TO: Tom Sudkamp, President, Faculty Senate  
CC: David Hopkins, President, WSU  
     Stephen Angle, Provost, WSU  
     All members of the Athletics Council

FROM: Mike Sincoff, Chair, Athletics Council

RE: Athletics Council Report to Faculty Senate

DATE: May 22, 2009

The Athletics Council met eight times in 2008-2009. A summary of activities follows along with final committee reports as submitted to the Chair of the Council.

• 2008-09 officers: Mike Sincoff (Chair), Dan Krane (Vice-Chair), Sheryl Kent (Corresponding Secretary, ex officio).

• 2008-09 Steering Committee: Mike Sincoff (Chair), Steve Fortson, Dan Krane (Vice-Chair), Dave Reynolds, Anthony Smerk (Student, President of SAAC), Beth Sorensen.

• 2008-09 members appointed by the Faculty Senate: Jeff John, Dan Krane, Amber Peplow

• 2008-09 subcommittee chairs:
  • Academic Affairs Karen Lahm
  • Constitution/Bylaws Dan Krane
  • Diverse Student Advocacy Steve Fortson
  • Gender Equity Mary Kenton
  • Steering Mike Sincoff
  • Student Welfare Steve Fortson

• We determined that WSU athletes have majors across the university—35 are in organizational leadership, 26 in biological sciences, 21 in psychology, 19 in communication, 14 in marketing, 12 in nursing, 11 in accountancy, 10 in early childhood education, 9 in mechanical engineering. Other majors are represented to a lesser extent. The Council continues to monitor student-athletes’ academic progress toward graduation and maintains close contact with the Athletics Department’s Academic Advisors.

• We approved 2009-2010 fifth-year scholarship grants for 14 student-athletes who had exhausted their athletic eligibility. Grants totaled approximately $114,000. Overall, the average grantee needed to complete 26.5 credit hours in order to receive an undergraduate degree.
• In February 2009, we recognized 170 student-athletes and other students affiliated with the WSU athletics program (e.g., student trainers, team managers) for their academic accomplishments in achieving cumulative GPAs of 3.0 or higher. Awards were presented to 118 student-athletes, 16 Spirit Unit Members, 31 Trainers, and 5 Sports Information students. The breakdown by teams of the 118 student-athletes was: 5 Men's Basketball, 10 Baseball, 5 Women's Basketball, 8 Men's Cross Country/Track, 12 Women's Cross Country/Track, 5 Golf, 9 Men's Soccer, 12 Women's Soccer, 6 Softball, 12 Men's Swimming and Diving, 16 Women's Swimming and Diving, 3 Men's Tennis, 6 Women's Tennis, and 9 Volleyball.

• We continued to modify the student-athlete exit interview questionnaires and timing. Confidential questionnaires are now completed on-line with a follow-up personal interview.

• WSU continues to offer Life Skills Seminars to student-athletes.

• Review of student-athlete exit interviews reflects high satisfaction with sports medical services available and provided.

• We continue receiving national attention on the revised student-athlete pregnancy policy that the Council approved in September 2006 and revised in Fall 2007. The WSU policy has become the national standard and is known to have been used by more than 200 colleges and universities. WSU’s continuing advocacy on behalf of pregnant and parenting student-athletes has had a favorable influence on NCAA policy and caused changes to NCAA Bylaws.

• Title IX Compliance Summary for 2008-2009: Strengths and Weaknesses.

For the first time in the history of its Gender Equity reports, Wright State University failed to meet the accepted standards for compliance with Title IX requirements in two major areas: (I) Accommodation of Interests & Abilities and in (II) Athletic Financial Assistance. It is hard to overstate the seriousness of these problems in terms of Gender Equity and Title IX compliance. The most disturbing aspect of this situation is that these are issues we thought we had long since resolved. The Office of Civil Rights and the NCAA are the two oversight bodies most concerned with Title IX compliance. In audits or certifications, both look for positive steps toward full compliance, while recognizing that unforeseen circumstances might cause an institution to experience minor fluctuations in enrollment or financial aid. Our problems, however, result from an intentional act—establishing a new men’s team and not adequately funding the athletes. The committee strongly recommends that the university not leave itself in this exposed position for any longer than absolutely necessary. We must move swiftly to correct these deficiencies.
In terms of the 2004-2009 Five Year Plan, we can identify several problems. We have not fulfilled all of the commitments made to Softball for facility improvements. While good progress on the goal of enhancing the scholarship budget for Women’s Indoor and Outdoor Track was made, last year’s actual spending fell below the goal set for 2002-03. We made no progress on the facility improvements outlined for Women’s Track. We have not made any progress on coaching salaries, nor have we met our goals for hiring women to coaching positions. These failures need to be taken into account when preparing the 2010-2015 Gender Equity Plan.

We must be careful not to let the serious problems identified immediately above to completely overshadow areas of accomplishment. The Athletics Department has made good progress on two persistent problems in the laundry list of “Other Program Areas.” In the Equipment and Supplies category, the department improved by almost 8% in the past year. And in 2008, women actually outspent men by a few thousand dollars in Travel and Per Diem category. These are significant achievements and should be applauded. Year after year, these reports show that we do some things very well: Tutors, Medical and Training Facilities and Services, and Housing and Dining are examples of compliance areas where we never identify problems. In fact, the institution has received much positive publicity for our pregnancy policy and the committee is confident that student athletes at Wright State receive first-rate medical and training services. Student GPA’s don’t show up on EADA Reports, but Wright State student athletes are generally excellent in the classroom, equaling or besting the overall university GPA most quarters.

• We have improved the AC monthly meeting format that was revised three years ago to include time for focused educational/academic presentations. We have had presentations/interaction with WSU’s President, David Hopkins and Jon LeCrone, the Horizon League Commissioner. We had four presentations by coaches (and student-athletes) from men’s basketball, volleyball, women’s soccer, and baseball. At each presentation by a coach, the coach introduced two team captains (or principal players) who also spoke with the Council about their WSU athletic experience. Representatives from the leadership of the Athletics Department (the Athletics Director, the two Senior Associate Athletics Directors) regularly presented information to the Council. We have had presentations from the Director of Compliance and the President of SAAC (the Student Athlete Advisory Committee). We have made a concerted effort to interact with SAAC; two members of SAAC are on the Council and its President is on the Council’s Steering Committee. Athletics Council members regularly attend monthly SAAC meetings. Also, we have had regular attendance at Council meetings by members of Student Government.

• In February 2008, the AC initiated a “Pre-Basketball Game Lecture Series” with the intent of combining an evening of academics with athletics preceding a Saturday home basketball game. Because of the success of that inaugural event,
this year we expanded the Series and had presentations by Professors Beth Sorensen, Dan Krane, and Mike Raymer on February 14, 21, and 28, 2009 preceding three Saturday home basketball games. We hope to continue this lecture series next year.

• We reviewed the Athletics Department’s current budget in Spring 2009; however, we took no action and made no recommendations pending university-wide budget cuts that were forthcoming at the time this was written.

Committee Reports follow from Academic Affairs, Constitution and Bylaws, Diverse Student Athlete Advocacy, Gender Equity, and Student Welfare.
Academic Affairs Committee Final Report
April 29, 2009

Athletic Council 2008-2009 Year End Report
Academic Affairs Subcommittee

Chair: Karen F. Lahm, Ph.D.
   Assistant Professor, Dept. of Sociology & Anthropology
   267 Millett Hall, karen.lahm@wright.edu

Committee members consisted of Judy Chivers, Amber Peplow, Dave Reynolds, Rod Perry, Sheryl Kent, and Karen Lahm.

This committee met three times during the academic year: October 9th, 2008, February 10th, 2009, and April 23rd, 2009. All of the minutes from these meeting were submitted to the chair of the University Athletic Council, Dr. Michael Sincoff and are available for review.

Quarterly grade reports of student athletes were presented and discussed at all three meetings. Overall, GPAs for student athletes were around 3.0. This has been consistent over the past couple of years. There were no noticeable changes in eligibility status (i.e. M1, M2, etc.) for this year’s student athletes, when compared to the past several years.

Progress reports were also discussed at all three meetings. The newest challenge is that the athletic department is trying to get these reports on-line rather than using paper forms. Judy Chivers reports that progress is taking place and the new grade report system should be ready by next year. Overall, Judy Chivers reports a solid response rate from professors in regards to the paper grade report requests.

We also approved 14 fifth year scholarships for a total of $113,348. This request is down considerably from years past ($228,000 last year and $151,000 two years ago). This number only includes tuition and not housing, fees, meals, etc. The average credit hours needed to graduate for this group was about 26.5 hours. This is down from last year’s value of 31.4 average hours. These students are all being monitored very closely and should have no trouble completing their hours.

At the last two meetings, we discussed including an APR report in the grade report rather than one of the current statistical pages in the existing grade report. Judy Chivers has created an example of this APR report and the committee will discuss it in front of the whole council on May 29th, 2009 for final approval. From this report, only two sports, men’s tennis and women’s softball are close to falling below the baseline of 925. The athletic department is monitoring the continual progress of these two sports.

The committee, at our first meeting in October of 2008, also considered conversion from quarters to semesters. Pertinent issues for the conversion are as follows: eligibly of student athletes, especially baseball; an increased need for academic advisors, tutors,
study table monitors, etc. for students athletes; the missed class schedule of Fall sports will change; the potential increased need of fifth year scholarships, and the semester break schedule and its affects on student athletes (i.e. missed internships, less time for other outside academic experiences). The committee decided that all of these issues need to be met at least one year prior to the conversion from quarters to semesters. Also, the committee suggested an increased need for money, people (advisors, etc.), and time for training current advisors throughout the university.

Amber Peplow and Dave Reynolds have been recommended as possible chairs of next year’s Academic Affairs Subcommittee.

Recommendations for Academic Affairs 2009-2010:
1) continue to monitor the grade reports of student athletes (including the possible new APR page)
2) continue to review “fifth year grants” and monitor the changes in these over time
3) continue to monitor the needs of student athletes in regards to the conversion to semesters (especially in areas like eligibility, scheduling, time off, etc.)
Constitution and Bylaws Committee 2008-2009 Year End Report

Chair: Dan Krane
Professor, Biological Sciences
Dan.krane@wright.edu
775-2257

Members: D. Reynolds

Two relatively small changes to the Athletics Council By-laws have been put before the Athletics Council this year. Both were considered as part of “old business” at the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Athletics Council on May 29, 2009 where they were both approved. Those proposed changes were:

1) change the language that suggests that representatives to the Athletics Council are “elected” or “appointed” to simply “selected” to reflect differences in the process in different constituencies; and

2) the addition of language that allows representatives to the Athletics Council to designate non-voting substitutes for meetings that they are not able to attend.

An inconsistency between the number of Faculty Senate representatives to the Athletics Council that the Faculty Senate select (3, according to their by-laws) and the number that the Athletics Council by-laws calls for (currently 2) still remains. The difference was deemed to still be immaterial at the present time since Dan Krane is one of the Faculty Senate appointees to the Athletics Council and would be a member anyway due to his status as elected Vice Chair of the Council. The Faculty Senate has put off its scheduled quadrennial review of its by-laws until the fall of 2009 and the Council as a whole expects that this issue will be most easily resolved by requesting a change to the Faculty Senate’s by-laws during that review.
Diverse Student-Athlete Advocacy Committee 2008-2009 Year End Report

May 14, 2009

Chair: Steve Fortson. Members: Sonny Osborne, Judy Chivers, Chuck Willis, Ta-myra Davis, Rod Perry

The Diverse Student Athlete Advocacy Committee met three times during the 2008-2009 academic year. The committee focused its discussions on the 2004-2009 5-year Minority Opportunities Plan and other issues related to the diversity and athletics. These additional issues included a review of graduation rates (historical and current), retention rates, ineligibility rates, diverse student athlete GPA, and diverse student athlete participation. The committee also explored semester conversion issues and the potential impact on diverse student athletes.

In 1998, this committee suggested a number of recommendations regarding diverse student athletes and the Athletics Department’s commitment to diversity. These recommendations are evaluated and reviewed each year. The proceeding information is the results of the 2008-2009 evaluation.

1st Recommendation – Diverse student-athletes should strive for a graduation rate equal to or higher than the overall student-athlete graduation rate:

Graduation Rates data is based on the 2001 Cohort of student-athletes at Wright State:

- 27 of 30 (90%) – non-minority student-athlete graduated
- 6 of 7 (85.7%) – diverse student-athletes graduated
- 2 of 2 (100%) – non-resident alien (international students) student-athletes graduated

The diverse student-athletes average is very close to that of the non-minority student athletes. The percentage is slightly less because of the lower number of diverse student athletes. This condition was not met.

2nd Recommendation: Diverse student-athletes should strive for a retention rate that is equal to or higher than the overall student-athlete retention rate (this variable looks at scholarship student athletes only).

- 2 Diverse student athletes not retained.
- 7 Non-Diverse student athletes not retained.

This condition was met.

3rd Recommendation: The level of academic ineligibility for diverse student-athletes should be no higher than their proportional representation at Wright State University.

Ineligible after Fall 2008:
- 7 Non-Diverse Student Athletes
2 Diverse Student Athletes

Ineligible after Winter 2009:
3 Non-Diverse Student Athletes
2 Diverse Student Athletes

This condition was met.

4th Recommendation: Diverse student-athletes as a group should strive for a grade point average that is equal to or higher than the overall student-athlete grade point average:

Overall student-athlete GPA after Winter 2009
Cumulative – 3.007
Term – 2.977

Student-Athletes GPA minus diverse student-athletes
Cumulative – 3.053
Term – 3.030

Diverse Student-Athletes GPA
Cumulative – 2.809
Term – 2.752

This condition was not met.

5th Recommendation: The Athletics Department will insure that the number of diverse participants in intercollegiate athletes will not fall below the percentage of diverse students at the university.

The percentage of diverse student-athletes is 20.24 %
The percentage of undergraduate diverse students at Wright State is 18.04%

This condition was met.

Review of 5-year Minority Opportunities Plan

The committee also addressed the 5-year Minority Opportunity Plan 2004-2009 and reviewed progress on each goal.

Goal 1: Maintain and expand when possible diversity in Athletics Department Personnel.

Current percentage of diverse personnel in Athletics is 16.1%. Historical review of diversity hiring in Athletics shows that from fall 2005 through the summer 2007 the Athletics Department interviewed a minority candidate in 18 out of 37 searches.
Goal 2: Attract and involve underrepresented groups in athletes.

The Athletics department has not provided the committee with data to support the evidence this goal is being met. This data was requested at each meeting held this year.

Goal 3: To develop more programs dealing with racial sensitivity.

The Athletics Department did not sponsor or develop any programming in the area of racial sensitivity training in 2008-2009. In December 2007, 3 Athletics Department personnel attended multicultural presentation delivered by Derald Sue. It has been proposed that additional workshops may be delivered by the School of Professional Psychology.

Goal 4: Attract more minorities to participate in underrepresented sports.

Current data was requested but has not been forwarded to this committee. The latest data provided in this area was for 2007-2008. That data does reflect the recruitment of minority student athletes in underrepresented sports.

Goal 5: The number of minority student athletes should not fall below the number of minority students at WSU.

This goal was addressed as recommendation #5.
The percentage of diverse student-athlete is 20.24%
The percentage of undergraduate diverse students at Wright State is 18.04%

Goal 6: Increase the retention and graduation rate of minority students.

This goal was also addressed as recommendation #1 and #2. One of these recommendations was met for 2008-2009.

Goal 7: To involve minority student athletes in governance and decision making process of the Athletics Department.

The primary mode for student athlete participation in governance and decision-making in athletics is through the Student Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC). In 2008-2009 SAAC did have minority members. However, there is no current mechanism in place to ensure SAAC does retain minority members.
Introduction

The Gender Equity subcommittee of Athletics Council met 8 times between January 22 and April 16, 2009 to assess Wright State University’s Compliance with Title IX as well as progress on the NCAA Certification Self-Study (Fall 2003) Gender Equity Five-Year Plan 2004-09 which contains additional elements beyond Title IX. Originally, the committee intended to prepare a new Five-Year Plan for 2010-2015. Because these plans require institutional approval and may involve additional institutional funding, we invited Associate Provost Bill Rickert to join in our deliberations. By early spring quarter, it was clear to all of us that budget conditions throughout the state would make it impossible to create the specific kind of Five-Year Plan that the NCAA requires as part of the certification process. We thought it prudent to put off that task until after the start of the new fiscal year in July when the budget picture will be clearer. The present group is eager to take up our work again at that point and to produce a document by the end of August.

Documents used for the analyses and conclusions presented in this report were:
- 2007-08 Gender Equity Committee Year End Report
- 2004-09 Gender Equity Five-Year Plan (2003 NCAA Recertification Self-Study)
- 2008 Equity Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) Report (actual participation, revenues & expenses)
- 2008-09 Athletic Department Budget (planned 2008 revenues & expenses)
- Trends prepared from historical data (E. Sorensen)

SECTION ONE: TITLE IX COMPLIANCE
The 1979 Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Interpretation divides athletics issues into three major categories to be analyzed for Title IX compliance in sports offerings: I. Accommodation of Athletic Interests and Abilities, II. Athletic Financial Assistance, and III. Eleven Other Program Areas.

I. Accommodation of Athletic Interests and Abilities

*Compliance Standards:*

A. Participation Opportunities - Need compliance in one of these areas:
   1. Participation is proportionate to full-time undergraduate enrollment.
   2. Demonstrate a history and continuing practice of program expansion that is responsive to developing interest and abilities of underrepresented sex.
   3. Fully and effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of the underrepresented sex.

B. Levels of Competition - Need compliance in one of these areas:
   1. Provide proportionally similar numbers of male and female athletes equivalently advanced competitive opportunities.
   2. Demonstrate a history and continuing practice of upgrading the competitive opportunities available to the disadvantaged sex (NCAA Achieving Gender Equity, 2000; pp. II-6 through II-8).

Table I. Athletic Participation Trends (2000 – 08).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate % a</th>
<th>Duplicated Student-athletes % b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
a.) EADA, Percent of male and female undergraduates, p. 1.  
b.) EADA, Item 50, Athletics Participation, total participants (“duplicated” headcount).  
c.) In 2008 the corrected duplicated headcount included 167 males and 162 females.
To determine compliance with the Participation Opportunities standard, Wright State University has always elected to use Test 1: Participation is proportionate to full-time undergraduate enrollment. The committee applied the Office of Civil Rights’ (OCR’s) 1996 Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Guidance: The Three-Part Test guidelines regarding “substantial proportionality” for Test 1.

Figure 1 and Table I show that for 2008 females constituted 55.1% of undergraduates and 49.2% of athletic participants while males constituted 44.9% of undergraduates and 50.8% of athletic participants. These proportions include allowable duplicated headcounts and walk-ons.

Women are considered underrepresented because their rate of participation (49.2%) is almost 6 (5.9) percentage points less than their rate of enrollment (55.1%). These numbers represent a significant increase in disparity, a jump of more than 3% in one year. In cases where females are underrepresented, the NCAA recommends adding female athletes until proportionality is achieved and discourages solving the problem by eliminating participation opportunities for men. Following these guidelines would require adding 43 female participants, for totals of 205 female and 167 male participants for a new total of 372. Women would then be 55.1% of the participants (i.e., 205 of 372). Unfortunately adding 43 participation slots is not possible given current economic realities. Athletics Department staff members are already stretched to their limits and would not be able to manage 372 athletes adequately. However, such a large disparity in
participation must be addressed immediately. It surely puts the institution clearly outside any reasonable interpretation of effective accommodation.

How did the institution create such a significant change in status in the space of one year? Most critical was the decision to add a Men’s Outdoor Track team and to enhance men’s participation on the Cross Country Team. According to the latest available figures from the Athletics Department, these two changes account for an additional 29 male athletics opportunities. Added to that number are 5 additional participants in Baseball, 3 in Men’s Basketball, 5 in Men’s Tennis, and 2 in Golf, and 1 in Men’s Soccer, for a total of 46 additional participation opportunities from 2007. (These figures differ only slightly from those taken directly from the 2007 and 2008 EADA reports, which show a gain of 45 participation slots for men and a loss of 3 slots for women.) Though the university received $28,000 from the NCAA for adding a sport, that sum is woefully inadequate to support those athletes, as well as the addition of more than 40 participation slots for women.

Wright State University meets the Levels of Competition standard. Both men’s and women’s teams compete in Division I and all teams meet the minimum contest and participant requirements outlined in NCAA Bylaw 20.9.4.3. Both men’s and women’s teams have the opportunity to participate in league championships and in preseason tournaments.

Recommendation: It is difficult at this point to suggest the best correction. The Athletics Department is exploring possible options with the NCAA. As budget planning for 2009-10 goes forward, solving this problem must be a central goal. It is understood that a careful analysis of all rosters will be required. Perhaps the department also ought to consider adding a policy that requires a written analysis of likely consequences before decisions are implemented to add or delete sports or otherwise change participation numbers significantly. Unfortunately, one ill-advised decision can have huge and long-lasting repercussions. Even if we take immediate and decisive action to correct this problem, our participation numbers will remain out of balance for at least another reporting year, probably two. If we delay and/or take half measures, this problem could be a factor in our 2012 NCAA certification visit.

II. Athletic Financial Assistance

Compliance Standard: Proportional spending within 1% of the proportion of unduplicated headcount of participants by gender (NCAA Achieving Gender Equity, 2000, p. II-9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II. Athletic Financial Aid Trends 2000 – 08.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a.) EADA, Item 50 Athletic Participants, Unduplicated Count of Participants.
b.) EADA, Item 17 Total Athletic Student Aid.
c.) In 2008, there were 149 unduplicated male athletes and 105 unduplicated female athletes. Athletic financial aid totaled $2,691,987 with $1,221,146 awarded to males and $1,470,841 awarded to females.

Figure 2. The Proportion of Financial Resources for Women’s and Men’s Athletics from 2002-08.

Table II and Figure 2 both show that in 2008 reporting year female athletes received **54.6%** of the Total Aid and constituted **41.3%** of the unduplicated head count; male athletes received **45.4%** of the Total Aid and constituted **58.7%** of the unduplicated head count. If rounded to the nearest whole number the proportional spending shows a 13% deficiency in scholarships awarded to male athletes. This is by far the largest disparity of scholarship spending since the founding of the Gender Equity Committee more than 15 years ago.

This compliance problem originates largely in the decision to add Men’s Outdoor Track without also adding adequate scholarship dollars to support the new athletes. New male participation opportunities were created in other sports, again without adding sufficient
scholarship dollars to support them. This problem needs to be solved in tandem with the proportionality problem.

Additionally, it should be noted that though the current 2004-2009 Five-Year Plan recommended increasing scholarship funding for women’s track, actual spending has dropped off dramatically to $37,302 reported on the current EADA. The Five-Year Plan called for scholarships for women’s track to reach $100,000 by the 2008-09 academic year. The next lowest spending women’s team is tennis, with $82,318 awarded in the current reporting cycle. Tennis, of course, fields far fewer athletes than track.

**Recommendation:** Resolve this disparity in the next reporting year. Athletics Department administrators need to aim for “strict proportionality” when budgeting for scholarships and to watch closely for variances in dollars awarded (e.g., ensure summer and fifth year awards are equivalently encouraged and available). A single person should be formally vested with the authority (in consultation with the Athletics Director) to ensure that awards fall within acceptable guidelines. Once again, delay or half measures could put the institution in an awkward position for the 2012 NCAA certification visit.

### III. Other Program Areas

*Compliance Standard: Equity in all areas.*

The NCAA offers guidance on compliance on each of the 11 other program areas, sometimes referred to as the laundry list. Money often plays a significant role in determining equity on laundry list items; however, total dollars spent are not the sole factor in determining compliance in these areas. Year to year fluctuations are allowable if reasonable explanations can be offered. Gender Equity Committees do not examine each of these 11 areas in detail every year. We have generally looked to expenditures to guide our explorations. That is, if spending on equipment and supplies favored men’s teams by a significant percentage, we would ask for additional budgetary detail and explanation. Some areas that are historically trouble free, tutoring, for example, do not receive close scrutiny every year. The new Five-Year Plan will, however, require close analysis and updating of every item on the list.

#### A. Equipment, Uniforms and Supplies

Five areas of compliance are: 1) Quality; 2) Suitability; 3) Amount; 4) Availability; 5) Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male Budget</th>
<th>Female Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Male Actual</th>
<th>Female Actual</th>
<th>Proportion Male</th>
<th>Proportion Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>73,015</td>
<td>80,058</td>
<td>153,073</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>90,890</td>
<td>66,834</td>
<td>157,724</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>130,559</td>
<td>76,632</td>
<td>207,191</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Equipment &amp; Supplies</th>
<th>% Gender Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>114,871</td>
<td>103,213</td>
<td>218,084</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>67,966</td>
<td>108,900</td>
<td>176,866</td>
<td>60,586</td>
<td>82,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>71,390</td>
<td>121,491</td>
<td>192,881</td>
<td>70,032</td>
<td>93,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>71,390</td>
<td>94,244</td>
<td>185,634</td>
<td>70,032</td>
<td>86,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a.) In 2006 the Gender Equity Committee began requesting the Athletic Department budget.

b.) EADA, Item 26 Equipment, Uniforms and Supplies.

c.) In 2008, a total of $180,304 was spent for equipment, uniforms & supplies with $94,244 going to males, $86,060 going to females, and $16,969 (8.7%) not allocated by gender.

Figure 3. The Proportion of Expenditures Spent on Women’s and Men’s Athletic Teams from 2003-08.

Both Table III and Figure 3 show that the department has improved spending in this area for 2008. The 4.1% advantage in spending for men’s teams is notably better than the 11.8% disparity reported for 2007.

Recommendations: Continue to monitor closely and work towards removing any inequity.

B. Scheduling of Games and Practice Times
Seven areas of compliance are: 1) Number of Competitive Events; 2) Practice Opportunities; 3) Time of Day Conference Schedules; 4) Time of Day of Practice; 5) Preseason Competition; 6) Postseason Competition; 7) Season of Sport and Length of Season.

The committee reviewed the practice schedule for the McLin Gym and the Weight Training Room, both of which showed an equitable pattern of use. An examination of team schedules shows an equitable pattern of preseason play. Men’s and Women’s basketball scheduled two double headers to comply with Horizon League mandates, but in both instances the women’s games started at 5:00 to make it more convenient for fans to attend. Wright State sponsors the maximum allowable number of competitions in every sport. Post season play is determined by the outcomes of conference championships.

**Recommendation:** Continue to monitor yearly.

C. Team Travel and Per Diem Allowance

**Compliance** includes: 1) Modes of Transportation; 2) Housing furnished during travel; 3) Length of Stay Before and After Competitive Events; 4) Per Diem Allowances; 5) Dining Arrangements

TABLE IV. Expenditures on Men’s and Women’s Team Travel 2000 – 08.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$ Male Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>$ Female Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>227,186</td>
<td></td>
<td>251,573</td>
<td></td>
<td>478,759</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>265,003</td>
<td></td>
<td>249,192</td>
<td>514,195</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>419,840</td>
<td></td>
<td>316,097</td>
<td>735,937</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>386,206</td>
<td></td>
<td>302,921</td>
<td>689,127</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>266,168</td>
<td>374,141</td>
<td>273,873</td>
<td>753,207</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>277,629</td>
<td>497,300</td>
<td>284,614</td>
<td>888,749</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>273,129</td>
<td>463,028</td>
<td>284,614</td>
<td>468,857</td>
<td>931,885</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  

a.) In 2006 the Gender Equity Committee began requesting the Athletic Department budget.  
b.) EADA, Item 25 Team Travel.  
c.) In 2008, a total of $931,885 was spent for travel with $463,028 for males and $468,857 for females.
As shown in Figure 4 and Table IV, a gender neutral travel policy has been in effect for several years now. 2008 showed gender equitable spending for team travel, with men’s teams spending $463,028 and women’s teams spending $468,857. The Athletics Department is to be congratulated for its significant improvement from 2007. Unfortunately, however, actual spending in 2008 exceeded budgeted spending by nearly $200,000 for all athletic teams. As team travel budgets are brought into line next year, care must be taken to keep them equitable. Travel is yet another budget line where the addition of male participation opportunities can be expected to have a negative effect on equity.

**Recommendation:** Continue to monitor yearly.

D. **Tutors**

Tutoring and academic support are appropriately offered on a gender-neutral basis. No problems were identified.

E. **Coaches**

Three criteria for compliance: 1) Availability; 2) Assignment (qualifications); 3) Compensation

**Conclusion:**
1) Availability: Men’s and women’s teams each have 7 head coaches; women’s teams have 11 assistant coaches and men’s 10.
2) Assignment: Recent job postings for coaches that were examined show a pattern of very similar requirements and responsibilities for coaches of men’s and women’s teams.

3) Compensation. There is a clear gender difference in compensation. In 2008 coaches of women’s teams received only 39.8% of the total compensation pool, though their participation rate was 49.2%. These numbers represent a discouraging trend. The 2004-2009 Five-Year Plan recommended modest steps to move in the direction of closing the salary gap, but, in fact, the institution moved in the opposite direction. The 2002-03 EADA report shows 47.5% of salaries going to women’s teams. The new Five Year Plan needs to address this trend and to encourage an assessment of institutional liability under Title IX, Title VII, and the Equal Pay Act. With respect to compensation discrepancies between coaches who are female and coaches who are male, the Athletics Department should also be mindful of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 which extended substantially the time for filing back pay claims for alleged discrimination under Title VII. Not all discrepancies are discriminatory, but institutions are advised to be in a position to offer legally acceptable explanations. Extended discussion and relevant case law examples are available in the 2000 Achieving Gender Equity Manual published by the NCAA.

Figure 5. The Proportion of Salaries for Men’s and Women’s Coaches from 2001-08.
The Office of Civil Rights’ main concern, however, “is less about the individual coaches and their compensation packages and concerns of discrimination, but rather whether the student-athlete is discriminated against on the basis of gender in the provision of coaches. In other words, are the men’s program and the women’s program provided coaches of equivalent talent?” (p.109) Recent changes in coaching staff have enhanced the student-athlete experience on several teams. We can point with pride to the recent success of our Women’s Soccer team, the Baseball and Softball teams and Men’s Basketball. As is evidenced in recent searches for coaches, it is usually necessary to spend more money to access a higher grade of talent. As positions open up in women’s sports, the institution must be prepared to recruit and hire the caliber of coaches who will ensure that all of our student athletes have the same opportunity to participate on a winning team.

Over the years, the Gender Equity Committee has recommended that the department make serious efforts to increase the number of women who serve as coaches. Very little, if any, progress has been made on that front. Current employee data show that of the 23 coaches listed for all sports, only 5 are women (22%).

Recommendations: Prior to the development of a new Five Year Plan, the Athletics Department in conjunction with Human Resources should conduct a thorough reevaluation of compensation practices within the department guided by Title IX, Title VII, Equal Pay Act, and Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act liabilities. There is some evidence that the department is not in compliance with its own written compensation guidelines with respect to some positions. The Athletics Department also needs to reevaluate its practices in terms of recruiting and hiring new coaches to see if there are additional steps that could be taken to improve the proportion of women coaches.

F. Locker Rooms, Practice and Competitive Facilities

Compliance Standard for Locker Rooms: “Usually, compliance is achieved when the same number of women’s and men’s teams have locker rooms of the same quality” (NCAA Achieving Gender Equity, 2000, p. II-16). Compliance Standard for Practice and Compliance Facilities: “Compliance may be achieved when roughly equivalent percentages of female and male athletes have facilities of equivalent quality exclusively for their use” (p. II-16).

On Friday, February 20, the Gender Equity Subcommittee took a facilities tour of locker rooms and playing surfaces in the Nutter Center, the Mills Morgan Center and Nischwitz Stadium, and the softball field. We did not look at the pool or the soccer fields. We concluded that most teams have adequate locker rooms and playing facilities, and generally they seem gender equitable. The variations that we noticed tended to be in favor of men’s teams. For example, the lounge area for men’s basketball was more expensively and amply furnished, though its layout and design was exactly the same as the women’s lounge. Volleyball has a fairly nice locker room in the Nutter Center, but must occasionally share that space when basketball has a home game. The men’s and women’s soccer teams share the same field and team spaces and have very similar locker
areas. Baseball has onsite lockers and heated dugouts. Softball is overdue for the improvements outlined in the Five Year Plan.

Recommendation: Improvements, beyond those made to the playing surface, need to be made to the softball facilities, per the Five Year Plan. A budget and a fundraising plan should be developed and potential sponsors should be identified before the end of the next academic year.

G. Medical and Training Facilities and Services

Four criteria for compliance: 1) Availability of medical personnel; 2) Availability and qualifications of trainers; 3) Availability and quality of training rooms, weight rooms, and conditioning facilities; 4) Health, accident and injury insurance coverage.

1. Medical Group: Wright State Orthopedic and Sports Medicine (Miami Valley Hospital).

Three (3) male physicians are at the core of student-athlete care. There is a group of ten (10) additional physicians (with various specialties) that work as consultants to the Wright State Orthopedic and Sports Medicine group and will see student-athletes as needed. One (1) female OB/GYN is also included in this consultant group.

2. Wright State University Athletic Training Staff consists of five women and two men. Two of the women are paid .5 FTE through the Athletics Department and .5 FTE through Health, Physical Education and Recreation. One man is paid through Athletics and on through Miami Valley Hospital. Three female graduate assistant trainers receive a stipend through HPR.

The facilities tour showcased our outstanding training, conditioning and weight facilities. An examination of the schedule revealed a gender equitable pattern of use. All WSU student athletes carry health insurance of some kind with no gender differences noted.

H. Housing and Dining Facilities and Services

Criteria for Compliance: 1) Housing; 2) Dining; 3) Housing and Dining During School Breaks.

Equitable arrangements are in place for housing and dining benefits available during the regular academic year, the provision of pre-game and post-game meals, as well as when classes were not in session. No gender-specific problems identified.

I. Publicity

The committee reviewed team posters, media guides, and game-day programs and concluded that they were reasonably equitable. The Athletics Department does a good job of providing local media with gender neutral press releases on all teams and offers balanced campus coverage. Promotional activities are fairly equally distributed. Staff
includes four (4) full-time males. A thorough analysis of assignments should be undertaken before the new Five-Year Plan.

J. Support Services

Criteria for Compliance: 1) Administrative Support; 2) Secretarial Support 3) Office Space and Equipment; 4) Other Support Staff

It is difficult to make generalizations about support services. In 2006, we see a distinct difference in spending in favor of male team support, an improvement for 2007 and wider gap again in 2008.

Table V. Support Services Expenditures for Men’s and Women’s Athletics at WSU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$ Males</th>
<th>$ Females</th>
<th>$ Not Allocated by Gender</th>
<th>% Males</th>
<th>% Females</th>
<th>% NABG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>210,125</td>
<td>100,218</td>
<td>1,310,768</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>149,202</td>
<td>126,079</td>
<td>1,605,377</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>141,303</td>
<td>97,029</td>
<td>1,843,709</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation: Support Services needs a thorough examination when the five-year report is prepared, looking closely at all four of the criteria required for compliance.

K. Recruitment of Student Athletes

Criteria for Compliance: 1) Opportunity to Recruit; 2) Financial and Other Resources; 3) Treatment of Prospective Student-Athletes.

Table VI. Expenditures for Recruiting 2000 – 08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$ Male</th>
<th>$ Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>60,873</td>
<td>40,671</td>
<td>101,544</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>69,844</td>
<td>41,890</td>
<td>111,734</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>91,231</td>
<td>59,130</td>
<td>150,361</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>124,898</td>
<td>67,963</td>
<td>192,861</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>95,693</td>
<td>54,984</td>
<td>150,677</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>62,600</td>
<td>54,520</td>
<td>154,135</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>88,053</td>
<td>170,453</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>101,865</td>
<td>164,265</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a.) In 2006 the Gender Equity Committee began requesting the Athletic Department budget.
b.) EADA, Item 24 Recruiting.
Figure 6. The Proportion of Expenditures for Recruiting Female and Male Athletes at WSU.

Table VI and Figure 6 both show in 2008, that 57% of recruiting dollars were spent for recruiting male student athletes and 43% for recruiting female athletes. The historical trend shows a consistently gender-inequitable pattern, with between 55 and 65% of total dollars going towards the recruitment of male athletes.

Recommendation: Athletic department recruiting practices should be reviewed to determine the source of this consistently inequitable pattern. Coaches who consistently under-spend or over-spend their recruiting budgets should be identified, provided instruction, and assisted through frequent monitoring of their recruiting activities and budgets.


We must be careful not to let the serious problems identified in this report completely overshadow areas of accomplishment. The Athletics Department has made good progress on two persistent problems in the laundry list of “Other Program Areas.” In the Equipment and Supplies category, the department improved by almost 8% in the past year. And in 2008, women actually outspent men by a few thousand dollars in Travel and Per Diem category. These are significant achievements and should be applauded. Year after year, these reports show that we do some things very well: Tutors, Medical and Training Facilities and Services, and Housing and Dining are examples of compliance.
areas where we never identify problems. In fact, the institution has received much positive publicity for our pregnancy policy and the committee is confident that student athletes at Wright State receive first-rate medical and training services. Student GPA’s don’t show up on EADA Reports, but Wright State student athletes are generally excellent in the classroom, equaling or besting the overall university GPA most quarters. Unfortunately, the overall picture of Title IX compliance is not so rosy.

For the first time in the history of Gender Equity reports, Wright State University failed to meet the accepted standards for compliance with Title IX requirements in two major areas: (I) Accommodation of Interests & Abilities and in (II) Athletic Financial Assistance. It is hard to overstate the seriousness of these problems in terms of Gender Equity and Title IX compliance. The most disturbing aspect of this situation is that these are issues we thought we had long since resolved. The Office of Civil Rights and the NCAA are the two oversight bodies most concerned with Title IX compliance. In audits or certifications, both look for positive steps toward full compliance, while recognizing that unforeseen circumstances might cause an institution to experience minor fluctuations in enrollment or financial aid. Our problems, however, result from an intentional act—establishing a new men’s team and not adequately funding the athletes. The committee strongly recommends that the university not leave itself in this exposed position for any longer than absolutely necessary. We must move swiftly to correct these deficiencies.

In terms of the 2004-2009 Five Year Plan, we can identify several problems. We have not fulfilled all of the commitments made to Softball for facility improvements. While good progress on the goal of enhancing the scholarship budget for Women’s Indoor and Outdoor Track was made, last year’s actual spending fell below the goal set for 2002-03. We made no progress on the facility improvements outlined for Women’s Track. We have not made any progress on coaching salaries, nor have we met our goals for hiring women to coaching positions. These failures need to be taken into account when preparing the 2010-2015 Gender Equity Plan.

SECTION TWO: Final Progress Report on the 2004-09 Gender Equity Five-Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues in the Self Study</th>
<th>Measurable Goals</th>
<th>Steps to Achieve Goals</th>
<th>Individuals/Officers Responsible for Implementation</th>
<th>Specific Timetable for Completing the Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintain rates of proportional participation</td>
<td>Proportional Participation</td>
<td>Recruitment and Roster management as required</td>
<td>Director of Athletics Coaches</td>
<td>Continuously Monitor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008-09 Progress Review: Wright State does not meet the standard for proportional participation. The 2008 EADA reports 6% deficiency in the number of participation opportunities offered to women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase scholarships to</td>
<td>Maintain scholarship</td>
<td>Add scholarship support for</td>
<td>Director of Athletics</td>
<td>Maintain continuously</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
keep pace with increased participation rates for women

awards within allowable range
track, continue to move women’s soccer towards being fully funded
Assoc. Dirs. of Athletics

2008-09 Progress Review: Wright State does not meet the standard for compliance, which is achieved when proportional spending is within 1% of the proportion of unduplicated headcount of participants by gender. Spending on the 2008 EADA shows a nearly 13% disparity, which is the result of adding male participation opportunities without also adding sufficient scholarship funding for them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Fund scholarships for track teams</td>
<td>Fund track to levels comparable with other teams</td>
<td>Add $10,000 per year for five years</td>
<td>Director of Athletics Assoc. Dirs. of Athletics</td>
<td>Five years—achieve by next interim report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008-09 Progress Review: Scholarships for women’s track are not on target. Current EADA reports only $37,302 awarded to women track and field and cross-country athletes. Budget enhancements were on target through 2007, but nothing has been added since.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Maintain proportional spending for equipment and supplies</td>
<td>All teams are equipped and supplied in an equitable manner</td>
<td>Maintain appropriate budgets</td>
<td>Business Manager, Coaches, Assoc. Dirs.</td>
<td>Annual Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008-09 Progress Review: Progress made in current year; differential in expenses by gender reduced from 11.8% in 2007 to 4.1% in 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Maintain equitable arrangements for scheduling of games and practice times</td>
<td>Teams have access to facilities on a gender equitable basis</td>
<td>Collaborative input from coaches and student athletes</td>
<td>Director of Athletics, SWA, facilities manager, coaches</td>
<td>Quarterly review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Continue gender equitable travel and per diem regulations</td>
<td>Team travel and per diem are arranged according to written policies that are gender neutral</td>
<td>Ensure adequate budget to meet written guidelines</td>
<td>Director of Athletics, Assoc. Dirs., Business Manager</td>
<td>Annual Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Meet student need and demand for academic support on gender neutral basis

All athletes have open access to needed academic assistance, resources and equipment

Ensure adequate budget and facilities to meet student demand

Director of Athletics, Assoc. Dir., SWA/Asst. Dir.

Annual Review

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Coaching salaries need to move toward a proportionate spending basis</td>
<td>Increase salaries in selected women’s sports</td>
<td>Increase salaries of coaches in selected women’s sports at a rate of 1.5% higher than coaches of comparable men’s teams</td>
<td>Director of Athletics, Assoc. ADs, SWA</td>
<td>Achieve results by 2008, continuously monitor thereafter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Improve ratio of female coaches to female athletes</td>
<td>Increase the number of female coaches by 3</td>
<td>Actively recruit qualified female candidates as vacancies are anticipated and occur</td>
<td>Director of Athletics, Affirmative Action Dir., SWA</td>
<td>Achieve results by 2007, and monitor thereafter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008-09 Progress Review: This item rises from Title VII of the Civil Rights Act which prohibits gender inequity in salary given similar skills and job requirements. Wright State has not met the Office for Civil Rights’ (OCR, US Department of Education) policy of proportional spending (based on participation) for coaches' salaries in past years. This difference is largely due to the significant gap between salaries for the coaching staffs of men's (current and past) and women's basketball.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Move towards more equitable locker rooms, and playing facilities</td>
<td>1. Create more adequate locker space for volleyball, equalize lockers for men’s and women’s basketball</td>
<td>Construction of new Pavilion will enable necessary changes</td>
<td>Director of Athletics</td>
<td>Pavilion Construction complete in 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Continue improvements to the softball facility, culminating in</td>
<td>Establish fundraising plan to raise money for necessary</td>
<td>Director of Athletics, Asst. AD for Development, Assoc. ADs</td>
<td>Completion goal for track by 2007, softball lights by 2008,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Construct track for use by cross-country and indoor and outdoor women’s track.

4. Construct concession and toilet facility with limited locker space to serve soccer and track.

**2008-09 Progress Review:** Goals 2, 3, and 4 have not yet been met. The Gender Equity Committee requests that the Athletics Department provide an updated report on its progress toward achieving Goals 2, 3, and 4 and identify the issues impeding progress in those areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Maintain gender equitable medical and training services</td>
<td>Continue to provide high quality services to all students, taking particular care that students have full access to gender specific medical services.</td>
<td>Develop a written policy for pregnant student athletes, keep an OB-GYN specialist on call, evaluate services on an annual basis</td>
<td>Director of Athletics, Head Athletic Trainer, SWA</td>
<td>Continuously monitor, policy by winter 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2008-09 Progress Review:** On target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Continue gender equitable policies with regard to housing and dining services</td>
<td>Ensure that male and female athletes receive comparable benefits</td>
<td>Survey student athletes and monitor budgets to ensure equity</td>
<td>Director of Athletics, SWA, Assoc. ADs</td>
<td>Annual Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2008-09 Progress Review:** On target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Sports are publicized on an equitable basis</td>
<td>Publicity produced by the university will be equitable in all respects—quality, size, quantity, etc.</td>
<td>Sports Information Director and Marketing Director will analyze and report</td>
<td>Director of Athletics, SID, Marketing Dir., SWA</td>
<td>Annual Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2008-09 Progress Review:** On target.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Support services are to be provided on an equitable basis</td>
<td>There will be no gender differences in terms of clerical support, office space, job perquisites such as club memberships or cars</td>
<td>Annual report will be produced by department</td>
<td>Director of Athletics, Asst. AD for Foundation</td>
<td>Annual Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Recruiting expenditures need to reflect proportion of male to female student athletes</td>
<td>Budgets and expenses for recruiting will reflect proportionality</td>
<td>Coaches will be strongly urged to spend monies budgeted for recruiting</td>
<td>Director of Athletics</td>
<td>Achieve goal in 2004, continuously monitor thereafter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008-09 Progress Review: The current EADA report shows that only 43% of recruiting dollars went towards recruiting female athletes. This area should continue to be rigorously monitored.
Student Welfare Committee Final Report

May 14, 2009

Chair: Steve Fortson. Members: Jeffery John, Mike Sincoff, Jason Franklin, Rod Perry, Judy Chivers, Bob Grant.

The Student Welfare Committee met three times during the 2008-2009 academic year. The following issues were discussed:

**Miscellaneous issues:** The committee was asked to investigate the dissemination of travel allowance by team to determine any patterns of unfairness. It was reported by Athletics Administration personnel in attendance that the existing travel policy was currently being updated/revised. The current policy was forwarded to committee and policy seems to be an umbrella plan for all of athletics. No specific teams were identified in the plan, so it was difficult to determine any unfairness in the policy itself. Athletics Administration staff did share that Men’s and Women’s Basketball are allocated differently (at a higher level) than the other sports. One of the complaints asserted that some coaches do not give players all their per diem funds during trips. It was explained to the committee that funds are at the coach’s discretion, and sometimes players get less if the coach decides on a team meal. This issue was not fully investigated because the committee is still waiting on revised policy. Furthermore, it was reported that current fiscal constraints might cause further modifications to new policy.

The committee also investigated how the upcoming change to semesters might impact student welfare of student-athletes. Quarters were viewed as superior to semesters regarding the issue of eligibility. Since fall quarter ends in mid-November, this allows for some student-athletes to participate sooner versus semester calendars that end a month or more later. The semester calendar was viewed favorably regarding team schedules since most other schools are already on semesters. Under a semester calendar competition takes place while classes are in taking place rather than in-between or after the quarter. Overall, the semester conversion was not viewed as problematic for student welfare.

**Exit Interviews:** The committee discussed student athlete exit surveys at each meeting held this year. It was decided by the committee that a survey would also be given to returning student athletes. A modified version of the existing exit survey was created and made available for returning student athletes. Returning student athletes were surveyed in the winter and spring quarter. Exit interviews were conducted via WebCt survey and in-person. Results and analysis of survey information is ongoing.

**Life Skills Seminars:** Kevin Williams, Women’s Assistant Basketball Coach, currently holds the dual title of Life Skills Coordinator. It was communicated to this committee by the Athletics Administration that they would like to hire someone else as Life Skills Coordinator, who can devote more time to the duties. The position was posted in late fall quarter, but due to fiscal restraints and a hiring freeze, the position was not filled. The initial feedback from exit interviews seems to indicate a lack of programming in the area.
of Life Skills. It will be important for the Athletics department to address this area in the coming academic year.

**Sports Medicine Report:** The committee was briefed by Head Athletic Trainer, Jason Franklin, on the status of the drug testing program, athletic illnesses and injuries, sports medicine coverage and other related issues. Regarding the drug testing program, the staff randomly tested 10-15% of the total number of student athletes participating in sports. The NCAA also tested a select number of participants during its championship competitions. Overall, the program seems to be functioning well, per report of Mr. Franklin. The small numbers of student athletes who do test positive are referred for assessment and appropriate intervention. The assessment and intervention program is headed by Dr. Joseph Keferl. On the topic of illnesses and injuries, Mr. Franklin reported that referrals to sports medicine are fairly average this year. The team of family practice and surgical specialist are attending to all referrals and overall, the system seems to be operating smoothly. The issue of athletic trainer coverage was also discussed and it was reported that trainers are able to cover the majority of team practices and events. However, there have been some shortages to cover tennis, cross-country and track. This shortage seems to be due to the absence of former head Trainer, Tony Ortiz, who no longer works in Athletics. The addition of one full-time trainer would solve this problem. Additionally, one additional trainer could also be given Life Skills responsibilities thereby filling two needs in one hire.