

Chairman Stevens, Ranking Member Inouye and other distinguished members of the Committee, thank you for inviting me to testify before you today.

I am Christine Grant, former Athletic Director for our separate women's athletic department at the University of Iowa for 27 years and currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Health and Sport Studies.

Today I would like to do three things: (1) present you with some facts and figures that describe the progress we have made since 1972 for women in sport in our nation, (2) briefly describe some financial trends, especially in football and men's basketball at the intercollegiate level, and (3) note areas where institutions in specific divisions are doing well and where institutions in divisions need to consider providing additional support.

In slide 1, the growth of girls' participation at the high school level since 1971 has risen to 42% of the athletic population. However, it is also important to note that boys' participation numbers have also increased significantly, from 3.7million to over 4 million. Today, boys still have 58% of all athletic opportunities.

The trend of increasing participation slots for men is also seen at the intercollegiate level. In the NCAA, men in 1989 had approximately 176,000 opportunities, and by 2004 that number had increased by about 42,000.

There is a myth circulating around the nation that Title IX has caused the demise of some men's sports, specifically wrestling and gymnastics. Yet the next slide shows that there has actually been a significant and steady decline in the popularity of these two sports since the early 1980s. You will recall that in the decade of the 1980s, Title IX did not apply to athletics for a period of 4 years due to the Supreme Court's decision in *Grove City College v. Bell*.¹ Additionally, there was little, if any, enforcement of the law even when it was restored in 1988 when Congress passed the Civil Rights

¹ 465 U.S. 555 (1984).

Restoration Act of 1987.² So, the fact that many teams were lost in the 80s is not because of Title IX. The reality is that the popularity of specific sports changes over the years. For example, look at the increase in the number of football teams and soccer teams in that same time frame. Between these two sports, 333 teams were added for men; teams that were lost in wrestling and gymnastics totaled 182.

I also decided to track what was happening in women's gymnastics. As you see, the declining popularity of that sport is clearly apparent.

The General Accounting Office was asked to do an in-depth study of participation opportunities in both the NCAA and the NAIA. Their results show that in an 18 year period, there was a net gain of 36 teams for men, which constituted a 5% increase in participation.

That trend was supported by the data from the NCAA. Between 1988 and 2002, there was a net increase of 61 men's teams. After further research, however, I discovered that while Divisions II and III had experienced net gains for men's teams, Division I had experienced a net loss. Upon further investigation, I discovered that it was in Division 1-A where the greatest net losses had occurred. This is surprising since these institutions have by far the largest budgets. Time does not allow me to expand on this issue except to say that I believe that million-dollar salaries for football and men's basketball, coupled with an arms race in the building of superb facilities, may well be related to the loss of some men's sports in Division I-A. For example, at Iowa, last year we paid our football coach over \$2 million; we paid the President of the University \$300,000.

The next slide shows the enormous population from which we recruit our intercollegiate athletes. Only 163,000 female student-athletes currently get the chance to compete at the university level. Obviously, we could add hundreds of women's teams from this large population. If we are not adding sports at the collegiate level, it is not because of a lack of interest or ability.

² [Pub. L. 100-259, 102 Stat. 28 \(1988\)](#).

Tracking the financial situation for the last thirty years shows that the lack of progress toward increased financial support for women was not caused by lack of money; it was caused by lack of commitment. The money was there; the commitment was not. In Division I-A, for every new dollar that went to women's sport after 1972 till 1993, three new dollars went to men's sports. Let me repeat that: for every new dollar that went to women's sports, three new dollars went to men's sport. Since 1993, for every new dollar spent on women's sports, two new dollars have gone to men's sports. This allocation is not a trend that lends itself to creating equal opportunities and comparable treatment for our female student-athletes. On the contrary, it exacerbates the problem.

In 1993, a new researcher decided to try to factor out the administrative costs. You will note that while the expenses of men's athletics currently are more than double those for women, the administrative costs also far exceed the costs for women's programs.

A troubling trend is the increasing expenditures in football and men's basketball. You will note in the next slide that men's football expenditures have increased three fold since 1985 and men's basketball expenses almost four fold.

At the same time, the deficits in athletic programs have been increasing at a rate that is extremely troubling. In Division I-A, the average deficit has doubled in ten years to \$4.4 million. This is at a time when universities as a whole are struggling to finance academic programs. All other divisions are facing the same trend in deficits.

This leads us to examine the expenditures of football and men's basketball, In 1985, the budgets for these two sports took up almost half of the men's athletic budget - 49%. In the latest financial analysis, these two sports now consume almost three quarters of the men's budget - 74%.

Where does that leave men's so called "minor" sports? On the short end. Let me rephrase what is happening; football with an average squad of 117 in Division I-A is spending about half a percentage point on each student-athlete for a total of 56% of the men's budget; basketball with 15 players is spending over 1% on each student-

athlete for a total of 18% of the men's budget. The other men's sports have only 21% of the budget for as many as 200 student-athletes. It is not Title IX that is causing this problem; it is the insatiable appetites of football and men's basketball.

The latest NCAA Gender Equity figures show that in the area of participation, Division I has been offering a greater percentage of opportunities. In Division I-A, the percentage of female athletes is 8% below the percentage of female undergraduates, and in Division I-AAA, it is 7% below the percentage of female undergraduates. However, it is clear that those in Division I-AA, II and III need to address this issue to determine if their institutions are being responsive to the increasing interests and abilities of their female students.

In the area of scholarships, the figures are better, but that is because they only have to match the participation rates, which, as I mentioned above, are still below where they should be.

In recruiting, Division I-A is well behind the other divisions and subdivisions. This is an area that needs a lot of attention.

So too is the disparity in Division I-A in the total expense column. Division I-A is 14% behind the participation ratio while the other subdivisions and divisions are doing well. Again, it appears that the most lucrative programs in the nation are not committed to equitable treatment for male and female student-athletes.

The final slide shows a 2003 Poll by the Wall Street Journal and NBC News. It notes that 68% of the public approve of Title IX. What is more surprising to many is the result that "cutting back on men's athletics to ensure equivalent athletic opportunities for women" received a 66% approval rating. The public recorded a 70% rating for strengthening the law or making no changes to the law.

In conclusion, the facts show that both men's and women's opportunities to play sports have increased since Title IX was enacted in 1972, with men and boys still receiving more opportunities than women and girls today. While some men's and women's teams have decreased in number, this decline is not because of Title IX, but

rather because the popularity of specific sports changes over the years for various reasons. With respect to expenditures, educational institutions are not even close to providing equal financial support to women, and men's budgets are being dominated by football and basketball, which leaves little money for all other men's teams. The recruiting budgets for female athletes are particularly dismal and need to be increased. Title IX and other gender equity laws must be strongly enforced if we are to continue moving forward towards true equality for women and girls in sports.