigned based on the ratio (.53) of total number of noncontact scholarships (231.1) to the total number of noncontact student-athletes (437).

Based on Starting Lineup Size

Definition

M3V1 A scholarship allocation model based on starting lineup size. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on football's ratio (3.54) of numeric scholarship limit (85) to its starting lineup size (24).

M3V2 A scholarship allocation model based on starting lineup size. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on the ratio (.97) of total number men's and women's scholarships (452.3) to the total average roster sizes for men's and women's sports (466).

M3V3 A scholarship allocation model based on starting lineup size. Scholarship allocations for contact sports would be assigned based on the ratio (2.41) of total number of contact scholarships (170.9) to the total number of contact student athletes (71). Scholarship allocations for noncontact sports would be assigned based on the ratio (.71) of total number of noncontact scholarships (281.4) to the total number of noncontact student-athletes (395).

All division I sports with scholarship caps listed in the 2014-15 NCAA manual were used in the model calculations. Sports that are indicated with an "N/A" either did not have an average roster size, NCAA travel squad size limit, or starting line up size and were not included in the specific calculations.

For Variant 3, the 1975 Title IX Regulations defined contact sports as football, men's and women's basketball, men's and women's ice hockey, rugby, and wrestling. These sports are designated with an "*" in the tables, and were used in the contact sport ratio calculation unless

they indicated an “N/A” in their average roster size, NCAA travel squad size, or starting line up size. All other sports are considered noncontact sports.

Assuming each school would fully fund all programs, each model was compared to the current student body and athletic participation in the Power 5 schools to see if the new model was more compliant with Title IX than the current. Specifically, each model’s financial aid break down is compared to the current climate of athletic participation and the Title IX compliant athletic participation—the current student undergraduate body.

Model 1: NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on Average Roster Size

For the first model, 2014 EADA data was used to find the average number of participants per sport amongst the Power 5 schools. All sports were included in these calculations other than Rugby and Triathlon since there was no EADA data included for these sports.

For Variant 1, the football scholarship ratio is .72. This number is calculated by dividing the total number of football scholarships (85) by the football average roster size (118.4). This ratio is multiplied to each sport’s average roster size to calculate the scholarships needed for Variant 1. Under this model, 11 (16.92%) Power 5 schools would be Title IX compliant with the current climate—43 (66.16%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 11 (16.92%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. If schools would adjust their participation rates to be Title IX compliant with the current student body, then 11 (16.92%) schools would be compliant—13 (20.00%) would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 41 (63.08%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females.

For Variant 2, the reallocated scholarship ratio is .40. This number is calculated by dividing the total number of current NCAA scholarships (440.3) by the total number of student-athletes (1166.1). This ratio is multiplied to each sport’s average roster size to calculate the

scholarships needed for Variant 2 in the first model. Under this model, 7 (10.77%) Power 5 schools would be Title IX compliant with the current climate—47 (72.31%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 11 (16.92%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. If schools would adjust their participation rates to be Title IX compliant with the current student body, then 12 (18.46%) schools would be compliant—14 (21.54%) would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 39 (60.00%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females.

For Variant 3, the contact sport ratio is .65 and the noncontact sport ratio is .31. The contact sport ratio is calculated by dividing the total number of contact sport scholarships (158.9) by the total number of contact sport student-athletes (243.5). This ratio of .65 is multiplied to each contact sport’s average roster size to calculate the scholarships needed for contact sports in Variant 3 of the first model. The noncontact sport ratio is calculated by dividing the total number of noncontact sport scholarships (281.4) by the total number of noncontact sport student-athletes (922.0). This ratio of .31 is multiplied to each noncontact sport’s average roster size to calculate the scholarships needed for noncontact sports in Variant 3 of the first model. Under this model, 4 (6.15%) Power 5 schools would be Title IX compliant with the current climate—5 (7.69%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 56 (86.15%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. If schools would adjust their participation rates to be Title IX compliant with the current student body, then 3 (4.62%) schools would be compliant—0 (0.00%) would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 62 (95.38%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. Table 5 provides the results of the new scholarships limitations model based on a pragmatic sport-related criteria of average roster size.

Table 5

New NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on Average Roster Size

Head-Count Sports

<u>Men's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Avg Roster</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Basketball*	13	15.7	11.3	5.9	10.2
Football*	85	118.4	85	44.7	77.3

<u>Women's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Avg Roster</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Basketball*	15	21.7	15.6	8.2	14.2
Gymnastics	12	18.6	13.4	7.0	5.7
Tennis	8	9.9	7.1	3.7	3.0
Volleyball	12	17.2	12.3	6.5	5.2

Equivalency Sports

<u>Men's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Avg Roster</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Baseball	11.7	36.4	26.1	13.7	11.1
Cross Country/Track & Field	12.6	108.3	77.7	40.9	33.0
Fencing	4.5	23.3	16.7	8.8	7.1
Golf	4.5	10.5	7.5	4.0	3.2
Gymnastics	6.3	20.2	14.5	7.6	6.2
Ice Hockey*	18	26.9	19.3	10.2	17.6
Lacrosse	12.6	47.8	34.3	18.0	14.6
Rifle	3.6	8.3	6.0	3.1	2.5
Skiing	6.3	11	7.9	4.2	3.4
Soccer	9.9	29.5	21.2	11.1	9.0
Swimming and Diving	9.9	33.3	23.9	12.6	10.2
Tennis	4.5	10.8	7.8	4.1	3.3
Volleyball	4.5	19.2	13.8	7.2	5.9
Water Polo	4.5	30.5	21.9	11.5	9.3
Wrestling*	9.9	35.6	25.6	13.4	23.2

<u>Women's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Avg Roster</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Bowling	5	12	8.6	4.5	3.7
Cross Country/Track & Field	18	118.4	85.0	44.7	36.1
Equestrian	15	50	35.9	18.9	15.3
Fencing	5	21.3	15.3	8.0	6.5
Field Hockey	12	23.6	16.9	8.9	7.2
Golf	6	8.9	6.4	3.4	2.7
Ice Hockey*	18	25.2	18.1	9.5	16.4
Lacrosse	12	34.3	24.6	13.0	10.5

Rowing	20	80.8	58.0	30.5	24.6
Rugby*	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sand Volleyball	6	18.3	13.1	6.9	5.6
Skiing	7	11.7	8.4	4.4	3.6
Soccer	14	29.9	21.5	11.3	9.1
Softball	12	21.6	15.5	8.2	6.6
Swimming and Diving	14	31.4	22.5	11.9	9.6
Triathlon	3.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Water Polo	8	25.6	18.4	9.7	7.8

Notes. Calculations do not include any sport with an "N/A" indication for Avg Roster. Sports with asterisks (*) are considered contact sports.

Model 2: NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on NCAA Travel Squad Size

For the second model, NCAA travel squad sizes were used as the pragmatic variable to calculate new scholarship limits. Men's and women's cross country/track and field, men's fencing, men's wrestling, equestrian, rugby, and triathlon were not included in these calculations since the NCAA does not have a regulated travel squad size for these sports.

For Variant 1, the football scholarship ratio is 1.42. This number is calculated by dividing the total number of football scholarships (85) by the football travel squad size (60). This ratio is multiplied to each sport's NCAA travel squad size to calculate the scholarships needed for Variant 1 in the second model. Under this model, 7 (10.77%) Power 5 schools would be Title IX compliant with the current climate—46 (70.77%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 12 (18.46%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. If schools would adjust their participation rates to be Title IX compliant with the current student body, then 6 (9.23%) schools would be compliant—24 (36.92%) would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 35 (53.85%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females.

For Variant 2, the reallocated scholarship ratio is .66. This number is calculated by dividing the total number of current NCAA scholarships (380.3) by the total number of student-

athletes (578). This ratio is multiplied to each sport's NCAA travel squad size to calculate the scholarships needed for Variant 2 in the second model. Under this model, 8 (12.31%) Power 5 schools would be Title IX compliant with the current climate—45 (69.23%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 12 (18.46%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. If schools would adjust their participation rates to be Title IX compliant with the current student body, then 7 (10.77%) schools would be compliant—22 (33.85%) would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 36 (55.38%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females.

For Variant 3, the contact sport ratio is 1.06 and the noncontact sport ratio is .53. The contact sport ratio is calculated by dividing the total number of contact sport scholarships (149.0) by the total number of contact sport student-athletes (141). This ratio of 1.06 is multiplied to each contact sport's NCAA travel squad size to calculate the scholarships needed for contact sports in Variant 3 of the second model. The noncontact sport ratio is calculated by dividing the total number of noncontact sport scholarships (231.3) by the total number of noncontact sport student-athletes (437). This ratio of .53 is multiplied to each noncontact sport's NCAA travel squad size to calculate the scholarships needed for noncontact sports in Variant 3 of the second model. Under this model, 9 (13.85%) Power 5 schools would be Title IX compliant with the current climate—8 (12.31%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 49 (75.38%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. If schools would adjust their participation rates to be Title IX compliant with the current student body, then 1 (1.54%) school would be compliant—3 (4.62%) would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 61 (93.85%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. Table 6 provides the results of the new scholarships limitations model based on a pragmatic sport-related criteria of current NCAA travel squad size limitations.

Table 6*New NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on NCAA Travel Squad Size*

<u>Head-Count Sports</u>					
<u>Men's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Travel Size</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Basketball*	13	15	21.3	9.9	15.9
Football*	85	60	85	39.5	63.4
<u>Women's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Travel Size</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Basketball*	15	15	21.3	9.9	15.9
Gymnastics	12	15	21.3	9.9	7.9
Tennis	8	8	11.3	5.3	4.2
Volleyball	12	15	21.3	9.9	7.9
<u>Equivalency Sports</u>					
<u>Men's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Travel Size</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Baseball	11.7	27	38.3	17.8	14.3
Cross Country/Track and Field	12.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fencing	4.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Golf	4.5	5	7.1	3.3	2.6
Gymnastics	6.3	12	17.0	7.9	6.4
Ice Hockey*	18	27	38.3	17.8	28.5
Lacrosse	12.6	40	56.7	26.3	21.2
Rifle	3.6	5	7.1	3.3	2.6
Skiing	6.3	12	17.0	7.9	6.4
Soccer	9.9	21	29.8	13.8	11.1
Swimming and Diving	9.9	19	26.9	12.5	10.1
Tennis	4.5	8	11.3	5.3	4.2
Volleyball	4.5	15	21.3	9.9	7.9
Water Polo	4.5	16	22.7	10.5	8.5
Wrestling*	9.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<u>Women's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Travel Size</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Bowling	5	10	14.2	6.6	5.3
Cross Country/Track and Field	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Equestrian	15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fencing	5	12	17.0	7.9	6.4

Field Hockey	12	24	34.0	15.8	12.7
Golf	6	5	7.1	3.3	2.6
Ice Hockey*	18	24	34.0	15.8	25.4
Lacrosse	12	38	53.8	25.0	20.1
Rowing	20	25	35.4	16.4	13.2
Rugby*	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sand Volleyball	6	12	17.0	7.9	6.4
Skiing	7	12	17.0	7.9	6.4
Soccer	14	22	31.2	14.5	11.6
Softball	12	20	28.3	13.2	10.6
Swimming and Diving	14	19	26.9	12.5	10.1
Triathlon	3.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Water Polo	8	20	28.3	13.2	10.6

Notes. Calculations do not include any sport with an "N/A" indication for Travel Size. Sports with asterisks (*) are considered contact sports.

Model 3: NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on Starting Line Up Size

For the third model, NCAA sport manuals were used to find the minimum starting line up size for each team sport, while NCAA championship formats were used to find the individual sports line up size. All sports were included in these calculations other than Triathlon since there is no NCAA championship format set.

For Variant 1, the football scholarship ratio is 3.54. This number is calculated by dividing the total number of football scholarships (85) by the football starting line up size (24). This ratio is multiplied to each sport's starting line up size to calculate the scholarships needed for Variant 1 in the third model. Under this model, 3 (4.62%) Power 5 schools would be Title IX compliant with the current climate—62 (95.38%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 0 (0.00%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. If schools would adjust their participation rates to be Title IX compliant with the current student body, then 4 (6.15%) schools would be compliant—53 (81.54%) would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 8 (12.31%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females.

For Variant 2, the reallocated scholarship ratio is .97. This number is calculated by dividing the total number of current NCAA scholarships (452.3) by the total number of student-athletes (466). This ratio is multiplied to each sport's starting line up size to calculate the scholarships needed for Variant 2 in the second model. Under this model, 2 (3.08%) Power 5 schools would be Title IX compliant with the current climate—63 (96.92%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 0 (0.00%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. If schools would adjust their participation rates to be Title IX compliant with the current student body, then 4 (6.15%) schools would be compliant—54 (83.08%) would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 7 (10.77%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females.

For Variant 3, the contact sport ratio is 2.41 and the noncontact sport ratio is .71. The contact sport ratio is calculated by dividing the total number of contact sport scholarships (170.9) by the total number of contact sport student-athletes (71). This ratio of 2.41 is multiplied to each contact sport's starting line up size to calculate the scholarships needed for contact sports in Variant 3 of the third model. The noncontact sport ratio is calculated by dividing the total number of noncontact sport scholarships (281.4) by the total number of noncontact sport student-athletes (395). This ratio of .71 is multiplied to each noncontact sport's starting line up size to calculate the scholarships needed for noncontact sports in Variant 3 of the third model. Under this model, 10 (15.38%) Power 5 schools would be Title IX compliant with the current climate—11 (16.92%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 44 (67.69%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. If schools would adjust their participation rates to be Title IX compliant with the current student body, then 2 (3.08%) schools would be compliant—3 (4.62%) would have a 1.0% disparity against males, while 60 (92.31%) schools would have a 1.0% disparity against females. Table 7 provides the results of the new

scholarships limitations model based on a pragmatic sport-related criteria of participants needed to produce a minimum starting lineup.

Table 7

New NCAA Scholarship Limits Based on Starting Line Up Size

<u>Head-Count Sports</u>					
<u>Men's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Lineup</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Basketball*	13	5	17.7	4.9	12
Football*	85	24	85	23.3	57.8
<u>Women's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Lineup</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Basketball*	15	5	17.7	4.9	12
Gymnastics	12	15	53.1	14.6	10.7
Tennis	8	12	42.5	11.6	8.5
Volleyball	12	6	21.3	5.8	4.3
<u>Equivalency Sports</u>					
<u>Men's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Lineup</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>
Baseball	11.7	10	35.4	9.7	7.1
Cross Country/Track and Field	12.6	54	191.3	52.4	38.5
Fencing	4.5	9	31.9	8.7	6.4
Golf	4.5	5	17.7	4.9	3.6
Gymnastics	6.3	15	53.1	14.6	10.7
Ice Hockey*	18	6	21.3	5.8	14.4
Lacrosse	12.6	10	35.4	9.7	7.1
Rifle	3.6	5	17.7	4.9	3.6
Skiing	6.3	6	21.3	5.8	4.3
Soccer	9.9	11	39.0	10.7	7.8
Swimming and Diving	9.9	18	63.8	17.5	12.8
Tennis	4.5	12	42.5	11.6	8.5
Volleyball	4.5	6	21.3	5.8	4.3
Water Polo	4.5	7	24.8	6.8	5
Wrestling*	9.9	10	35.4	9.7	24.1
<u>Women's Sports</u>	<u>Current Limit</u>	<u>Lineup</u>	<u>Variant 1</u>	<u>Variant 2</u>	<u>Variant 3</u>

Bowling	5	5	17.7	4.9	3.6
Cross Country/Track and Field	18	51	180.6	49.5	36.3
Equestrian	15	16	56.7	15.5	11.4
Fencing	5	9	31.9	8.7	6.4
Field Hockey	12	11	39.0	10.7	7.8
Golf	6	5	17.7	4.9	3.6
Ice Hockey*	18	6	21.3	5.8	14.4
Lacrosse	12	12	42.5	11.6	8.5
Rowing	20	23	81.5	22.3	16.4
Rugby*	12	15	53.1	14.6	36.1
Sand Volleyball	6	10	35.4	9.7	7.1
Skiing	7	6	21.3	5.8	4.3
Soccer	14	11	39.0	10.7	7.8
Softball	12	10	35.4	9.7	7.1
Swimming and Diving	14	18	63.8	17.5	12.8
Triathlon	3.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Water Polo	8	7	24.8	6.8	5

Notes. Calculations do not include any sport with an "N/A" indication for Travel Size. Sports with asterisks (*) are considered contact sports.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary

Previously, there was no research that clarified or outlined the initial criteria utilized to classify sports as head-count or equivalency. Some have speculated that head-count sports were defined by revenue generation, while others thought there were no criteria at all (Sutter & Winkler, 2003). However, this study identified that there were certain rationales for those classifications. Likewise, current scholarship limits have had many criticisms about the inequity between head-count and equivalency sports, with many concerned with the minimal amount of scholarships allocated to men's equivalency sports (George, 1999; Elliott & Mason, 2001). Title IX has taken the brunt of the blame. This study outlined that most scholarship limits were actually adjusted to offset the large number of football scholarships and for overall cost reduction of financial aid.

With this history in mind, it's no wonder the current NCAA scholarship model isn't allowing Power 5 schools to be Title IX compliant in regards to financial aid. With schools handcuffed to awarding 85 football scholarships, only 16 Power 5 schools are currently in Title IX compliance in regards to financial aid (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). Even if schools could fully fund all their sport programs, only 11 schools would be in Title IX compliance. With this data, new models were created and Title IX compliance was compared to the current model.

Research Question 1

Why are sports classified as Head-Count or Equivalency?

Head-count sports are characterized by the popularity and the needs of the sport. In the 1970's college athletics was experiencing major issues of stockpiling and runoff (NCAA Convention, 1973). Big programs were able to bring in large numbers of freshmen on scholarship each year, and then hold a tryout once the student-athletes arrived on campus—most would stay on the team, while some would be cut. Since most of the talent went to big name schools on scholarship, this created a huge disadvantage for smaller teams and an overall divide in the level playing field (NCAA Convention, 1973.). To combat these inequities, the NCAA put restrictions on football and men's basketball's maximum initial awards—the two sports where these were major issues when the initial scholarship limits were imposed in 1973 (NCAA Convention, 1973). Schools could then only offer financial aid to a specific number of freshmen each year for football and basketball, while other sports could split up their scholarships amongst multiple student-athletes.

Football and basketball went completely to head-count sports in 1974 when the NCAA representatives wanted to simplify the counting process (NCAA Convention, 1974). At that point, the maximum additional awards per year could still be split amongst multiple student-athletes for football and basketball. NCAA legislation was passed to then include that all scholarships—initial and additional—be given at a 1 to 1 ratio, and any recipient on financial aid became a “counter.” When women's sports were added in 1982, the NCAA classified women's basketball, gymnastics, tennis, and volleyball as head-count sports given the limited number of events or positions per sport, and the overall popularity and possibility of stockpiling student-athletes (NCAA Convention, 1982).

With these classifications for head-count sports identified, it leads to question if any other sports in today's college athletics should or could be limited to head-count. Other than football and track and field, men's lacrosse has the most players per roster for men's sports and averages 14 more players per team than women's lacrosse (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). Women's lacrosse is offered at 21 Power 5 schools, but only 10 Power 5 schools carry a men's lacrosse team (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). The low number of programs offered at the Power 5 level could be a cause of stockpiling. If men's lacrosse were to go to head-count and limit their number of players on scholarship that could possibly spread out the talent to other schools if they were to create men's lacrosse programs. Baseball is another sport that could be considered for head-count classification. Due to its limit of 27 counters split amongst 11.7 scholarships, the popularity of the sport and need for counters could make baseball an eligible head-count sport as well. However, football and men's basketball have been nearly coupled as a package in every proposal since 1973, so it could be unlikely that another men's sport be added to head-count given the history and excessive number of men's head-count scholarships already.

To help even out the number of men's and women's head-count scholarships, there are several women's sports that could be limited to head-count as well. Given their popularity, women's golf, women's soccer, and women's track and field are offered at 60, 63, and all 65 Power 5 schools, respectively (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). Adding these three women's sports would add 38 female head-count scholarships to the current model, and would help offset the 98 male scholarships to a new total of 85 female scholarships. Along with women's track and field, equestrian, women's fencing, and women's swimming and diving could also be considered as a head-count sport due to the limited number of events for competition. The most popular of those—women's swimming and diving—is offered at 52 Power 5 schools and accounts for 14

scholarships, and if added, would increase the maximum female head-count limit to 99 scholarships.

Given the two classifications of head-count and equivalency, there is an obvious inequity with the maximum number of scholarships allowed for each gender. New models of adding women's sports as head-count should be considered to help offset the 98 male scholarships to 47 female scholarships. The question as to why not all sports go to one classification—head-count or equivalency— is historically due to stockpiling and ease of participation (NCAA Convention, 1973). In 1973, NCAA representatives wanted to have an equivalency scale for scholarships in all sports due to the low participation numbers in sports other than football, basketball, and track and field (NCAA Convention, 1973). However, given the popularity of college sports, a decision made over 40 years ago should be reconsidered for today's landscape.

If all sports were to go head-count, schools would be limited to the number of student-athletes on scholarship. Previous concerns of a decrease in participation and popularity of Olympic sports are now outdated due to the high number of student-athletes “walking-on” and participating without receiving any athletic aid (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). One could also argue that Title IX compliance could be regulated easier than the current model allows. If schools could afford the full cost of athletic scholarships for each student-athlete, schools would now only have to consider the ratio of male and female student-athletes and out-of-state and in-state tuition, as opposed to accounting for equivalency values per student-athlete.

If all sports were to go equivalency, schools would be limited to the total aggregate amount of scholarships allowed per sport. Schools would be able to divide scholarships amongst multiple student-athletes per sport, and overall more student-athletes could receive athletic-based aid. However, with that flexibility, concerns of bigger programs stockpiling talent could increase due

to the increased number of student-athletes able to receive athletic-based aid (Sutter & Winkler, 2003). For example, football could now divide 85 scholarships amongst an entire team averaging 118 players. Scholarship amounts per student-athlete could decrease overall, but an extra 33 student-athletes could now be on some amount of athletic-based aid. Talented student-athletes that were originally on the cusp of receiving one or none of the 85 scholarships could now receive an equivalent amount of financial aid and still attend schools with big-time programs. Overall, having an equivalency based model for all sports would allow greater flexibility in the number of student-athletes on athletic based aid and the amount awarded per each.

Research Question 2

How were the initial and current NCAA scholarship limits decided for each sport?

Review of NCAA archival data shows that scholarship limits were initially imposed due to the rising cost in college athletics (NCAA Special Convention, 1973). Historically, schools could self-impose scholarship limitations for their sports—most capped football at 125 scholarships—however, the NCAA originally had no bylaw to restrict the number of scholarships per sport (Sutter & Winkler, 2003). In 1971, the NCAA created the special Committee on Offers of Financial Aid and Costs to find ways in reducing the overall increase of financial aid (NCAA Convention, 1973). Surveying the opinions and needs of coaches and administrators, the committee presented their initial proposal and in 1973 the NCAA imposed its first scholarship limits on its recognized sports (NCAA Special Convention, 1973).

Reductions to scholarships after 1973 were in part for two main reasons—to reduce financial aid costs and to mimic football and men’s basketball reductions (NCAA Convention, 1975). Research shows that football has been the main driver in rising costs and disparity, and thus has been reduced from 105 to 85 scholarships throughout the years. NCAA representatives have

gone on record stating that football can and should operate at 65 to 75 scholarships per year, but had compromised to 85 due to the worries of schools not bringing in as much revenue with lower scholarship numbers (NCAA Convention, 1975). Sutter & Winkler's (2003) study validated those concerns when they found that the current football scholarship limit of 85 was too high to weaken strong programs, and should be decreased to actually create greater parity amongst schools.

Research shows that equivalency sports have been reduced simply because football and men's basketball scholarships were being reduced those same years (NCAA Convention, 1975; NCAA Convention, 1991). However, most of the time they were reduced at a higher rate than football and men's basketball. With equivalency sports already operating at lower scholarship to participant ratios, many spoke up on behalf of those sports and pleaded for an increase in scholarships (NCAA Convention, 1976; NCAA Convention, 1977; NCAA Convention, 1978). However, even though football scholarships were the main expense, they were also cited as the main source of revenue in college athletics, and men's equivalency sports were ultimately reduced to decrease overall costs. With equivalency sports affected by the decisions made for head-count sports, there is an obvious tier and inequity created by the historic favorable treatment of men's basketball and football. Entitlement problems of head-count sports exhibited today have been an on-going cause and effect of the authority received and resources given to these sports—about 40 years in the making.

In today's landscape, football is a main source of revenue for the Power 5, but for the other Division I schools, many struggle to generate football revenues that support only football. Trying to keep competitive and fully funding 85 football scholarships causes many schools to stay in the red—with approximately 22 of the 120 FBS schools actually making a profit each year (NCAA,

2011). If the football scholarship limit was reduced for all schools, costs would most certainly decrease and the talent would spread out amongst all Division I schools (Elliott & Mason, 2001; Sutter & Winkler, 2003). Holding today's programs to previous decisions is widening the gap between the Power 5 and mid-majors, and the consistently high football scholarship limit is still handcuffing schools to high financial aid costs.

Considering this historic rationale, the new models found in RQ4 considered football's current scholarship limit to help create an equitable and pragmatic model and award scholarships to sports at a similar rate as football. Under this model, scholarship numbers per sports mainly increased proving that football's current limits are set at a higher rate than the majority of college sports. Likewise, a second model, which reexamines the number of scholarships awarded to each sport, was created with a pragmatic consideration of all sports in mind as opposed to only football and men's basketball's needs. Under this model, scholarship limits decreased for head-count sports, while increasing equivalency numbers proving that there is a current inequity between head-count and equivalency scholarship numbers. A third model was found which considered contact and non-contact sport scholarship needs, and once again reallocated scholarships amongst all sports given their current needs. The first model allowed sports to mimic football's current scholarship allocation, while the other two considered the current landscape of all college sports, and found scholarship needs per sport as opposed to assigning arbitrary numbers based on historic participation.

In 1982, women's sports were recognized by the NCAA and their scholarship numbers were limited to reflect size of the prospective student-athlete pool, the inherent risk of injury in the sport, the competitive squad size, and/or the particular team scoring method (NCAA Convention, 1982). Women's sports at the time were overlooked and unpublicized; this criterion is

particularly worrisome since it defined limits at a time when the market was influenced by a lack in opportunity and historic discrimination against females in athletics. Title IX was also considered for scholarship limits when women's sports were added in 1982, however, men's equivalency sports were the ones that were actually affected. Instead of increasing women's scholarship numbers, the NCAA decided to decrease men's equivalency scholarships by 10 percent (NCAA Convention, 1981). Once again, a solution that could have been easily fixed by reducing football's scholarship numbers was passed along to men's equivalency sports without consideration of how that impacted the experience of the student-athlete.

Looking at the initial scholarship limits and where they are today, every men's sport has seen an overall reduction, while nearly every women's sport has either remained unchanged or seen a small increase. Other than men's ice hockey, every men's equivalency sport has been reduced by almost 50 percent throughout the years, while men's basketball and football have only been reduced by 20 percent. Other than women's rugby, which saw a decrease of 8 scholarships, women's sports have seen a very minimal increase. Most were reduced in 1993-94, however, their initial limits were reinstated the following year. The largest increase in scholarships for all women's sports is actually women's soccer, which saw an overall increase of 3 scholarships. Comparing men's sports to women's sports, women's sports still have higher scholarship limits than their comparable men's sports.

With the biased and arbitrary nature of the initial scholarship limits and adjustments, new models found in RQ4 have three main considerations to help achieve a more pragmatic and equitable scholarship model. Rather than considering revenue-generation or even Title IX compliance, scholarship limits were based on the sports' specific needs—average participation, NCAA travel squad size, and sport lineup size. Within those new models, equivalency sports

overall saw major increases to scholarship limits, while head-count sport either stayed similar or decreased in the number of awarded scholarships. Rather than making adjustments to the current model, these new scholarship models provide a clean slate and accurate descriptions and demographics of today's college athletics.

The current scholarship model hasn't had any major adjustments since 1996. Men's sports' scholarship limits have not been touched since their last major reduction in 1992-93, or had any new sports recognized by the NCAA. The last major adjustment for women's sports' occurred in 1996 when six sports increased their limits by one or two scholarships. Four emerging women's sports remain today—equestrian, rugby, sand volleyball, and triathlon—and only rugby has had any adjustments to its initial scholarship limit. The current model has been untouched for nearly 20 years, and with an increase in the arms race and overall popularity in women's sports, it is hard to believe that the model should remain constant in today's landscape.

Research Question 3

How do current NCAA scholarship limits hinder schools from complying with Title IX financial aid regulations?

Looking at the current model, and given that there has not been any major adjustments since 1996, one can assume that the current model is sufficient for NCAA member schools and their Title IX compliance. There are nearly similar amounts of scholarships for men's and women's sports. Men outweigh women's scholarships in head-count sports 98 to 47, while women outweigh men's scholarships in equivalency sports 187.5 to 123.3 (NCAA, 2015). Overall, there is a maximum of 221.3 male scholarships and 234.5 female scholarships permissible by the NCAA (NCAA, 2015).

However, assuming all scholarships are valued the same, the current model only allows 15 Power 5 schools to fully fund all their sport programs while still staying in Title IX compliance for financial aid (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). With a 1% disparity, 21 Power 5 schools would discriminate against males, while 29 Power 5 schools would discriminate against females (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). With the maximum amount of scholarships nearly equal (women actually have 13.2 more scholarships), it is interesting that the current model still shows an overall disparity against females.

Looking closer at the model, this disparity can be explained because there are some sports that are only offered at a small number of schools or not offered at all. For women's sports, rugby and triathlon, which account for 12 and 3.5 scholarships respectively, are also not offered at any Power 5 school, whereas every men's sport is offered in at least one Power 5 school (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). Those account for 15.5 scholarships that women do not see in the current model at the Power 5 level. Women's bowling, which accounts for 5 scholarships, is only offered at two Power 5 schools, while equestrian and fencing, which account for 15 and 5 scholarships respectively, are only offered at eight Power 5 schools (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). Meaning, 25 female scholarships are being used at a minimal rate amongst the Power 5 schools. Also, women's rowing, which offers the most female scholarships at 20, is only offered at 30 Power 5 schools, while football, which offers the most male scholarships at 85, is offered at every Power 5 school (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). Even though the current model seems to offer scholarships at a similar amount for both males and females, some women's sports are not offered or abundant in the Power 5 schools, and therefore Title IX compliance and female limits are decreased and at a disadvantage.

However, Title IX measures the dollar amounts given to males and females—not the number of awards. The NCAA does not restrict the dollar amount of financial aid given to student-athletes; rather it restricts the number of awards allowed per sport. This overall method of NCAA compliance of scholarships is not parallel to Title IX compliance in regards to financial aid, and therefore impedes ease of Title IX compliance within member schools. Since out-of-state tuition is usually greater than in-state tuition, schools now have to find a balance between the dollar amount of awards given to females and males with in-state student-athletes and out-of-state student athletes in mind. As discussed earlier, looking at a full equivalency or head-count based model should be researched to see if Title IX compliance can be better achieved and the overall equity of the scholarship model increased.

Research Question 4

Are there alternatives to the current scholarship model that could facilitate an equitable division of scholarship allocation?

This research found nine new models that considered pragmatism and equity in the scholarship allocation of recognized NCAA sports. Three themes—average roster size, NCAA travel squad size, and lineup size—were considered for the new models. Within each model, three variants—football ratio, reallocation of scholarships, and a contact and non-contact consideration—were used to show the differences in the three main models.

Assuming that each scholarship is valued the same and each Power 5 school fully funded all their sport programs, the first model—average roster size—would be the best model in concerns with Title IX compliance. The first variant—football ratio—had the best outcome with 11 schools in compliance. Compared to the current model’s Title IX compliance, this new model would actually decrease the number of schools that would be in compliance—43 schools would

have a 1% disparity against males, while 11 would have a 1% disparity against females. However, when both the current model and new model compared Title IX compliance at a 2% disparity, the new model would actually have more schools in compliance compared to the current—23 to 22 respectively. The new model would increase compliance by 12 schools, while the current would only increase by 7 schools. This shows that the new model actually has an overall lesser disparity than the current model even though it would have fewer schools in Title IX compliance at the 1% disparity.

Comparing the M1V1 model to the current student undergraduate ratio, the model still only has 11 schools in compliance. However, 13 schools would have at least a 1% disparity towards males, while 41 schools would have a 1% disparity towards females. Given that the model is based on average participation, and most schools are not in Title IX compliance in regards to athletic participation, these schools would have to create more women's sports programs to be in compliance in regards to financial aid.

Looking at the 11 schools that are in compliance, there are some similar characteristics amongst the schools. First, most schools male to female undergraduate ratio hovers around 50% each. Florida State University and the University of Virginia had the highest female undergraduate ratios of 56.0% and 54.8% respectively, while the rest of the schools hovered around 51%-47% (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). However, nearly every school's female athletic participation was 50% or below, where only one school—Kansas State University—was above the median with 52.02 percent. Every other school was at 50% or below with Florida State University having the lowest female participation ratio at 44.75 percent (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014).

Men's sports offered at every school in compliance include basketball, football, golf, and track and field, while baseball and tennis are offered at 10 schools (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). For women's sports, basketball, golf, tennis, and track and field are offered at every school, while soccer and volleyball are offered at 10 schools (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). Other popular sports include rowing (8 schools), softball (9 schools), men's and women's swimming and diving (7 and 8 schools respectively), and wrestling (6 schools) (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). There is no similarity in the number of sports offered at each school; Ohio State University offers the most at 28 while Kansas State University offers the least at 14 sports (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). Similar with the number of men's and women's sports offered at each school, only one school—Ohio State University—offers the same number of men's and women's sports at 14 each, while the rest have a difference in the number of men's and women's sports with the greatest difference of three—University of Arkansas—with 6 men's sports and 9 women's sports (EADA Cutting Tool, 2014). However, every school offers more women's sports than men other than Ohio State University, which offers 14 each.

Looking at the model, an interesting observation is how the scholarship numbers increase or decrease per sport in M1V1. Only two sports—men's basketball and women's tennis—decrease their number of scholarships. These sports—both head-count—decrease their scholarship limits by 1.7 and .9 respectively. Every other sport (other than football which remains constant) increases their scholarship limits; the most had an increase of 100.4 scholarships, which is a 658% increase. However, the head-count sports had very little changes. Volleyball had a .3 scholarship increase, women's basketball had a .6 scholarship increase, and women's gymnastics had a 1.4 scholarship increase. This shows that the current head-count

numbers are already very similar to football in a scholarship to participant ratio, while the equivalency sports are at a huge disparity.

Considering men's and women's comparable sports, the scholarship to participant ratio decreases the inequity found in most men's equivalency sports. For example, in the current model, women's gymnastics nearly doubles the amount of men's gymnastics scholarships. In the new model, men's gymnastics would now have a similar amount to women's gymnastics, and would even exceed women's gymnastics by 1.1 scholarships. Another common complaint comes with baseball scholarship limits, which currently operates at 11.7 scholarships. Baseball, which carries on an average a larger team of 36.4 players, operates at .3 scholarships less than softball, which usually carries around 21.6 players. Under the new model, softball and baseball would now have 15.5 and 26.1 scholarships, respectively. These numbers are not similar like men's and women's gymnastics, however, they are comparable to the average rosters sizes needed for a softball and baseball team. Once again, proving that the M1V1 model focuses on the pragmatic and equitable allocation of scholarships amongst all sports.

Even though 11 Power 5 schools would be compliant in this model, there are some issues that could be further researched and addressed to help make the M1V1 model more accurate. Data collected for the EADA cutting tool could be inaccurate and cause inconsistencies in the model. For example, men's and women's track and field have an average roster size of 108.3 and 118.4 student-athletes respectively. Looking further into the individual school's data, these average roster sizes could be double what a school actually carries. To remedy this problem, schools should report an accurate roster size to the NCAA if scholarship limits were to ever be adjusted according to roster size. Also, there are only six men's sports—baseball, basketball, football, golf, tennis, and track and field—and eight women's sports—basketball, golf, soccer,

softball, swimming and diving, tennis, track and field, and volleyball—that are offered in over 50 Power 5 schools. These sports and scholarship limits should be heavily considered if the NCAA were to ever adjust scholarship limits since these are the most popular sports in the Power 5.

Future Research

Current NCAA scholarship limits should continue to be researched and questioned given the current inequities. This research was specific to only Power 5 schools, however, with nearly 350 schools within Division I, this research only examines 19% of the affected population (albeit the most visible percentage). Also, with the new autonomy structure in place, a one-size fits all scholarship model may not work for all Division I schools. Although similar, the amount of revenues and expenses vary greatly between most Power 5 schools and mid-majors. Research between the differences of the Power 5 and mid-majors could (and most likely will) lead to different scholarship limit findings when compared to average participation and sports offered.

College coaches, whom were included in the initial scholarship limits decisions, have been silenced and ignored since the last major reductions. Research on coaches' perceptions on the current model could bring about new ideas for adjustments to the scholarship model with an increase in overall awareness of the current inequities. After all, coaches are the most familiar with their sport and student-athletes' needs.

However, history shows that these inequities will continue to exist if schools are not held accountable for Title IX compliance. If the NCAA were to monitor Title IX compliance and enforce sanctions on schools that had any disparities, the current scholarship model would have to be adjusted in order to help its member schools comply. With huge NCAA tournament payoffs and coaches' and administrators' salaries and bonuses linked to winning percentage, one could question if Title IX compliance is a competitive disadvantage for schools since only 16 Power 5

schools are in numeric compliance today. If schools were held to NCAA bylaws of Title IX compliance, student-athlete participation would most likely increase since there is currently a disparity against females in athletic participation, and consequently, female scholarships would have to increase as well. However, without any incentive to comply with Title IX (other than to abide by the law), schools will likely continue to abide by NCAA bylaws as opposed to federally mandated legislation, and ultimately, men' equivalency student-athletes and female student-athletes will continue to face inequity and discrimination in college athletics.

APPENDIX A

The History of Scholarship Limits Per Sport (1972-1994)

	<u>72-</u> <u>73</u>	<u>73-</u> <u>74</u>	<u>74-</u> <u>75</u>	<u>75-</u> <u>76</u>	<u>76-</u> <u>77</u>	<u>77-</u> <u>78</u>	<u>78-</u> <u>79</u>	<u>79-</u> <u>80</u>	<u>80-</u> <u>81</u>	<u>81-</u> <u>82</u>	<u>82-</u> <u>83</u>	<u>83-</u> <u>84</u>	<u>84-</u> <u>85</u>	<u>85-</u> <u>86</u>	<u>86-</u> <u>87</u>	<u>87-</u> <u>88</u>	<u>88-</u> <u>89</u>	<u>89-</u> <u>90</u>	<u>90-</u> <u>91</u>	<u>91-</u> <u>92</u>	<u>92-</u> <u>93</u>	<u>93-</u> <u>94</u>	
Men's Sports																							
Baseball				19	19	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	11.	11.	
Basketball				18	18	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	13	15	15	15	15	15	14	13	
Football				10	10	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	92	88	
Track & Field				23	23	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	12.	12.		
Fencing				8	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5	4.5	
Golf				8	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5	4.5	
Gymnastics				12	12	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6.3	6.3	
Ice Hockey				23	23	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	18	18	
Lacrosse				23	23	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	12.	12.		
Rifle										4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3.6	3.6		
Skiing				12	12	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6.3	6.3	
Soccer				19	19	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	9.9	9.9	
Swimming & Diving				19	19	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	9.9	9.9	
Tennis				8	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5	4.5	
Volleyball				8	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5	4.5	
Water Polo				8	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5	4.5	
Wrestling				19	19	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	9.9	9.9	
Women's Sports																							
Gymnastics											10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
Basketball											15	15	15	15	15	13	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Ice Hockey																							
Tennis											8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	

The History of Scholarship Limits Per Sport (1994-2016)

Men's Sports	94-95	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
Baseball	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7
Basketball	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
Football	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85
Track & Field	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6
Fencing	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Golf	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Gymnastics	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3
Ice Hockey	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
Lacrosse	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.6
Rifle	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Skiing	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3
Soccer	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9
Swimming & Diving	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9
Tennis	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Volleyball	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Water Polo	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Wrestling	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9

Women's Sports	94-95	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
Gymnastics	10	10	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Basketball	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
Ice Hockey	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
Tennis	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Volleyball	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Bowling	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Track & Field	16	16	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18

APPENDIX B

Title IX Compliance on Current NCAA Scholarship Limits

NCAA Member Institutions

	<u>Male</u> <u>Undergraduate</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Undergraduate</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Male Athletic</u> <u>Participation</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female Athletic</u> <u>Participation</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Scholarship</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Scholarship</u> <u>Ratio</u>
<u>Atlantic Coast Conference</u>						
Boston College	46.15%	53.85%	46.93%	53.07%	50.98%	49.02%
Clemson University	53.16%	46.84%	56.13%	43.87%	56.89%	43.11%
Duke University	50.33%	49.67%	56.52%	43.48%	56.70%	43.30%
Florida State University	43.97%	56.03%	55.25%	44.75%	57.35%	42.65%
Georgia Institute of Technology-Main Campus	65.66%	34.34%	65.84%	34.16%	64.12%	35.88%
North Carolina State University at Raleigh	55.56%	44.44%	64.01%	35.99%	59.72%	40.28%
Syracuse University	44.94%	55.06%	50.91%	49.09%	48.56%	51.44%
University of Louisville	48.01%	51.99%	49.04%	50.96%	51.38%	48.62%
University of Miami	49.13%	50.87%	51.99%	48.01%	56.09%	43.91%
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	41.95%	58.05%	54.22%	45.78%	52.68%	47.32%
University of Notre Dame	52.22%	47.78%	58.17%	41.83%	57.79%	42.21%
University of Pittsburgh-Pittsburgh Campus	49.34%	50.66%	55.19%	44.81%	59.14%	40.86%
University of Virginia-Main Campus	45.20%	54.80%	53.85%	46.15%	54.83%	45.17%
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	57.95%	42.05%	65.16%	34.84%	59.19%	40.81%
Wake Forest University	47.26%	52.74%	65.89%	34.11%	62.42%	37.58%
	<u>Male</u> <u>Undergraduate</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Undergraduate</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Male Athletic</u> <u>Participation</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female Athletic</u> <u>Participation</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Scholarship</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Scholarship</u> <u>Ratio</u>
<u>Big Ten Conference</u>						
Indiana University-Bloomington	49.82%	50.18%	53.15%	46.85%	53.67%	46.33%
Michigan State University	49.25%	50.75%	50.88%	49.12%	55.59%	44.41%
Northwestern University	49.49%	50.51%	48.67%	51.33%	53.69%	46.31%
Ohio State University-Main Campus	52.23%	47.77%	54.86%	45.14%	54.18%	45.82%
Pennsylvania State University-Main Campus	53.48%	46.52%	55.38%	44.62%	56.70%	43.30%

Purdue University-Main Campus	57.96%	42.04%	57.04%	42.96%	60.42%	39.58%
Rutgers University-New Brunswick	50.12%	49.88%	51.54%	48.46%	50.67%	49.33%
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	55.84%	44.16%	60.09%	39.91%	57.06%	42.94%
University of Iowa	48.01%	51.99%	51.25%	48.75%	52.40%	47.60%
University of Maryland-College Park	53.04%	46.96%	58.90%	41.10%	56.82%	43.18%
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	50.51%	49.49%	52.48%	47.52%	54.84%	45.16%
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	48.89%	51.11%	51.73%	48.27%	54.07%	45.93%
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	52.98%	47.02%	59.73%	40.27%	54.73%	45.27%
University of Wisconsin-Madison	48.57%	51.43%	50.77%	49.23%	54.98%	45.02%

	<u>Male</u> <u>Undergraduate</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Undergraduate</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Male Athletic</u> <u>Participation</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female Athletic</u> <u>Participation</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Scholarship</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Scholarship</u> <u>Ratio</u>
<u>Big 12 Conference</u>						
Baylor University	41.87%	58.13%	41.71%	58.29%	53.97%	46.03%
Iowa State University	56.16%	43.84%	55.42%	44.58%	52.97%	47.03%
Kansas State University	52.28%	47.72%	47.98%	52.02%	57.43%	42.57%
Oklahoma State University-Main Campus	50.71%	49.29%	58.87%	41.13%	61.61%	38.39%
Texas Christian University	39.84%	60.16%	56.14%	43.86%	56.66%	43.34%
Texas Tech University	54.97%	45.03%	61.23%	38.77%	60.70%	39.30%
The University of Texas at Austin	47.59%	52.41%	53.46%	46.54%	54.27%	45.73%
University of Kansas	50.08%	49.92%	48.51%	51.49%	51.59%	48.41%
University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus	50.92%	49.08%	48.73%	51.27%	55.77%	44.23%
West Virginia University	54.81%	45.19%	59.33%	40.67%	56.62%	43.38%

	<u>Male</u> <u>Undergraduate</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Undergraduate</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Male Athletic</u> <u>Participation</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female Athletic</u> <u>Participation</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Scholarship</u> <u>Ratio</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Scholarship</u> <u>Ratio</u>
<u>Southeastern Conference</u>						
Auburn University	49.91%	50.09%	52.16%	47.84%	52.84%	47.16%
Louisiana State University	48.35%	51.65%	56.47%	43.53%	54.69%	45.31%
Mississippi State University	51.35%	48.65%	61.00%	39.00%	60.70%	39.30%
Texas A & M University-College Station	51.19%	48.81%	53.73%	46.27%	55.33%	44.67%
The University of Alabama	46.06%	53.94%	46.36%	53.64%	51.87%	48.13%
The University of Tennessee-Knoxville	50.23%	49.77%	51.39%	48.61%	54.27%	45.73%

University of Arkansas	47.71%	52.29%	51.43%	48.57%	54.19%	45.81%
University of Florida	44.18%	55.82%	55.66%	44.34%	53.44%	46.56%
University of Georgia	42.22%	57.78%	47.10%	52.90%	52.84%	47.16%
University of Kentucky	47.63%	52.37%	62.79%	37.21%	58.22%	41.78%
University of Mississippi	44.04%	55.96%	60.61%	39.39%	60.70%	39.30%
University of Missouri-Columbia	47.75%	52.25%	62.41%	37.59%	56.91%	43.09%
University of South Carolina-Columbia	45.36%	54.64%	48.66%	51.34%	55.74%	44.26%
Vanderbilt University	49.92%	50.08%	53.76%	46.24%	58.80%	41.20%
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male Athletic</u>	<u>Female Athletic</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Participation</u>	<u>Participation</u>	<u>Scholarship</u>	<u>Scholarship</u>
<u>Pacific 12 Conference</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>
Arizona State University-Tempe	55.97%	44.03%	56.35%	43.65%	53.98%	46.02%
Oregon State University	53.85%	46.15%	55.11%	44.89%	52.14%	47.86%
Stanford University	52.78%	47.22%	53.56%	46.44%	50.96%	49.04%
University of Arizona	47.54%	52.46%	58.75%	41.25%	54.69%	45.31%
University of California-Berkeley	47.86%	52.14%	57.79%	42.21%	48.93%	51.07%
University of California-Los Angeles	44.07%	55.93%	44.47%	55.53%	50.88%	49.12%
University of Colorado Boulder	55.49%	44.51%	54.12%	45.88%	56.89%	43.11%
University of Oregon	47.38%	52.62%	51.69%	48.31%	53.31%	46.69%
University of Southern California	49.28%	50.72%	53.38%	46.62%	53.04%	46.96%
University of Utah	55.19%	44.81%	57.07%	42.93%	54.64%	45.36%
University of Washington-Seattle Campus	47.71%	52.29%	52.85%	47.15%	53.44%	46.56%
Washington State University	49.49%	50.51%	50.29%	49.71%	54.23%	45.77%
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male Athletic</u>	<u>Female Athletic</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Participation</u>	<u>Participation</u>	<u>Scholarship</u>	<u>Scholarship</u>
<u>All Power 5 Conferences</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>
Total	50.10%	49.90%	54.22%	45.78%	55.11%	44.89%

REFERENCES

- A Policy Interpretation; Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics, 45 C.F. R. Part 26 (1979). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/t9interp.html>
- About NCAA Division I. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about?division=d1>
- Brake, Deborah L. (2007). *Celebrating thirty-five years of sport and Title IX: Title IX as pragmatic feminism*. Cleveland State Law Review.
- Carpenter, L. J., & Acosta, R. V. (2005). Title IX. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Guidance: The Three-Part Test. (1996). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/clarific.html#two>
- Elliott, S. A. & Mason, D. S. (2001). Gender equity in intercollegiate athletics: an alternative model to achieving Title IX compliance. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 11 (1). Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/jlas11&div=7&g_sent=1&collection=journals
- Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool. (2013). Retrieved from <http://ope.ed.gov/athletics/>
- George, B. G. (1999). Title IX and the scholarship dilemma. *Marquette Sports Law Journal*, 9 (273). Retrieved from <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1424&context=sportslaw>
- George, B. G. (1995). Who plays and who pays: Defining equality in intercollegiate athletics. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 5 (647). Retrieved from <https://litigation-essentials.lexisnexis.com/webcd/app?action=DocumentDisplay&crawlid=1&srctype=smi&srcid=3B15&doctype=cite&docid=1995+Wis.+L.+Rev.+647&key=f018da17f982deb9d660d4994773b65c>
- Gibson, N. (2012). NCAA scholarship restrictions as anticompetitive measures: the one-year rule and scholarship caps as avenues for antitrust scrutiny. *William & Mary Business Law Review*, 3 (203). Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/wmaybur3&div=9&g_sent=1&collection=journals#209
- Greene, Stephanie M. (2000). Regulating the NCAA: Making the calls under the Sherman Antitrust Act and Title IX. *Maine Law Review*, 52. Retrieved from <http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/maine52&div=9&id=&page=>

- McDonagh, E., & Pappano, A. (2009). *Playing with the boys: Why separate is not equal in sports*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Mota, S. (2006). Title IX, the NCAA, and intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of College and University Law*, 33 (1). Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/jcolunly33&div=9&g_sent=1&collection=journals
- NCAA. (2011). NCAA Revenues and Expenses Division I Report. Retrieved April 4, 2016, from NCAA Publications <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/2010RevExp.pdf>
- NCAA. (2015). *2015-16 NCAA Division I Manual*. Retrieved May 11, 2015, from NCAA Publications <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/D115.pdf>
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1971). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 65th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Houston, TX.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1972). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 66th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Hollywood, FL.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1973). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 67th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Chicago, IL.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1974). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 68th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. San Francisco, CA.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1975). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 69th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Washington, D.C.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1977). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 71st Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Miami Beach, FL.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1978). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 72nd Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Atlanta, GA.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1979). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 73rd Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. San Francisco, CA.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1980). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 74th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. New Orleans, LA.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1981). *Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: 75th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Miami Beach, FL.

- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1982). Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: *76th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Houston, TX.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1983). Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: *77th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. San Diego, CA.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1984). Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: *78th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Dallas, TX.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1985). Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: *79th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Nashville, TN.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1986). Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: *80th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. New Orleans, LA.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1987). Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: *81st Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. San Diego, CA.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings. (1988). Proceedings from the NCAA Annual Convention: *82nd Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Nashville, TN.
- NCAA Convention Proceedings 1989-2013. (2013). Proceedings from the 1989-2013 NCAA Annual Convention: *Annual Conventions of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*.
- NCAA Special Convention Proceedings. (1973). Proceedings from the NCAA Special Convention: *1st Special Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Chicago, IL.
- NCAA Special Convention Proceedings. (1975). Proceedings from the NCAA Special Convention: *2nd Special Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Chicago, IL.
- NCAA Special Convention and Annual Convention Proceedings. (1976). Proceedings from the NCAA Special and Annual Convention: *3rd Special Convention and 70th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*. St. Louis, MO.
- Office of Civil Rights (1998). *Dear Colleague Letter: Bowling Green State University*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/bowlgrn.html>
- Powell, Kemper C. (2013). A façade of amateurism: An examination of the NCAA grant-in-aid system under the Sherman Act. *Sports Law Journal*, 20. Retrieved from <http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/sportlj20&div=13&id=&page=>
- Regulations. (1975). 34 C.F.R. Part 106.41. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/rights/reg/ocr/edlite-34cfr106.html>

Schwarz, R. (2014). Time out! Getting back to what Title IX intended and encouraging courts and the office of civil rights to re-evaluate the three-prong compliance test. *Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice*, 20 (2). Retrieved from <http://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/crsj/vol20/iss2/12>

Sutter, D. & Winkler, S. (2003). Scholarship limits and competitive balance. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 4 (1). Retrieved from <http://jse.sagepub.com/content/4/1/3.short>

Title IX of the Education Amendments, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq. (1972).

Villalobos, P. M. (1990). The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987: revitalization of Title IX. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 1 (1). Retrieved from <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/sportslaw/vol1/iss1/6>