

1-1-2003

Title IX Compliance: Non-Appalachian Versus Appalachian in Colleges and Universities

Monica Corbo

Follow this and additional works at: <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#), [Legal Studies Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Corbo, Monica, "Title IX Compliance: Non-Appalachian Versus Appalachian in Colleges and Universities" (2003). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Paper 539.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu.

**TITLE IX COMPLIANCE: NON-APPALACHIAN VERSUS
APPALACHIAN IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

**Thesis submitted to
The Graduate College of
Marshall University**

**In partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree of
Master of Science
Health and Physical Education**

by

Monica Corbo

**T. Jeffery Chandler, EdD., CSCS*D, FASCM, Committee Chairperson
Steven Banks, EdD
John Kiger, ReD
R. Daniel Martin, EdD, ATC**

Marshall University

April 22, 2003

This thesis was accepted on _____
Month Day Year

as meeting the research requirements for the master's degree.

Advisor _____

Department of

Dean of the Graduate College

ABSTRACT

TITLE IX COMPLIANCE: NON-APPALACHIAN VERSUS APPALACHIAN IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

By Monica Corbo

The purpose of this study was to see if economic status of the region was related to a difference in Title IX compliance rates among schools. NCAA Division I-A and I-AA schools were studied in non-Appalachian and Appalachian regions.

The female and male ratings of students to student athletes were derived and compared according to three variables; (1) division, (2) region and (3) division x region. In order to be in compliance the overall female and male ratings should be similar.

The outcome of the overall female and male ratings showed a significant difference, favoring males. Therefore, Title IX compliance is not being met. Division played a significant role in female and male ratings. Regional location, by economic status, was not significant. The effects of division and region combined did not play a significant role.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT..... iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....iv

LIST OF TABLES.....v

CHAPTER I.....1

 INTRODUCTION.....1

CHAPTER II.....4

 REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....4

 HISTORY.....6

 History of Title IX

 History of NCAA

 History of Chronicle of Higher Education

 History of Appalachian Regional Commission

CHAPTER III.....17

 METHODS.....17

 Subjects

 Variables

 Statistics

CHAPTER IV.....22

 RESULTS.....22

 Table 1: Overall Statistics

 Table 2: Female Statistics

 Table 3: Male Statistics

CHAPTER V.....25

 DISCUSSION.....25

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....28

 APPENDIX A.....31

 CURRICULUM VITAE.....41

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Overall Statistics.....	22
TABLE 2: Female Statistics.....	22
TABLE 3: Male Statistics.....	23

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Title IX is a law against discrimination based on gender in institutions receiving federal funding. In 1972, when Title IX was first introduced, its applications and implications on athletics were not the main focus. It was originally aimed at providing equal opportunities for women and men in the work place. And today, Title IX has had an immeasurable effect on the lives of women. For example, the number of women involved in athletics has more than doubled since Title IX was applied to sports.

Title IX makes headlines for three reasons. One reason is the 30th year anniversary of Title IX in 2002. Title IX is being celebrated as a great step forward for women. It played a large role in allowing women to develop in fields ranging from professional careers to athletics. The number of women involved in intercollegiate athletics has rose greatly from less than 30,000 before 1972 to almost 151,000 in 2003, although still not equal to the men's numbers and opportunities at this point (Fletcher, 2003).

However, Title IX has not been without its problems and challenges. The other reason Title IX has been in the news is due to a lawsuit filed by the National Wrestling Coaches Association, NWCA. The NWCA is suing the U.S. Department of Education over how it enforces Title IX in athletics. The enforcement of Title IX has lead to the elimination of hundreds of men's teams across the country. Opponents of the NWCA's lawsuit claim schools use Title IX as the excuse to cut these men's teams but that it is

actually a budget decision they make to invest more money in lucrative sports such as football and basketball (Olian, 2002; Sack, 2002).

The third reason Title IX has received headlines is the Secretary's Commission on Opportunity in Athletics. They were formed when the NWCA filed their lawsuit and charged with the task of reviewing Title IX enforcement. The Commission studied Title IX and considered 24 alterations to the law (Commission to review, 2003). These alterations were adamantly fought by Title IX supporters who argued that while women made great advances in sports, they still have a long way to go to be equal to men (Hawes, 2002).

Throughout the years, different aspects of Title IX have been challenged, such as its application to sports. When applied to athletics, Title IX it is done through the three-part test. Compliance with Title IX relies on colleges proving one of the following guidelines of the three-part test: proportionality, meaning that the percentage of the underrepresented athletes reasonably match the percentage of the overrepresented gender of athletes; history of progress, show an increase in the underrepresented gender's sporting opportunities over time; or accommodation of interests, display an achievement of meeting the underrepresented gender's athletic interests and abilities. This study singles out the proportionality part of the three-part test for several reasons. One, it is the only part that has finite numbers that can be collected and examined. The other two methods of measuring Title IX compliance are subjective. Additionally, it is the only one of the three tests that stands up in a court of law. And finally, it is the main target of the NCWA's lawsuit and of the Secretary's Commission on Opportunity's concerns.

Research has offered many reasons that schools cite for not complying with the proportionality measure, one is a lack of funds. Lack of funds is also accused of being the real reason many schools cut non-profitable men's teams, such as wrestling. This study compares the effect of two characteristics that affect college funds, division and location.

The colleges researched were National Collegiate Athletic Association, or NCAA Division I-A and I-AA, which by definition have football teams. Location was also used to see if colleges with football teams in economically depressed areas like the Appalachian region have a lower compliance rate with Title IX than those outside of this economically depressed area. Using these characteristics each college was put into two of four categories; non-Appalachian Region or Appalachian Region and Division I-A or Division I-AA. Then the proportionality rating of each gender's undergraduate enrollment to its number of athletes of each gender was compared among the different college groupings. The hypothesis being that colleges and universities located in the Appalachian Region will have a lower Title IX compliance rate because they are in an economically depressed area.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

There has been a myriad of research concerning Title IX in connection with the various NCAA divisions of collegiate teams. Calkins and Coleman studied Title IX compliance among all three Division I sports and interviewed a randomly selected few to find why they felt they were or were not able to comply with Title IX. The surveys returned showed that Division I-AAA was much more likely to comply than Division I-A or I-AA schools. These differences were attributed to the fact that both Division I-A and I-AA have football teams where as Division I-AAA does not. They also found that colleges in the South were less likely to comply with Title IX although an explanation was not offered. Other reasons for non-compliance included problems with financial revenue, capacity to access resources and the resolve of the college's decision maker's towards meeting Title IX (Calkins and Coleman, 2000).

Further research conducted by Garrett suggests that less than half of Division I colleges meet with Office of Civil Rights, OCR, and NCAA's definition of Title IX compliance. Researched excuses for not complying with Title IX in this study largely included confusing surrounding policies, procedures and guidelines developed for Title IX and a lack of commitment to meet Title IX standards (Garrett, 2000).

In a more promising Title IX study, it was discovered that the colleges included in the Certified NCAA Division I Athletic Program Schools have made many positive changes in the area of gender equity. The certified schools undergo a 1 year process to ensure the integrity of the athletic department. They may be awarded full certification or partial certification in which case they will be re-evaluated. Eventually, all NCAA school will be certified ([http://www. Ncaa.org/releases/miscellaneous/](http://www.Ncaa.org/releases/miscellaneous/)). These institutions have shown more improvement in the areas of recruiting and operating budgets for female sports than the NCAA as a whole. However, the study found that in the 29 percent of responding institutions there was only one female involved in athletic administration (Hovan, 1998). No one can refute the success of Title IX in creating more opportunities for women. But these research studies show large gaps between where Title IX wants colleges to be and where colleges actually stand.

The theme of these studies seems to be that many colleges are not complying with Title IX. There also seems to be a lower Title IX compliance rate among colleges with football teams (Calkins and Coleman, 2000). Schools cite lack of financial aid, funding, and access to resources as excuses for not meeting Title IX requirements. Therefore, this study aims to look at differences in division and economic regional location among college and university females and males.

This study relies on the numbers officially published by the Chronicle of Higher Education for the academic year of 2000-2001 to perform an ex post facto study of the figures between full-time female and male undergraduate student enrollment and female and male athletes in Division I-A and I-AA colleges.

History

History of Title IX

A complete assessment of Title IX is important to fully appreciate its impact on the lives of women. To understand Title IX one must see how it began, how it has evolved, and what it has become. And realize that Title IX is being constantly challenged and transformed.

Title IX was originally passed in 1972 as “Title IX, Educational Amendments of 1972” in the US Code. Simply stated, Title IX prohibits discrimination based on gender in any educational programs and activities receiving federal funding (Discrimination Based on Sex or Blindness, 1972). Thus, Title IX compliance is important to any educational program in order to keep their federal funding. This original reading of Title IX was broad based for all public institutions and it was not until 1979 that its application was directly applied to intercollegiate athletics.

The 1979 policy interpretation of Title IX was written by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to explain how Title IX was to be applied to intercollegiate athletics (Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Interpretation, 1979). It describes the scope of the athletic application as applied specifically to intercollegiate athletics, but the general principals apply to all club, intramural, and interscholastic athletic programs. It discusses topics like equal financial assistance and scholarships among female and male sports teams. Then it attempts to describe the three-part test of Title IX compliance. Each part is a possible way for the school to meet with Title IX compliance.

Part one is called proportionality and calls for equal athletic benefits and opportunities. For instance, equality of the proportionality number of participants,

coaching salaries, practice time availability, and access to facilities and medical training. It even outlines recruiting and supportive services for sports. Part two of the test calls for effective accommodation of interests and abilities for students of the underrepresented sex. This refers to the adding or detracting of teams due to student interests and abilities. And the third part calls for the college to make a determination of athletic interests and abilities among the underrepresented students and to work towards meeting these factors. This part ensures the university is assessing and fulfilling the demands and interests of the student body.

The three-part test first described by the 1979 Policy Interpretation caused confusion among many educational institutions. This became largely apparent in 1984 with the Grove City College vs. Bell Court Case (Grove City v. Bell, 1984). Grove City claimed that Title IX did not apply to athletics because the athletic department did not directly receive federal funding. The court agreed with Grove City, prompting many Title IX court cases to be withdrawn. This case highlighted problems concerning what federal funding entailed and what was included in educational programs and activities.

Then Congress passed the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987. This Act overturned the Grove City decision by applying Title IX to all facets of any institution receiving any federal money. This meant that intercollegiate athletics was officially added as a federally assisted program whether the federal money was applied directly to athletics or not.

In 1992, the Franklin vs. Gwinnett County Public Schools Court Case strengthened the importance of Title IX (Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools, 1991). Franklin sued the school system for allowing her to be verbally and physically

harassed by a co-worker. She won and received a monetary reward. This served to strengthen Title IX by setting the precedence for intentional Title IX violations to be monetarily rewarded.

In 1996, *Cohen vs. Brown* pinpointed another potential problem with Title IX (*Cohen v. Brown University*, 1996). Brown University was sued because of the decision to eliminate 2 men's teams and 2 women's teams. Brown argued that it was complying with Title IX because it was cutting an equal number of female and male sports. But the amount of money being cut from the women's athletic budget was more than twice the amount being cut from the men's budget. And when the court compared Brown University to the three-part test it failed to comply with any of the three parts. Brown's proportionality was largely and wrongly in favor of men. There was no history of progress because they had only added one women's team since 1970. And they did not meet accommodation of interest because Brown was proposing to cut two women's teams that had a lot of female interest and had proven to be competitive in their league. Because Brown did not meet any part of the three-part test the Supreme Court decided Brown did not have a case.

This case demonstrated the need for educational institutions to have a better understanding of the three-part test. In 1996, the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights wrote a letter concerning the test (*Clarification of intercollegiate athletics policy guidance: The three-part test*, 1996). The letter clarified, in great detail, the three-part test of Title IX. Part one the three-part test says that participation opportunities for male and female athletes should be substantially proportionate to the number of full-time male and female student undergraduate enrollment numbers. It also defines a team's eligibility list

and what “team opportunities” means. The key word in part one is “substantially” proportionate. “Substantially” means the proportionality does not have to be exact, but within at least five percent. The rule also affords for some flexibility in that schools can be working towards proper proportionality, be fairly close to proportionality, or equal to the previous years’ proportionality, all of which are considered compliance.

Under part two of the three-part test, there must be a history or continuing effort towards proportionality progress along the lines of student interest and abilities. Compliance here can be obtained through adding intercollegiate teams, increasing the number of participants or responding to requests to add or elevate a club team to a varsity team for the underrepresented gender. One way of complying with part two is through the elimination of programs for the over-represented sex, the method with which the NWCA disagrees.

Part three of the three-part test determines that the school must accommodate the interests and abilities of the underrepresented sex. This means that if a team is added it must meet an unmet interest, sufficient sustainability must be available and a reasonable ability to be competitive must be considered. This means that schools have to make a valid attempt at creating a successful team. If a team that meets these demands is eliminated, the Office of Civil Rights will be involved to investigate the grounds for elimination. Each school must find and meet unmet interests through examining current and future students. Future students refers to the population from which you will draw the most students such as local community sports, high school sports, and amateur sport leagues in the area. Sufficient ability to sustain a team means that students have the ability and experience to perform the sport and the ability and support to maintain a

varsity team and to compete in intercollegiate competitions. A reasonable competition expectation refers to the ability to oppose competitive schools, without having to travel great distances for every competition.

The main point of the three-part test is to fairly give schools an opportunity to meet Title IX demands. The three-part test offers a lot of flexibility because schools only have to meet one of the three parts to remain compliant with Title IX. Unfortunately, the only one of the three parts that holds up in a court of law is the first part, proportionality. Proportionality is measured with concrete numbers that are hard to dispute. The other two measures are subjective and can be easily misinterpreted.

Many schools cite Title IX, specifically proportionality, as the reason for the elimination of some of its men's teams (Olian, 2002; Sack, 2002; Flores, 2002). Often, wrestling is one of the teams eradicated. This prompted the NWCA to sue the Department of Education. Mike Moyer, the executive director of the NWCA, and others feel that roster capping and elimination of teams in the name of proportionality is not helping women sports in addition to harming men's sports (Sack, 2002; Flores, 2002). Their case outlines the enormous and continued growth of women's sports seemingly at the expense of men's sports. The suit filed states facts such as the 81 percent women's sports growth from the 81-82 academic year through the 98-99 year, while men's sports has grown only 5 percent. As of the 98-99 academic year, women had approximately 330 more teams than men. The NWCA concedes that some schools have been able to reach compliance without the elimination of men's teams. Organizations for other sports, often eliminated, have joined the NWCA lawsuit. For example, the Gymnastics Association and United States Track Coaches Association joined in the lawsuit (Hawes, 2002). In all,

there have been about 20,000 male athletes who have lost their teams and sometimes scholarships because of the decision to eliminate men's teams (Carlson, 2002).

The Commission on Opportunity in Athletics was formed in response to the NWCA's lawsuit and their job was to evaluate Title IX and its enforcement. The panel consisted of a diverse group of 15 people, including males and females. The commission members selected held many different views. The NWCA's executive director, Mike Moyer, was pleased with the diversity of the panel (Davis, 2002; Hawes, 2002). The commission debated and voted on 24 possible recommendations for changing Title IX and then submitted their report to Education Secretary Rod Paige (Commission to Review Title IX rule, 2003; Fletcher, 2003; Changes to Title IX in play, 2003). The recommendations involved changing athlete proportionality standards to a pre-established number, splitting proportionality 50/50 for athlete gender numbers and scholarship amounts, and completely eradicating the proportionality requirement (Fletcher, 2003; Changes in title IX in play, 2003). Many females were concerned that female athletes and programs would lose opportunities due to these recommendations (Brady, 2003; Olian, 2002). Many argued that team cuts are not due to Title IX but over spending on football and basketball programs (Changes to title IX in play, 2003; No big changes in women's sports law, 2003). Arguments for the recommended changes were backed by situations such as a lack of female interest in sports while hundreds of men's teams are being eliminated (Commission to review title IX rule, 2003). The main point of contention reviewed by the panel was the proportionality standard because proportionality is the only test considered in a court of law. Proportionality has been the labeled cause of many

decisions to cut men's athletics teams (Davis, 2002). The commission was unable to agree on many recommendations but was able to agree on three points:

1. Title IX must be better explained to schools
2. Title IX violator's sanctions should be enforced, no sanctions have been as to this date
3. Schools should stop overspending on sports like football and basketball at the expense of other men's sports

(No Big Changes in Women's Sports Law, 2003)

History of NCAA

The NCAA, National Collegiate Athletics Association, is an extensive governing body for collegiate athletics. In this study, the colleges identified and used fit within certain NCAA standards and definitions of Division I-A and I-AA. A comprehension of the NCAA and its scope is important to authenticate its legitimacy as an institution.

Title IX is an important concern for the NCAA since they are concerned with any national athletics problems or concerns. The NCAA is a "voluntary association of about 1200 colleges and universities, athletic conferences, and sports organizations devoted to the sound administration of intercollegiate athletics" (<http://www.ncaa.org/>). The NCAA is composed of about 1,200 colleges and universities, has approximately 320 employees, and is located in Indianapolis. The general goals of the NCAA are to promote, protect, prepare, and provide for student athletes.

The NCAA got its initial start due to the extreme roughness of football in the early 1900's. Many athletes were seriously injured or even killed during these football games. This prompted President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905 to call a meeting with

colleges about making football reforms. Out of this meeting came the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS). On March 31, 1906 the IAAUS was officially constituted and went on to become the NCAA in 1910. In 1921, the first NCAA Championship was held for Track and Field. From there, NCAA Championship Competitions as well as the NCAA grew quickly. In 1973, the NCAA was so large it divided into 3 divisions known as Division I, II and III. In 1978, Division I further divided into A, AA, and AAA. Finally, in 1980, the NCAA scope covered female sports. In 1997, the NCAA changed the governance of athletics to allow each school more autonomy to rule over their particular school and division (<http://www.ncaa.org/>).

The NCAA has strict requirements that must be met in order for any school to belong to Division I. The NCAA requirements for Division I consider many facets of the athletic program, from number of teams to season scheduling minimums. Division I programs must have at least seven sports for men and women including two team sports for each gender. These numbers can vary slightly to six men's team and eight women's teams. Each gender must participate in a sport during each season. Further requirements consist of competition scheduling criteria and minimum contest and participant numbers. Sports teams schedules, except football and basketball, must meet a minimum number of contests against other Division I schools. Any contests beyond the minimum requirement must consist of 50 percent Division I opponents. These Basketball teams must play 1/3 of all contests at home and can only play two schools outside of Division I. Division I requirements also demand that schools meet minimum, and do not exceed maximum, financial aid awards for their athletics program (<http://www.ncaa.org/>).

Division I-A football has to meet minimum requirements for contest attendance numbers or stadium seating availability and conference member minimums. These requirements afford some flexibility because combinations of two or more without meeting every single requirement can qualify a school as Division I-A. First, a team must have at least 17,000 people attend per home game, or average 20,000 people at home games over the most recent four year period or have 30,000 permanent seats in the stadium or be in a conference with at least six other members who offer football and more than half of these schools. Division I-AA teams do not need to meet minimum attendance requirements (<http://www.ncaa.org/>).

History of Chronicle of Higher Education

This study relies on The Chronicle of Higher Education for much of its information. This means that an understanding of what it is and why it is considered a reliable source is imperative to the validity of this research.

Title IX and any other important information affecting colleges or universities can be found in the Chronicle of Higher Education. The Chronicle is a weekly publication containing news from campuses all over the world, personal and professional concerns on campuses, statistics concerning anything from salaries to enrollment numbers, opinion articles by respected academics, job listings, and listings of updates and deadlines ranging from calendar events to grant information, among other things. Its web site contains everything in the paper issue and more including Internet uplinks, daily updates, an archive of “The Chronicle” since 1989, open forums for discussions, and a career network (<http://www.chronicle.com/>).

History of Appalachian Regional Commission

This study calls for the identification of a large economically depressed area. The Appalachian Region is a nationally recognized area of economic depression. This area can be located and labeled through the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC). An understanding of the ARC and the Appalachian Region is essential to establishing this area as a viable economically depressed region.

ARC began in the 1960s when the governors of the region formed the Conference of Appalachian Governors to help the Appalachian Region. In 1961, this Conference invoked the sympathetic ear of President John F. Kennedy. In 1963, the group became the Presidential Appalachian Regional Commission aimed at “a comprehensive program for the economic development of Appalachian Region”

(<http://www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=1>). President Lyndon B. Johnson submitted the Commission's plan in 1964. By 1965, the Appalachian Regional Development Act was passed due to growing concerns about the varied problems facing the region. Problems such as one third of the population lived in poverty, per capita income was significantly lower than the US average, and the combination of unemployment and harsh living conditions which drove more than two million people out of the region.

The Commission is dedicated to helping the people of Appalachia help themselves through the creation of jobs that will help economic stability and improve quality of life in the area. The Commission's goals are to aid in population growth, economic strength, technological progress and the health of the people in the region

(www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=27). The ARC is composed of a presidential appointee and incorporates 13 states, which includes all of West Virginia and parts of New York,

Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Ohio. Entire counties must apply for and meet the ARC requirements to be considered a member of the ARC. There are approximately 410 counties and 23 million people included in the 2003 Appalachian Region (www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=2). Each year the governors of the counties in the region submit spending plans for various projects for their communities. The governors then all congregate to review and approve individual projects. Each of these projects is passed on to the ARC federal co-chair for final approval. Once approved by the federal co-chair, the funds allotted to the ARC by Congress are accordingly distributed among the region (<http://www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=1>).

CHAPTER III

Methods

This study aims to see if colleges with football teams in economically depressed areas have a lower compliance rate with Title IX's proportionality test. The colleges used were NCAA's Division I-A and I-AA. Then the school's region was labeled as non-Appalachian or Appalachian. The proportionality rating for each of these college's female and male athletes was compared among the variables.

Subjects

The subjects were NCAA Division I-A and Division I-AA schools because they have football programs. Football teams primarily consist of males, are large and draw much of the athletic program's money and attention. Previous studies have shown that schools with football programs have a harder time complying with Title IX. As of school year 2000-2001, there were 115 schools in Division I-A and 124 in Division I-AA. All together this study has a total of 239 schools and collects each school's data from the Chronicle of Higher Education's 2000-2001 statistics. The 2000-2001 school year was used because it takes longer than a year to gather all of the statistics from each college.

Variables

Chronicle of Higher Education web site provided the 2000-2001 academic year female and male enrollment figures for each school, as well as, the number of female and

male athletes participating for each school (<http://www.chronicle.com>). The enrollment number was divided by the number of athletes for each gender and this was the proportionality rating used in the comparisons among the variables.

The first variable is division. Each school used belonged to either Division I-A or I-AA. The Chronicle for Higher Education has separate lists of schools belonging to each division listed by academic years. Of the 239 subjects in Division I-A and I-AA, there are 29 Appalachian Region schools and 210 non-Appalachian Region schools.

Variable two was identifying the region to which the school belongs. The regions used were the non-Appalachian and Appalachian. The region for each school was located with the help of the Appalachian Regional Commission's list of all the counties located within the Appalachian Region (<http://www.arc.gov/index.do?deld=27>). After scanning each school's web sites the town or city the school was located in was identified. Then each town was matched to its county through Town USA's General Information division (<http://www.town-usa.com>). These counties were checked against the list of counties provided by the Appalachian Regional Commission's list. There were 6 towns that could not be located on the Town USA page, consequently a map web site called "mapblast" was used to locate the city and its location was compared against the shaded Appalachian Region Map provided by the ARC (<http://www.mapblast.com>) (<http://www.arc.gov/images>). There are 210 non-Appalachian schools and 29 Appalachian schools.

The third variable was a combination of the first and second variables. The schools were labeled by both the division and regional location (division x region). The breakdown of the third variable was: Division I-A non-Appalachian 103, Division I-A

Appalachian 12, Division I-AA non-Appalachian 107, and Division I-AA Appalachian 17.

This information was entered into a table in Excel with 11 columns (Appendix A). The first three columns of the table represent the three variables. The first column was the division to which each school belongs. A “1” represented schools in Division I-A, and a “2” represented schools in Division I-AA. The second column labeled the schools regional location as being non-Appalachian or Appalachian. Those not included in the Appalachian region received a “1” and were called non-Appalachian schools. Schools inside the Appalachian region were given a “2” and called Appalachian schools. The third column used was the third variable, division x region, which divides the schools up using both the division and region. A “1” was given to Division I-A non-Appalachian schools, a “2” represented Division I-A Appalachian schools, a “3” was Division I-AA non-Appalachian schools and finally, a “4” marked Division I-AA Appalachian schools. Each category had to be separated for easy transference and use in SPSS, the statistical analysis program used.

The fourth and fifth columns were for school identification purposes. The fourth column was a unique number code given to each school. The fifth column listed all of the schools by name so they could be matched to their code number. Each school needed a code number to be identified by because SPSS cannot read words, only numbers. If a school had to be identified on SPSS it would have to be through its code number.

And the last six columns were specific information about the schools. Column six was the number of undergraduate female students enrolled. Column seven, the number of undergraduate male students enrolled. Column eight and nine were the number of female

athletes and male athletes at each school, respectively. Column ten was the proportionality rating of female athletes to undergraduate females enrolled. Column eleven was the proportionality rating of male athletes to undergraduate males enrolled.

The proportionality ratings were computed by hand by dividing the number of female athletes in one school by the number of undergraduate females enrolled in that same school. The same formula was used to find the male proportionality rating number of each school. It was these ratings that were focused on when the comparisons between schools using the variables was completed.

Statistics

The type of data collection used is called ex post facto. Ex post facto means that all the information was previously collected and is being recalled in order to perform a new analysis of the data. All of the school's undergraduate enrollment numbers and numbers of athletes were provided by the Chronicle of Higher Education. The information was then divided up and placed into specific categories so that a new way of manipulating the material was derived from the old information collected.

The first statistical test completed was a paired t-test of the entire table. This compared the overall athlete ratings of females and males. A paired t-test was used because this is the test used when the information being compared is two variables that are linked together. Each pair of proportionality ratings, female and male, were linked together because they belonged to the same school.

The next comparisons revolved around both the division and region variables. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was done for each characteristic, females and males individually. The one-way ANOVA was used because it allows a comparison of

two variables that are not grouped together. The female and male scores were not grouped together but considered separately for each school. The first of the ANOVA tests, the second test overall, was a comparison of the female ratings in Division I-A to I-AA. The third test compared the male ratings between Division I-A and I-AA. The fourth test was of the female ratings between non-Appalachian and Appalachian schools. The fifth, analyzed the male ratings between non-Appalachian and Appalachian schools.

Then a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to measure differences between the female and male ratings due to the third variable. The third variable divided the schools into four groups by division and region. Using this, the sixth test was the female scores and the seventh was the male scores. This allowed a test of the effects of these variables together on female and male ratings.

CHAPTER IV

Results

Table 1: Overall Female and Male Proportionality Ratings

	Mean of All Female Proportionality Ratings	Mean of All Male Proportionality Ratings	t	p
Overall	6.748	9.179	-5.516	.001*

* statistical significance ($p < .05$)

The first analysis was a paired t-test between the overall female ratings of athletes compared to the overall male ratings of athletes. Overall enrollment numbers were 1,413,725 for females and 1,278,492 for males, while the overall number of athletes was 53,509 females and 73,931 males.

Table 2: Female Proportionality Ratings Compared Among Division and Region

	Mean Female Proportionality Ratings	F	p
Division		14.314	.001*
I-A	4.461		
I-AA	8.869		
Region		.001	.981
non-Appalachian	6.754		
Appalachian	6.710		

* statistical significance ($p < .05$)

This was a one-way analysis of variance or ANOVA that measured the amount of effect each of the characteristics had on the female ratings. The first characteristic measured was the effect of the school's division. Division I-A had 954,260 females

enrolled and 28,254 female athletes. Division I-AA had 459,465 females enrolled and 25,255 females in athletics.

The non-Appalachian and Appalachian regional location was the next characteristic measured. Non-Appalachian schools' females have 1,277,395 enrolled and 47,732 in athletics. The Appalachian enrollment for females was 136,330 and they had 5,777 female athletes.

Table 3: Male Proportionality Ratings Compared Among Division and Region

	Mean Male Proportionality Ratings	F	p
Division		52.306	.001*
I-A	5.623		
I-AA	12.477		
Region		2.094	.149
non-Appalachian	8.899		
Appalachian	11.207		

* statistical significance ($p < .05$)

Division I-A had 895,886 males enrolled and 38,545 males in athletics. Division I-AA had 382,606 males enrolled and 35,386 male athletes.

Non-Appalachian schools had a male enrollment of 1,143,792 and 65,512 male athletes. Appalachian schools' male enrollment was 134,700 and athlete numbers were 8,420.

Lastly, a multivariate analysis of variance or MAONVA measured the effect of both variables, division and region, together on female and male ratings. The number of females enrolled in division I-A, non-Appalachian schools was 866,955 and the number of athletes in the same was 25,564. The number of division I-A, Appalachian females

enrolled was 87,305 and 2,690 for the athletes in these schools. Enrollment for division I-AA, non-Appalachian females was 410,440 and female athletes of the same number 22,168. Finally, division I-AA, Appalachian school's female enrollment was 49,025 and 3,087 for their female athletes.

Do you want a MANOVA table here? (fix this up)

The effects that division and region jointly have on male ratings were done through a MANOVA. Division I-A, non-Appalachian schools had a male enrollment number of 804,751 and an athlete number of 34,628. The division I-A, Appalachian schools' enrollment was 91,135 and 3,917 for the male athletes. There were 339,041 males enrolled in division I-AA, non-Appalachian schools and 30,883 of them were athletes. And division I-AA, Appalachian male enrollment was 43,565 while 4,503 of them were athletes. There was no significant interaction between division and region ($F = .115$; $p = .735$). There was also no significant interaction between division and region ($F = 1.354$; $p = .246$).

CHAPTER V

Discussion

The overall results for the females and males were anticipated. Garrett's research found less than half of Division I colleges met Title IX compliance. So when this study discovered a significant difference between the overall female ratings and the overall male ratings, in favor of the males, there was little surprise. A majority of the schools tested did not meet Title IX proportionality standards. If they did meet the proportionality standard the female and male ratings would equal within 5 percent of each other. This outcome was in spite of Hovan's research that discovered that Certified NCAA Division I Athletic Program Schools made more improvements for female sports than the rest of the entire NCAA. But this finding of Hovan's could have been due to circumstances surrounding the certified schools. These schools could have the largest amount of improvement to do and therefore when they made improvements they were still behind or maybe even with other schools in Title IX compliance.

Based on previous research the results for the analysis of the division were also expected. They showed that the division variable had a significant effect on the ratings of both females and males. There was a significant disproportion for female and male ratings between Division I-A and Division I-AA. This result was expected because of Calkins and Coleman's research. Calkins and Coleman's research suggested there would be differences between divisions when they stated that Division I-AAA is more likely to comply with Title IX than Division I-A and I-AA (Calkins and Coleman, 2000).

The only outcome not predicted was that the regional location of the schools would not play a significant role in Title IX proportionality compliance. Calkins and Coleman's research labeled the number one reason for not complying with Title IX as lack of financial revenue (Calkins and Coleman, 2000). Therefore the prediction was that the school's location outside of the economically depressed region, non-Appalachian, or inside of Appalachian region would play a larger role in Title IX proportionality compliance. But this researched showed that there was no significant difference between the two regions.

The last analysis done was also a surprise, for the same reason the region outcomes were a surprise. The last analysis compared was the effect of division and region together on female and male ratings. Once again since this characteristic included the regional location it was thought that there would be a significant difference between the groups. Neither female nor male ratings had a significant difference between the division x region groups.

This means that out of division, region and division x region combined the only variable that had a significant effect on Title IX proportionality compliance was division. The only variable tested responsible for the significant difference in the overall values, and therefore non-compliance with proportionality, was the division in which the schools competed.

Future research could compare compliance among schools of different economically depressed regions. Another would be to compare the schools within the Appalachian region for differences between actually money available to the athletic departments. Another option for a study would be to look further into division as the

significant factor and compare the percent of Division I-A to Division I-AA budgets spent on athletics.

Bibliography

ARC/About ARC. Retrieved October 10, 2002, from

<http://www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=1>

ARC/Appalachian Region. Retrieved October 10, 2002, from

<http://www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=27>

ARC/Counties in Appalachia. Retrieved October 10, 2002, from

<http://www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=2>

Brady, E. (2003). Title IX report reforms to balance law for male athletes. *USA Today*, p. 8C.

Calkins, K. & Coleman, C. (2000). Factors influencing title IX compliance in college athletics. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 2032.

Cantu`, N.V. (Jan. 16, 1996). Clarification of intercollegiate athletics policy guidance:

The three-part test. Retrieved Nov. 6, 2002 from

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/ORC/docs/clarific.html>.

Carlson, T. (2002, November) Foul Play. *Readers Digest*. pp. 39-41.

CBS News/Changes to Title IX in Play. (Jan. 30, 2003). Retrieved March 6, 2003,

from <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/01/30/national/main538566.shtml>

CBS News/No Big Changes in Women's Sports Law. (Jan. 31, 2003). Retrieved March

6, 2003, from

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/01/28/national/main538215.shtml>

Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved December 5, 2002, from

<http://www.chronicle.com/stats/genderequity/>

Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 *et seq.* (West 1988).

Cohen v. Brown University, 101 F. 3d 155 (1996).

Commission to review title IX rule. (2003). *The Herald*, p. 3D.

Davis, M.R. (2002, September 4). Diverse title IX panel takes on tough task. *Education Week*, 22, pp.37-39.

Discrimination Based on Sex or Blindness, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 *et seq.* (West 1972).

Dissemination of policy. 34 C.F.R. § 106.9 (July 1, 2001).

Fletcher, M.A. (2003). Proposal to change title IX could cut scholarships. *The Herald*, p. 5A.

Flores, C. (2002, February 1). Wrestling coaches sue education department over title IX enforcement. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48, pp. A39.

Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools, 503 S. Ct. 60 (1991).

Garrett, D.M. (2000). The effectiveness of NCAA division I athletic program leadership in assuring title IX compliance. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 3838.

Grove City v. Bell, 465 S. Ct. 555 (1984).

Hawes, Kay. (2002, December 23). Title IX in the balance: After year of scrutiny, law's longtime interpretation faces uncertain future. *NCAA News Centerpiece*. pp. A1, A4.

Hovan, J.A. (1998). Changes in certified NCAA DI athletic programs in the area of gender-equity. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60, 1960.

MapBlast! Maps, Driving Directions, Yellow Pages. Retrieved January 10, 2003, from <http://www.mapblast.com/myblastd/>

NCAA Announces Athletics Program Schools. Retrieved April 22, 2003, from <http://www.ncaa.org/releases/miscellaneous/1998082201ms.htm>

NCAA Division I, II and III Membership Criteria. Retrieved October 10, 2002, from http://www.ncaa.org/about/div_criteria.html

Olian, C. (Executive Producer). (2002, December 1). *60 Minutes* [Television broadcast]. New York: CBS.

Region Map. Retrieved October 10, 2002, from <http://www.arc.gov/images/regionmap.gif>

Sack, J.L. (2002, January 1). Lawsuit challenges department's gender-equity rules. *Education Week*, 21, p. 5.

The History of the NCAA. Retrieved October 10, 2002, from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/history.html>

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; A policy interpretation: Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics, 239, Fed. Reg. 71413 (Dec. 11, 1979). (to be codified at 45 C.F.R. pt. 86).

Town USA Search Page. Retrieved January 10, 2003, from <http://www.town-usa.com/searchengines/search2.html>

U.S. GAO. (2001). Intercollegiate Athletics: Four-Year Colleges' Experiences Adding and Discontinuing Teams. Report No. GAO-01-297. Washington, D.C.: GAO

Appendix A

College and University General Information

Division	Region	Division and Region	School Code Number	Schools	Female Enrolled	Male Enrolled	Female Athlete	Male Athlete	% Female Athletes	% Male Athletes
DI-A (1)	non-App (NA) (1)	DI-A/NP (1) DI-A/A (2)								
1	1	1	1	Arizona State University	17,752	16,233	224	334	1.263	2.058
1	1	1	2	Arkansas State University	4,221	3,122	114	205	2.701	6.566
1	1	1	3	Auburn University	8,753	9,573	227	295	2.593	3.082
1	1	1	4	Ball State University	7,799	6,960	255	342	3.267	4.914
1	1	1	5	Baylor University	6,812	4,994	188	332	2.76	6.448
1	1	1	6	Boise State University	4,840	4,052	170	243	3.512	5.997
1	1	1	7	Boston College	4,657	4,272	411	483	8.825	11.306
1	1	1	8	Bowling Green State University	8,790	6,704	255	329	2.901	4.908
1	1	1	9	Brigham Young University	15,225	14,275	340	322	2.233	2.256
1	1	1	10	California State University at Fresno	7,012	5,229	318	292	4.535	5.584
1	1	1	11	Central Michigan University	9,064	6,143	233	298	2.571	4.851
1	1	1	12	Colorado State University	9,972	9,103	238	267	2.387	2.933
1	1	1	13	Duke University	2,884	3,180	301	414	10.437	13.019
1	1	1	14	East Carolina University	7,950	5,768	209	336	2.629	5.825
1	1	1	15	Eastern Michigan University	11,019	7,112	281	355	2.55	4.992
1	1	1	16	Florida State University	14,840	11,582	242	298	1.631	2.573
1	1	1	17	Georgia Institute of Technology	3,077	7,668	155	305	5.037	3.978
1	1	1	18	Indiana University at Bloomington	15,150	13,142	349	405	2.03	3.082
1	1	1	19	Iowa State University	9,840	12,247	266	430	2.703	3.511
1	1	1	20	Kansas State University	8,604	9,648	279	299	3.243	3.099
1	1	1	21	Kent State University	8,701	5,785	257	281	2.954	4.857

1	1	1	22	Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge	13,772	12,358	252	393	1.83	3.18
1	1	1	23	Louisiana Tech University	3,306	3,805	111	230	3.358	6.045
1	1	1	24	Miami University (Ohio)	8,286	6,671	309	267	3.279	4.002
1	1	1	25	Michigan State University	16,056	13,884	402	368	2.504	2.651
1	1	1	26	Middle Tennessee State University	7,753	6,683	125	246	1.612	3.681
1	1	1	27	New Mexico State University	6,708	5,745	157	174	2.34	3.029
1	1	1	28	North Carolina State University	7,470	10,725	225	342	3.012	3.189
1	1	1	29	Northern Illinois University	8,154	7,114	197	277	2.416	3.894
1	1	1	30	Northwestern University	4,022	3,663	192	220	4.774	6.006
1	1	1	31	Ohio State University at Columbus	15,132	15,649	403	520	2.665	3.323
1	1	1	32	Oklahoma State University	8,117	8,812	220	277	2.711	3.143
1	1	1	33	Oregon State University	6,352	7,420	172	315	2.701	4.254
1	1	1	34	Purdue University	12,172	17,066	223	308	1.832	1.805
1	1	1	35	Rice University	1,249	1,409	138	283	11.049	20.085
1	1	1	36	Rutgers University at New Brunswick	13,360	11,697	436	610	3.263	5.215
1	1	1	37	San Diego State University	14,222	10,921	310	236	2.18	2.161
1	1	1	38	San Jose State University	7,676	7,218	163	181	2.124	2.508
1	1	1	39	Southern Methodist University	3,106	2,556	171	222	5.505	8.685
1	1	1	40	Stanford University	3,243	3,305	370	467	11.409	14.13
1	1	1	41	State University of New York at Buffalo	6,521	7,814	260	328	3.987	4.198
1	1	1	42	Syracuse University	6,271	5,083	262	338	4.178	6.65
1	1	1	43	Temple University	8,558	6,242	281	314	3.284	5.03
1	1	1	44	Texas A&M University at College Station	17,687	18,693	399	413	2.256	2.209
1	1	1	45	Texas Christian University	3,589	2,480	201	352	5.6	14.194
1	1	1	46	Texas Tech University	9,550	10,968	220	313	2.304	2.854
1	1	1	47	Tulane University	2,893	2,794	124	243	4.286	8.697
1	1	1	48	United States Air Force Academy	660	3,665	282	912	42.727	24.884

1	1	1	49	United States Military Academy	653	3,476	248	660	37.979	18.987
1	1	1	50	United States Naval Academy	642	3,530	288	1,206	44.86	34.164
1	1	1	51	University of Akron	6,624	5,821	156	300	2.349	5.134
1	1	1	52	University of Arizona	13,945	12,459	227	260	1.628	2.087
1	1	1	53	University of Arkansas at Fayetteville	5,198	5,490	180	308	3.463	5.61
1	1	1	54	University of California at Berkeley	11,849	10,829	405	485	3.418	4.479
1	1	1	55	University of California at Los Angeles	13,752	11,251	278	344	2.022	3.058
1	1	1	56	University of Central Florida	11,300	9,034	248	250	2.195	2.767
1	1	1	57	University of Cincinnati	7,390	8,108	270	272	3.654	3.355
1	1	1	58	University of Colorado at Boulder	10,408	11,275	194	250	1.684	2.217
1	1	1	59	University of Florida	15,597	13,547	255	312	1.635	2.303
1	1	1	60	University of Georgia	12,070	9,463	301	404	2.494	4.269
1	1	1	61	University of Hawaii-Manoa	6,503	5,217	226	241	3.475	4.62
1	1	1	62	University of Houston	9,025	7,825	202	324	2.238	4.141
1	1	1	63	University of Idaho	3,637	4,309	174	235	4.784	5.454
1	1	1	64	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	17,267	19,471	272	360	1.575	1.849
1	1	1	65	University of Iowa	10,509	8,775	314	389	2.988	4.433
1	1	1	66	University of Kansas	9,148	8,337	330	369	3.607	4.426
1	1	1	67	University of Kentucky	7,827	7,247	204	355	2.606	4.899
1	1	1	68	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	7,953	6,137	126	237	1.584	3.862
1	1	1	69	University of Louisiana at Monroe	4,215	2,619	146	256	3.464	9.77
1	1	1	70	University of Louisville	7,833	6,631	239	276	3.051	4.162
1	1	1	71	University of Maryland College Park	10,787	11,164	337	354	3.124	3.171
1	1	1	72	University of Memphis	8,945	6,351	135	273	1.509	1.149
1	1	1	73	University of Miami	4,370	3,706	223	245	5.103	6.611
1	1	1	74	University of Michigan at Ann Arbor	12,319	12,093	447	441	3.629	3.647
1	1	1	75	University of Minnesota-Twin	11,567	10,333	358	369	3.095	3.571

				Cities						
1	1	1	76	University of Mississippi	4,443	4,307	169	352	3.804	8.173
1	1	1	77	University of Missouri at Columbia	8,994	7,983	264	361	2.935	4.522
1	1	1	78	University of Nebraska at Lincoln	8,483	9,485	294	529	3.466	5.577
1	1	1	79	University of Nevada at Las Vegas	5,497	4,529	210	229	3.82	5.056
1	1	1	80	University of Nevada at Reno	5,432	4,420	222	209	4.087	4.709
1	1	1	81	University of New Mexico	6,751	5,240	216	449	3.2	9.523
1	1	1	82	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	8,962	5,761	379	477	4.229	8.28
1	1	1	83	University of North Texas	11,557	9,502	163	216	1.41	2.273
1	1	1	84	University of Notre Dame	3,717	4,321	409	509	11.003	11.78
1	1	1	85	University of Oklahoma at Norman	8,579	9,143	220	375	2.564	4.101
1	1	1	86	University of Oregon	7,481	6,604	221	258	2.954	3.907
1	1	1	87	University of South Carolina at Columbia	6,854	5,684	235	308	3.429	5.419
1	1	1	88	University of South Florida	17,879	12,576	242	233	1.345	1.853
1	1	1	89	University of Southern California	7,498	7,828	283	325	3.774	4.152
1	1	1	90	University of Southern Mississippi	7,730	5,089	146	264	1.889	5.188
1	1	1	91	University of Texas at Austin	16,614	15,922	291	348	1.752	2.186
1	1	1	92	University of Texas at El Paso	8,295	6,929	137	218	1.652	3.146
1	1	1	93	University of Toledo	6,064	6,047	214	262	3.529	4.333
1	1	1	94	University of Tulsa	1,382	1,262	175	214	12.663	16.957
1	1	1	95	University of Utah	5,908	7,221	191	259	3.233	3.587
1	1	1	96	University of Virginia	6,798	5,691	346	435	5.09	7.644
1	1	1	97	University of Washington at Seattle	11,579	10,622	306	335	2.643	3.154
1	1	1	98	University of Wisconsin at Madison	15,171	13,302	479	431	3.157	3.24
1	1	1	99	University of Wyoming	4,770	4,689	208	218	4.361	4.65
1	1	1	100	Utah State University	6,171	5,825	184	231	2.982	3.966
1	1	1	101	Vanderbilt University	3,254	2,981	164	193	5.04	6.474

1	1	1	102	Washington State University	7,015	7,109	256	271	3.65	3.812
1	1	1	103	Western Michigan	9,897	8,949	240	330	2.425	3.688
			Totals		866,955	804,751	25,564	34,628		
			Mean		8,417	7,813	248	336	4.607686	5.676745
1	2	2	104	Clemson University	6,395	7,671	235	338	3.675	4.406
1	2	2	105	Marshall University	4,430	3,685	168	315	3.792	8.548
1	2	2	106	Mississippi State University	5,785	7,033	136	251	2.351	3.569
1	2	2	107	Ohio University	8,879	7,411	265	335	2.985	4.52
1	2	2	108	Pennsylvania State University	15,158	16,931	412	492	2.718	2.906
1	2	2	109	University of Alabama at Birmingham	4,192	2,872	151	205	3.602	7.1387
1	2	2	110	University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa	7,945	7,111	210	346	2.643	4.866
1	2	2	111	University of Pittsburgh	7,773	7,156	189	293	2.431	4.094
1	2	2	112	University of Tennessee at Knoxville	9,129	8,731	276	335	3.023	3.837
1	2	2	113	Virginia Tech	8,480	12,260	220	346	2.594	2.822
1	2	2	114	Wake Forest University	2,020	1,930	168	273	8.317	14.145
1	2	2	115	West Virginia University	7,119	8,344	260	388	3.652	4.65
			Totals		87,305	91,135	2,690	3,917		
			Mean		7,275	7,595	224	326	3.481917	5.458475
2	1	3	116	Alabama State University	2,502	1,846	105	175	4.192	9.48
2	1	3	117	Alcorn State University	1,441	957	118	213	8.189	22.257
2	1	3	118	Austin Peay State University	3,929	2,729	113	169	3.433	6.193
2	1	3	119	Bethune-Cookman College	1,461	1,107	92	141	6.297	12.737
2	1	3	120	Brown University	3,016	2,676	553	523	18.336	19.544
2	1	3	121	Butler University	2,164	1,296	182	289	8.41	22.299
2	1	3	122	California Polytechnic State University	6,579	8,230	195	288	2.964	3.499

2	1	3	123	California State University at Northridge	9,966	6,983	177	251	1.776	3.594
2	1	3	124	California State University at Sacramento	8,688	6,485	276	253	3.211	3.901
2	1	3	125	Canisius College	1,480	1,393	205	306	13.851	21.967
2	1	3	126	Central Connecticut State University	3,195	3,180	207	205	6.479	6.447
2	1	3	127	Charleston Southern University	1,362	953	122	227	8.957	23.82
2	1	3	128	Citadel	79	1,734	60	353	75.949	20.358
2	1	3	129	Colgate University	1,415	1,358	288	385	20.353	20.351
2	1	3	130	College of the Holy Cross	1,476	1,320	387	448	26.22	33.939
2	1	3	131	College of William and Mary	3,186	2,399	327	374	10.264	15.59
2	1	3	132	Columbia University	4,522	2,871	348	442	7.696	15.395
2	1	3	133	Dartmouth College	2,110	2,254	464	500	21.991	22.183
2	1	3	134	Davidson College	837	841	212	288	25.329	34.245
2	1	3	135	Delaware State University	1,655	1,200	96	180	5.801	15
2	1	3	136	Drake University	1,963	1,283	157	245	7.998	19.096
2	1	3	137	Eastern Illinois University	4,855	3,599	247	367	5.088	10.197
2	1	3	138	Eastern Washington University	4,202	2,883	157	181	3.736	6.278
2	1	3	139	Elon University	2,312	1,475	158	215	6.834	1.017
2	1	3	140	Fairfield University	1,848	1,482	241	313	13.041	21.12
2	1	3	141	Florida A&M University	6,212	4,597	135	277	2.173	6.026
2	1	3	142	Florida Atlantic University	5,067	3,554	135	356	2.664	10.017
2	1	3	143	Florida International University	7,908	5,809	163	179	2.061	3.081
2	1	3	144	Fordham University	3,478	2,448	236	358	6.786	14.624
2	1	3	145	Georgetown University	3,283	2,778	335	459	10.204	16.523
2	1	3	146	Georgia Southern University	5,337	6,020	166	226	3.11	3.754
2	1	3	147	Grambling State University	2,731	1,985	124	243	4.54	12.254
2	1	3	148	Hampton University	2,889	1,747	121	190	4.188	10.876
2	1	3	149	Harvard University	3,099	3,573	605	855	19.522	23.929
2	1	3	150	Hofstra University	5,011	4,335	144	262	2.873	6.044
2	1	3	151	Howard University	4,426	2,542	187	278	4.225	10.936
2	1	3	152	Idaho State University	3,773	2,920	159	214	4.214	7.329

2	1	3	153	Illinois State University	9,705	6,854	193	229	19.795	3.341
2	1	3	154	Indiana State University	4,963	4,574	220	264	4.433	5.772
2	1	3	155	Iona College	1,452	1,426	162	323	11.157	2.651
2	1	3	156	Jackson State University	4,242	2,578	110	195	2.593	7.546
2	1	3	157	Jacksonville University	686	761	153	207	22.303	27.201
2	1	3	158	James Madison University	8,433	5,391	376	457	4.459	8.477
2	1	3	159	La Salle University	1,672	1,476	294	303	1.435	20.528
2	1	3	160	Lafayette College	1,084	1,095	284	340	26.199	28.571
2	1	3	161	Lehigh University	1,859	2,648	263	447	14.147	16.881
2	1	3	162	Liberty University	2,283	2,031	168	300	7.359	14.771
2	1	3	163	Marist College	2,090	1,683	289	397	13.828	5.764
2	1	3	164	McNeese State University	3,207	2,298	151	242	1.59	10.531
2	1	3	165	Mississippi Valley State University	1,515	843	65	141	4.29	16.726
2	1	3	166	Monmouth University	2,021	1,593	203	292	10.045	18.33
2	1	3	167	Montana State University at Bozeman	4,735	5,646	159	196	3.358	3.471
2	1	3	168	Morgan State University	3,344	2,341	124	186	3.708	7.945
2	1	3	169	Murray State University	3,145	2,351	256	174	8.14	7.401
2	1	3	170	Nicholls State University	3,375	2,073	157	236	4.677	11.384
2	1	3	171	Norfolk State University	3,118	1,803	133	208	4.266	11.536
2	1	3	172	North Carolina A&T State University	4,053	3,604	125	213	3.084	5.91
2	1	3	173	Northeastern University	6,711	6,860	266	282	3.963	4.111
2	1	3	174	Northern Arizona University	6,448	4,815	177	201	2.745	4.174
2	1	3	175	Northwestern State University	3,438	2,378	145	265	4.157	11.144
2	1	3	176	Portland State University	4,098	3,214	141	201	3.441	6.254
2	1	3	177	Prairie View A&M University	2,717	2,194	98	160	3.607	7.293
2	1	3	178	Princeton University	2,171	2,383	489	823	22.524	34.536
2	1	3	179	Sacred Heart University	1,565	1,107	411	489	26.262	44.173
2	1	3	180	Saint Mary's College of California	1,487	1,009	149	201	10.02	19.921
2	1	3	181	Saint Peter's College	1,042	981	124	243	11.9	24.771
2	1	3	182	Sam Houston State University	5,063	3,778	144	253	2.844	6.697

2	1	3	183	Siena College	1,447	1,358	171	214	11.818	15.758
2	1	3	184	South Carolina State University	2,047	1,592	151	205	7.377	12.877
2	1	3	185	Southeast Missouri State University	3,669	2,459	142	203	3.87	8.255
2	1	3	186	Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	6,987	8,448	169	273	2.419	3.232
2	1	3	187	Southern University at Baton Rouge	4,443	3,326	123	277	2.768	8.328
2	1	3	188	Southern Utah University	3,192	2,538	85	180	2.663	7.092
2	1	3	189	Southwest Missouri State University	6,525	5,401	241	315	3.693	5.832
2	1	3	190	Southwest Texas State University	10,685	8,727	178	217	1.666	2.487
2	1	3	191	St. John's University (N.Y.)	5,713	4,384	178	282	1.365	6.432
2	1	3	192	State University of New York at Albany	5,146	5,364	198	287	3.848	5.35
2	1	3	193	State University of New York at Stony Brook	5,752	6,182	141	275	2.451	4.448
2	1	3	194	Stephen F. Austin State University	5,958	4,288	177	197	2.971	4.594
2	1	3	195	Tennessee State University	4,444	2,699	127	188	2.858	6.966
2	1	3	196	Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi	2,464	1,531	74	81	3.003	5.29
2	1	3	197	Texas Southern University	2,253	1,864	102	173	4.527	9.281
2	1	3	198	Towson University	6,996	4,595	236	400	3.373	8.705
2	1	3	199	Troy State University	2,904	2,189	122	224	4.201	10.233
2	1	3	200	University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff	1,677	1,323	110	181	6.559	13.681
2	1	3	201	University of Connecticut	6,497	5,737	342	328	5.263	5.717
2	1	3	202	University of Dayton	3,380	3,075	242	213	7.16	6.927
2	1	3	203	University of Delaware	8,470	5,831	348	379	4.109	6.5
2	1	3	204	University of Maine	3,167	3,341	266	316	8.4	9.458
2	1	3	205	University of Massachusetts at Amherst	8,897	8,501	410	424	4.608	4.988
2	1	3	206	University of Montana	4,707	4,234	164	243	3.484	5.739

2	1	3	207	University of New Hampshire	5,994	4,245	393	305	6.557	7.185
2	1	3	208	University of Northern Iowa	6,377	4,597	182	318	2.854	6.918
2	1	3	209	University of Pennsylvania	4,765	4,935	440	641	9.233	12.989
2	1	3	210	University of Rhode Island	6,202	4,827	227	236	3.66	4.889
2	1	3	211	University of Richmond	1,496	1,416	248	236	16.578	16.667
2	1	3	212	University of San Diego	2,777	1,939	163	251	5.87	12.945
2	1	3	213	University of Tennessee at Martin	2,551	2,026	130	154	5.096	7.601
2	1	3	214	Valparaiso University	1,605	1,304	196	370	12.212	28.374
2	1	3	215	Villanova University	3,225	3,134	332	435	10.295	13.88
2	1	3	216	Virginia Military Institute	68	1,232	52	380	76.471	30.844
2	1	3	217	Wagner College	971	697	194	287	19.979	12.482
2	1	3	218	Weber State University	8,233	7,428	167	186	2.028	2.504
2	1	3	219	Western Illinois University	4,608	4,503	167	308	3.624	6.84
2	1	3	220	Western Kentucky University	6,001	4,638	127	262	2.116	5.595
2	1	3	221	Yale University	2,632	2,646	417	505	15.843	19.854
2	1	3	222	Youngstown State University	4,336	3,857	210	238	4.843	6.171
			Totals		410,440	339,041	22,168	30,883		
			Mean		3,836	3,169	207	289	8.850439	12.0338 2
2	2	4	223	Alabama A&M University	2,235	2,116	128	228	5.727	10.775
2	2	4	224	Appalachian State University	5,578	5,438	222	340	3.98	6.252
2	2	4	225	Bucknell University	1,700	1,818	384	490	22.588	26.953
2	2	4	226	Cornell University	6,523	7,067	510	623	7.818	8.816
2	2	4	227	Duquesne University	3,023	2,227	230	244	7.601	10.956
2	2	4	228	East Tennessee State University	2,875	2,203	136	203	4.73	9.215
2	2	4	229	Eastern Kentucky University	4,625	3,563	126	187	2.724	5.248
2	2	4	230	Furman University	1,467	1,162	135	218	9.202	18.761
2	2	4	231	Jacksonville State University	3,795	2,965	83	192	2.187	7.83
2	2	4	232	Morehead State University	3,261	2,452	130	291	3.987	11.868
2	2	4	233	Robert Morris University (Pa.)	1,223	1,444	163	241	13.328	16.69
2	2	4	234	Saint Francis University (Pa.)	708	458	178	228	25.141	49.782

2	2	4	235	Samford University	1,655	1,019	131	187	7.915	18.351
2	2	4	236	Tennessee Technological University	2,806	3,308	162	174	5.773	5.26
2	2	4	237	University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	4,003	2,990	122	221	3.048	7.391
2	2	4	238	Western Carolina University	3,038	2,750	131	217	4.312	7.891
2	2	4	239	Wofford College	510	585	116	219	22.745	37.456
			Totals		49,025	43,565	3,087	4,503		
			Mean		2,884	2,563	182	265	8.988588	15.26441
			All Total		1,413,725	1,278,492	53,509	73,931		



Monica Corbo

Curriculum Vitae

104 Woods Ave.
Oak Hill, WV 25901
(304) 465-0276

monicacorbo@hotmail.com



Education:

Marshall University Graduate College GPA: 4.0

Masters of Science in Sport Administration and Marketing

Thesis Option

Expected Graduation Date May 2003

The Pennsylvania State University GPA: 3.3

Bachelors of Science in Kinesiology- Athletic Training Emphasis

December 2000

Related Experience:

Marshall University Graduate College.....2001-present

Thesis: Title IX Compliance: Non-Appalachian Versus Appalachian in Colleges and Universities

Internship Experience: Special Events Director

- Coordinate competitions and social gatherings
 - Concho Classic: 12 Hour Mountain Bike Race
 - Revenge at Rocklick: NORBA WV State Mountain Bike Championship
 - Gauley Rolling Rodeo: American Whitewater Nationals Points Series Competition
 - Staff Appreciation Party: organize games, activities, prizes and awards for employees
 - Maintain communication between Special Events Department and Maintenance, Marketing, National Park Services, Climbing, Mt. Bike and Kayak Departments: as required for each event
 - Supervise event volunteers: delegate duties, direct to proper locations and schedule
- Graduate Assistantship: Certified Athletic Trainer for High School
- Responsible for the recognition, treatment and prevention of athletic injuries for Football, Soccer, Cross Country, Wrestling, Volleyball, Basketball, Baseball, Softball and Track athletes
 - Guest Speaker in Sports Medicine class
 - Presentations on the Athletic Training Profession
 - Psychology of Sport Injuries
 - Assisted in CAMC Sports Medicine Center with rehabilitation, modalities and aqua rehabilitation

The Pennsylvania State University.....1998-2000

Student Athletic Trainer: NCAA Collegiate Athletics and Intramurals

- Spent 1000+ hours with Pennsylvania State University Athletic Teams over a two year period
 - Responsible for the recognition, prevention and treatment of injuries
 - Attended home and away competitions including NCAA playoffs and tournaments
 - Women's Field Hockey (NCAA Final Four)

Monica Corbo

- Women's Soccer (NCAA Final Four)
- Men's and Women's Fencing (8 time NCAA Champions)
- Supervised and taught introductory athletic training students in fundamentals of athletic training
- Assisted in creation of workout routines for specific individual needs
- Coverage of Men's and Women's intramural sports: volleyball, basketball and co-ed softball

Special Skills and Qualifications:

- Excellent people skills, especially leadership and group communication skills
- Comfortable creating and delivering a presentations
- Experience with computer programs includes: Excel, SPSS, Word, Mac, Power Point, Quickens

Certifications:

- National Athletic Trainer Association 2001-present
- American Red Cross First Aid 1996-present
- American Red Cross Professional Rescuer CPR 1996-present

Recent Previous Employment:

- *ACE Whitewater - Oak Hill, WV* Summer 2000-2002
 - Whitewater Rafting Tour Guide
 - Mountain Bike Tour Guide/Instructor
- *Charleston Area YMCA Swimming Pool - Charleston, WV* 2000-2001
 - Swimming Instructor
 - Special Skill: pool spine boarding techniques

References:

Jay Hertel, PhD, ATC
The Pennsylvania State University
Associate Professor of Kinesiology
269 Recreation Building
University Park, PA 16802

Phone- (814) 865-8816
Email-jnh3@psu.edu

Jeffrey Chandler, EdD., CSCS*D, FACSM
Associate Professor and Department Head
Division of Exercise Science, Sport, and Recreation
Marshall University
Gullickson Hall 104D
Huntington, WV 25755

Phone- (304) 696-2924
Email- chandler@marshall.edu

Beth Gill
Special Events Manager

Phone- (304) 469-8235
Email-beth@aceraft.com

Oak Hill, WV 25901