WEST VIRGINIA CUTS MEN'S TRACK PROGRAM

For most track teams, a championship at a big regional meet would be cause for celebration. But when the West Virginia University men's team captured its first-ever IC4A championship in May, the victory was bittersweet at best. The reason? Only one month earlier, the university had announced that it was going to eliminate the 98-year-old program at the end of the 2003 outdoor season. For the Mountaineer runners, their greatest triumph would prove to be their last.

When it comes to cutting men's track programs, West Virginia is hardly alone. In the last few years, universities such as St. John's, Tulane, Vermont, Toledo, Ohio University, and Bowling Green have all axed their men's track teams. Ohio's decision to eliminate sports isn't a new concept in the Mid-American Conference. In 2007-08, the 12-school league will field only four men's swimming teams, five men's indoor and six men's outdoor track teams. Programs at Ball State and Fresno State are likewise in jeopardy. And when Marshall declared that it, too, would be dropping men's track, the Mountaineer State was suddenly left without a single Division I men's track team.

"Watch out," West Virginia coach Jeff Huntoon warned his colleagues at the Division I Track Coaches Association meeting in June. "You'll be next."

A Matter of Numbers

So why are men's track programs increasingly finding themselves on the endangered species list? There is no simple answer. However, any discussion of eliminating men's sports almost inevitably begins with the federal legislation known as Title IX.

Signed into law by President Nixon, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination in educational programs receiving federal assistance. According to the General Accounting Office, since Title IX's passage, colleges and universities have eliminated more than 350 men's teams, 45 of them track teams.

Under U.S. Department of Education guidelines, universities can satisfy Title IX's requirements in one of three ways: by showing a pattern of expanding opportunities for women, by proving that the athletic interests of women have been met or by keeping athletic participation numbers in line with those of the general student population. In practice-and particularly since the mid-1990s, when a federal court case involving Brown University established this third test as the key standard-most schools try to comply with the law by ensuring that athletic participation levels are roughly equivalent to the overall proportion of male and female students (i.e., if 54 percent of the student body at a university is female-and that's close to the national average-then approximately 54 percent of the athletes should also be women). This is where track's problems begin.

"From a Title IX perspective, men's track sort of has a bull's eye on its chest," says Teri Howes, associate athletic director and senior women's administrator at West Virginia. Under NCAA guidelines, track is counted as not one but two sports-indoor and outdoor track-and cross country is counted as a third. "At most schools, that means that each runner counts as two or three athletes for Title IX purposes. Those are big participation numbers."

For example, at West Virginia, the 2003 men's track team had 36 members. But for Title IX purposes, these 36 men counted as more than 80 male athletes. In a perfect world, this wouldn't be a problem, as the women's track and cross country programs would largely cancel out the men's numbers. However, in the real world, men's track and other non-revenue sports are competing against an 800-pound gorilla: football.

The Gorilla on the Table

With rosters of as many as 110 players, football teams tip the gender equity scale heavily toward the men's side. But at most schools, when it comes time to strike a gender balance, football is untouchable. "After the decision was made that we had to eliminate sports, football was one of the five sports we took off the table," Howes says. "The main supporter of all of our athletic programs is football. Football generates revenues. It's our bread and butter."

For West Virginia and the other members of the six conferences that comprise the Bowl Championship Series-the Atlantic Coast, Big East, Big Ten, Big 12, Pacific-10 and Southeastern-football revenues are generous. "The Bowl Alliance schools each receive $3 or $4 million a year from football," says Donna Lopiano, the executive director of the Women's Sports Foundation and the former director of women's athletics at the University of Texas. "All that extra money shouldn't be going to that small group of schools-it should be going to all schools."
In spite of the concentration of football revenues in a handful of power conferences, the sport has seen across-the-board growth. Since 1992, 39 schools have added football programs, and over the last two decades, the average roster size has increased by 12 players to 94. And even when teams have been neither prosperous nor successful, most have remained intact, often at the expense of other sports.

For instance, in 2001, the University of Massachusetts football team finished with a record of 3-8 and lost $2.5 million. The following spring, UMass eliminated seven sports. Football was not among them, but men's indoor track was.

Critics point out the Ohio football team lost $181,000 playing in the GMAC Bowl against Southern Mississippi. They say more than $85,000 was spent on "inspirational graphics" in football meeting areas, $39,890 was spent to keep the lights on in Peden Stadium during 57 visits by recruits and annual salaries of the offensive and defensive coordinators are $89,629.

Northern Illinois, 2006 Poinsettia Bowl: NIU sent 434 people to San Diego, costing the school about $916,800 in expenses. The school's share of the payout was $598,901, leaving NIU with a $317,898 deficit, more than the school spent last year on six of its nine women's sports combined.

Ohio University, 2006 GMAC Bowl: Former Nebraska coach Frank Solich led Ohio to its first bowl appearance since 1968. The celebration in Athens, however, was short-lived. A $277,550 bowl deficit was more than an athletic department already awash in red ink and facing Title IX sanctions could take. The university was forced to dip into general reserve funds to pay the bowl tab and just weeks after the game the school dropped track, swimming and lacrosse, leaving 383 athletes without teams. Ohio spent less than $200,000 annually on the three dropped programs.


Florida arrived at last year's BCS National Championship Game with 225 players, coaches and support staff, 350 band members and cheerleaders, and 196 VIPs.

And four baby sitters.

The Gators aren't the only team paying for baby sitters to go bowling. Colorado has even paid for cribs for the children of athletic department personnel at recent bowls.

"You pretty much have to because of all the functions the spouses have to go to at bowls," Florida senior associate athletic director Greg McGarity said.

That baby sitters are as commonplace as Heisman Trophy winners at bowl games these days, critics said, is another indication of a bowl system out of control.

Six-figure bowl expense deficits for universities have become increasingly common in the past four years, according to bowl expense documents for 62 schools obtained by The Orange County Register.

University officials say ticket allocations and hotel contracts dictated by the bowl committees are the driving forces behind the deficits.

"Bowls can get expensive in a hurry," Ohio State associate athletic director Ben Jay said. "Hotels, meals, transportation - it all adds up in a hurry."

But longtime observers of college sport said the lack of control by university administrations has allowed bowl games to become the ultimate college party and, it seems, everyone is invited.

"It's embarrassing," said Murray Sperber, the former chairman of the Drake Group, a national faculty committee pushing for college sports reform. "It's out of control. There's no cost containment.

"The trustees, the administration are along for the ride. The same administrators that are supposed to be watching over this are right there on the charter planes to the bowl."
Many money-losing bowls

Nearly half the schools competing in last year’s 32 bowl games lost money, according to the Register study that also reviewed conference financial documents, NCAA bowl records and athletic department financial reports filed with the U.S. Department of Education for all 120 universities in the NCAA Bowl Subdivision, formerly known as Division I-A.

The 64 teams playing in postseason games last season had combined bowl expenses of $69.7 million, a $16.8 million increase from just four years earlier.

Those figures don't include bowl bonuses for coaches and staff and the cost of feeding and housing teams on campus between the end of fall classes and the bowl trip.

Under conference revenue-sharing agreements, universities have bowl expense allowances set by the conference based primarily on the bowl's payout. Last season, schools from the six BCS conferences - ACC, Big East, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-10 and SEC - and Notre Dame had an average bowl expense allowance of $1.4 million and average expenses of $1.9 million. The average expense allowance for non-BCS schools was $727,162 with expenses averaging $937,834.

Florida and Ohio State together ran up more than $5 million in expenses at the 2007 BCS Championship, finishing with a combined deficit of more than $600,000. Texas A&M's expenses for its last two bowl games have exceeded the Aggies' share of bowl payouts by $670,190.

Even some BCS conference school administrators acknowledge that the high cost of going to a bowl has put a significant strain on their budgets.

"Financially it can be pretty painful," said Mollie Mayfield, Georgia Tech athletics' chief financial officer. "You spend the last six months of the year trying to cut back and say no to things you planned on doing."

"Bowls used to be a celebration of success," former NCAA executive director Cedric Dempsey said. "Now you have 6-6 teams going to bowls. And they're taking everybody under the sun that has ever had anything to do with the university."

For last year's Sun Bowl, Oregon State and Missouri paid for 1,186 people to make the trip to El Paso. Wisconsin took three Bucky Badger mascots to one recent bowl.

"I guess if the first two Buckys get too wasted on New Year's Eve," said Sperber, the former Drake Group chairman, "you've still got a third Bucky for the Rose Bowl."

The privileged ones

"In many ways, the educational elite consider themselves more privileged than the average individual, and what happens at many of these colleges is there's far too heavy of an emphasis on the athletic program over the academic mission of the university," said Colorado state Sen. Dave Schultheis, who has criticized the University of Colorado paying five baby sitters to attend the 2004 Houston Bowl and providing thousands of dollars in gifts for the spouses and children of university staff on earlier bowl trips.

"I think we've gone overboard," Schultheis continued, "when we start allocating for friends and wives all sorts of amenities and hotel rooms and that sort of thing."

Bowl payout figures can be deceiving. Not only are most payouts split with other conference schools after the participant's expense allowance, but most bowl deals require schools to buy thousands of tickets to resell to their fans. Selling those tickets isn't a problem if your team is in one of the five BCS games. But schools in other games usually end up eating thousands of dollars, often hundreds of thousands, worth of tickets.

Empty expensive rooms

Hotel prices and the mandated length of team stays at bowl sites are also playing significant roles in driving up bowl expenses.

"The biggest issue is you're assigned a location, assigned a hotel and the cost is non-negotiable," said Maryland associate athletic director Larry Leckonby.
Not only do bowl organizing committees tell teams where to stay, they also dictate the number of rooms and nights schools have to purchase.

"We're not talking the Marriott Courtyard at $89.99 a night," Georgia Tech's Mayfield said.

"Hotel pricing was very steep and the meals were very expensive and not good quality," Oregon State officials complained about their Sun Bowl hotel in a report to the NCAA.

Ohio State paid $230 per night at last year's BCS title game. "Hotels aren't cheap," said Jay, the school's associate athletic director. But at least the Buckeyes and most schools in the BCS games will use their hotel allocations. For schools in non-BCS games, filling all the rooms they're paying for can be difficult.

University officials said bowls routinely make schools agree to more hotel nights than they can use. At some bowls, schools can end up eating as many as 350 nights in unused hotel rooms over the course of a bowl stay. Schools try to cut their losses by re-selling rooms to boosters and players' parents. But those sales can also be difficult because NCAA rules prohibit schools from offering rooms to players' friends or family at discounted rates.

"At a bowl like the Gator Bowl," Mayfield said, "you're trying to peddle as much as half the inventory."

The high prices, however, haven't stopped the party. University-financed New Year's Eve parties, hospitality suites with 24-hour bar service, golf outings, tickets to concerts and sporting events and endless dinners and cocktail receptions have run up a combined $5.1 million tab in bowl-related entertainment over the past five seasons.

That total doesn't include gifts schools give players, staff, administrators, boosters, sponsors and even university employee spouses and children.

Bowl committees are allowed by NCAA rules to give players up to $500 each in gifts. Apple iPods, a popular gift at recent games, are now passe.

"Who wants another iPod?" Mayfield asked.

At least four bowls this season are giving away Sony surround-sound systems. Each participant in the Sugar Bowl will receive a Sony MP4 camcorder, leather jacket, watch and rolling suitcase. Schools can also spend an additional $350 on each player, and most schools reach the limit, giving players apparel, gift cards and, of course, more electronics.

"There is a keeping-up-with-the-Joneses (factor)," Mayfield said. "The kids all talk so it has become a recruiting factor."

Transporting everybody and their gifts also is costly. Many schools now fly charter planes to bowls because of the increased size of the traveling parties and limited availability of commercial tickets during the holidays.

Cal will spend $240,000 on charters to get the Golden Bears and Co. to Fort Worth's Armed Forces Bowl and back home. The school has budgeted $530,000 for the bowl. When Cal deputy athletic director Steve Holton was asked if the Bears had any chance of breaking even, he laughed before answering.

"No."

Ohio University

Here is what, you as alumni should be upset about and keep hounding the administration about from now till the time they come clean or reinstate the program or come to some kind of compromise like Miami did several years ago. This has far more to do with a new football coaching staff that has an insatiable appetite for spending and perks than it has to do with Title IX.

Your athletic director has stated over and over in the media that this has to do with equaling the number of scholarships on the men's side of the equation as the women's side. One of your assistant athletic directors, Amy Dean's mantra was "compliance, compliance, compliance."
By cutting men's indoor and outdoor track (five scholarships), and men's swimming (zero scholarships), and women's lacrosse (12 scholarships), that even with my poor math skills, that's a net gain of seven scholarships on the men's side.

This is about the interest of one football coach, who allegedly (haven't seen it in writing yet) got a $100,000 bonus for taking the team to a bowl game, which the team lost money making the trip. There are several more stories coming from the current track coaches about the football program's largesse in general and while on the road in Mobile. As you know, the football coach and the athletic director both are from the Big 12 Conference and have grand plans for the football program, I guess to lose even more money. The sad part is, both will jump ship the first time a larger school makes them an offer. The coach already interviewed at Minnesota but didn't get the job.

These are just a few of the changes that have come about since he and his staff arrived in Athens:

**For the first time ever last year, the athletic department paid to keep the team on campus all summer to help them with academics at an estimated cost of $100,000. Still, the starting tight end failed "softball" and was ineligible for the first couple of games before fall quarter started. He also was ineligible for the bowl game. New quarter, same results I guess.**

**For the first time, starting last year, the entire football team and staff began staying at Burr Oak Lodge the night before home games. I don't know what that cost is but 85 players, plus staff, has to add up a good bit faster than relay batons and vaulting poles. Oh, and by the way, in addition to the 85 FULL scholarship athletes, they have another 30 or so walk ons and red-shirts.**

**For the first time ever the team went to a bowl game, every player had his own room at the University Inn for the month of December while they stayed on campus. At $129 for one, I wouldn't want that bill. Do the math. It had to be 10's of thousands of dollars. There is a rumor that this announcement, cutting three sports, came when it did, because there was so much money spent participating the GMAC Bowl two weeks before the cuts.**

**The round numbers I'm hearing is that football took in $1.9 million dollars in 2006 and spent $4 million. They consume about 30 percent of the overall athletic budget. Indoor and outdoor and cross country combined use slightly less than two percent. And, they are keeping the coaches anyway, so where are all the savings?**

On the compliance side, there is a website "womensportsfoundation.org" that had an article that ranked the schools in Div. I-A football conferences that participate in the BCS, ACC, Big East, Big Ten, Big 12, PAC-10 and SEC, and then added the Mountain West and the MAC to the mix to make an eight conference tournament out of this mock competition. The author did a "tournament" comparing the best school in each conference with regard to Title IX compliance based on 2004 criteria set by The Chronicle of Higher Education. By the way, Ohio was top ranked in the MAC.

To quote the article: "In the tournament involving Title IX compliance, the Ohio University Bobcats of the MAC defeated the Stanford Cardinal of the PAC-10 in the finals to win this mythical national championship." So much for non-compliance

"Football is a visible sport and one of the few vehicles capable of bringing 10,000 people to campus," UMass athletic director Bob Marcus said soon after the cuts were announced. "You have to fund it at a certain level to be competitive."

**Whitten Blasts Ohio University President, Athletics Director for "Bogus" Attempt to Cut Men's Swim Team -- February 2, 2007**

An Interview with Phil Whitten, Executive Director of the College Swimming Coaches Association of America

By Jason Marsteller

PHOENIX, Arizona, February 2. TODAY, SwimmingWorldMagazine.com sat down with Phil Whitten, the Executive Director of the College Swimming Coaches Association of America (CSCAA), to discuss the recent decision announced by the Ohio University administration to cut its men's swimming program along with men's indoor and outdoor track and field and women's lacrosse.

*What was your initial reaction to the cuts at Ohio University as we first reported on Jan. 25?*

My initial reaction was that it made absolutely no sense whatsoever. On further investigation and refection, that initial reaction has been reinforced.
The University said [the cuts] were being done to comply with Title IX, and because of a $4 million deficit the department has accumulated over the years.

Yes, that's what they said. Now let's look at the facts. Actually, there are two major reasons why this decision fails to stand up to scrutiny. Let's look at each of them.

First, the University is not out of compliance with Title IX according to the Women’s Sports Foundation, probably the leading advocate for Title IX adherence. Last year, Ohio University ranked first out of the 119 Division I schools in Title IX compliance. This year, it ranks 21st – still better than more than 80 percent of Division I schools. So why does the athletic director maintain that his department is not in compliance? I believe there are only two possible explanations: Either his analysis was seriously flawed or there was a deliberate attempt to misstate the facts.

As for the issue of the budget deficit, the second rationale: Yes, the Ohio University Athletic Department has built up a $4 million deficit over the years. This is not something that happened overnight. Didn't anyone notice?

Aside from that, you have to ask: what impact would cutting men's swimming have on the deficit? It turns out that the incremental cost of having a men's swim team -- in addition to the women's team -- comes to roughly $35,000 a year. Let's see: at $35,000 a year, it would only take a bit more than 114 years to erase the deficit. And, that's assuming zero inflation and zero interest on the debt.

On top of that, we have learned that even as the A.D. is crying "poverty," he plans to move on with building a $20 million indoor football practice facility. When asked, he says "most" of the $20 million will come from "private donations." But he's unclear about how much "most" is. It could be just pennies more than $10 million. Or it might be 11 to 12 million, or maybe even 15. Whatever it is, it will only add to the deficit, perhaps doubling or even tripling it.

As a former college professor, I would have to give the OU administration an "F" for research and transparency.

There has been talk that the process by which the decision was made was flawed. Is that so, and can you enlighten our readers on the issues with the process as well as the reaction to those problems?

Sure. The process has been seriously flawed from the get-go. Like all universities these days, OU has a specified, institutionalized process for dealing with this type of issue. That process includes representation of the students. At OU, that representation comes through its Student Athlete Advisory Council. Yet, the administration ignored its own policy and deliberately excluded the student-athlete reps. Why?

I understand that the students are so angry about both the decision, and the deliberate exclusion of student input in the process, that they plan to hold a rally today in support of the four teams and then march on the president's residence.

In addition, the student government has stated that it will withhold the $1 million it contributes to the athletics budget if the sports are not reinstated.

The students are angry. Yes, they support the teams that the administration wants to kill, but they are even angrier by the fact that they were cut out of the process.

What is the CSCAA doing about this issue?

Well, in addition to suggesting to the coach, athletes and alumni ways of responding to this threat, we plan on obtaining a number of documents and e-mails regarding the decision, going back 17 months when this process first began under the Ohio Public Records Act.

It should be interesting. During the last 17 months, the University has consistently said it would not cut teams if the school was out of compliance with Title IX. For almost a year-and-a-half, the A.D. told coaches it would reduce roster sizes proportionally if there were a Title IX problem. Apparently, that was not at all what he was planning.

What about other potential alternatives to making these cuts?
Well, the athletics department stated that it looked at every possible alternative, and that this was the only one that could solve the problems.

As we have seen, there is no Title IX problem, though there is a real deficit. But the AD's “solution” is no solution at all. Maybe it would be in a world constructed by Franz Kafka.

You know, it reminds me of an incident during the Vietnam War when one U.S. officer explained: “We had to destroy the village to save it.” That’s akin to the action the OU administration would take citing Title IX. "We had to cut three men’s teams and a women’s team to increase opportunities for women." Can you hear "The Twilight Zone" music?

Tell me, how does cutting a women’s team -- not to mention three men's teams -- increase opportunities for women? Does OU have Kafka writing its pres releases

As for there being no other alternatives, that is pure rubbish. It took me 20 seconds to come up with a better one to the alleged Title IX issue: How about creating a women's water polo team with the available athletes you already have on the women's swimming team? That is, if you are even out of compliance with Title IX. Greg Werner, the swim coach, has experience coaching water polo experience and he’s already on staff, and you don't have any additional facility costs.

With that one move, you don't cut women's lacrosse which, like water polo, is an emerging women's sport. And you, have added 25-30 women athletes at a rock-bottom, minimal cost.

As for exploring all other possibilities, that's a joke. Ohio University did not even take the first step. Here's what Myles Brand, the President of the NCAA, said recently.

‘I certainly hope no University cuts sports to comply with Title IX. There are always alternatives. The NCAA is always ready and able to work with an athletics department to identify acceptable alternatives to cutting sports. It should not be the case that men's participation opportunities are diminished to comply with Title IX.”'

Here, we have the president of the NCAA, Dr. Brand, saying don’t cut teams and we will work with you if you come to us. Then, we have OU claiming to have explored every possibility when it didn’t bother to take even a first baby step.

With football virtually off-limits, other large-roster sports-like track, wrestling, gymnastics and swimming-become targets when budgetary pressures mandate cuts. When Title IX is factored into the equation, heavy-participation men’s sports become that much more vulnerable, as their elimination can go a long way toward achieving or maintaining gender equity.

Although a significant tuition hike initially spurred West Virginia's decision to cut programs, it was Title IX that helped put the men's track team squarely in the cross hairs. "Our athletic department is self-sustaining, so we have to fund all of our scholarships," explains Howes. "The main issue was budgeting, but with any cuts that were made, we wanted to stay within the five percent mark," meaning, keep women's participation levels within five percent of the school's overall female population.

In 2002, West Virginia's women's sports numbers (41 percent of its athletes were female) lagged significantly behind its general enrollment figures (46 percent female). "So," Howes says, "even though Title IX did not drive the decision, it was a factor."

The Elephant in the Middle of the Room

To Lopiano of the Women’s Sports Council, Title IX has become a scapegoat for what she sees as the real culprit lurking behind the life-or-death struggle track and other non-revenue sports now face. "What people don’t want to talk about is the elephant in the middle of the room-uncontrolled expenditures,” she contends.

“Collegiate athletic budgets have increased at almost twice the rate of inflation. Institutions are absolutely obsessed with keeping up with the arms race.”

In Lopiano's eyes, over-emphasis on such high-visibility sports as football and men's basketball has knocked college athletics off its proper axis. "How can you justify paying a coach at a nonprofit institution $2 million a year?" she asks. "What happened to participation as a guiding value?"
Still, with no legal recourse available to prevent institutions from pouring money into football coffers, the U.S. Track Coaches Association joined the National Wrestling Coaches Association and other athletics groups in a lawsuit against the U.S. Department of Education. The suit claimed that Title IX promoted women's collegiate sports programs at the expense of male athletics teams. But in June, a federal district judge rejected the claims, ruling that the track coaches and their fellow plaintiffs could not show that the creation of women's sports programs had resulted in the elimination of men's teams. The decision is now on appeal.

Lopiano believes that the future of non-revenue sports hinges not on litigation, but on fiscal restraint. "For wrestling and track, there should be a concerted effort to get their alumni friends to push for collegiate reform. If there's no fiscal control, then both men's and women's teams are at risk." Indeed, when West Virginia, St. John's, Massachusetts and Vermont cut men's track teams, each school also eliminated at least one women's sport.

Cutbacks in women's programs, though, have been the exception rather than the rule. Female participation in collegiate athletics has jumped from about 30,000 to 157,000 in the three decades since Title IX's enactment, while the number of women's intercollegiate teams has climbed from about 4,800 to more than 8,400 since the NCAA began keeping gender-related records in 1981. Still, Lopiano sees Title IX as a work in progress.

"Since Title IX went into effect, there has been a 411 percent increase for women at the collegiate level, and where there were virtually no athletic scholarships for women 30 years ago, we now see $371 million going to women in scholarships each year. That's the good news," she says. "The bad news is that there are still 58,000 more participation opportunities and $133 million more in athletic scholarships available for men at the college level."

Under Title IX, men's participation has dropped slightly, from 248,000 in 1972 to 234,000 in 1998. Critics have attacked the law as a quota system and contend that the current standards are unfair because women consistently express lower levels of interest in playing college sports than men. The Bush administration responded this summer by issuing a clarification to current Title IX rules. While keeping the current three-pronged compliance framework intact, administration officials stressed that proportionality is not the only way to satisfy the law. In a statement, NCAA President Miles Brand said that the clarification "emphasizes that cutting men's sports is a disfavored practice."

Giant Steps, Personal Tragedies

It remains to be seen whether this clarification will lead a shift away from the current numbers-based approach. But whatever the outcome, West Virginia's Howes hopes that the debate over enforcement schemes will not eclipse the giant steps women's athletics have taken since 1972. "Title IX has had a tremendous impact not only on the number of opportunities but on competitiveness," she says. "Look at the emergence of women's soccer. Look at the strides women's basketball has made. I think it all goes hand-in-hand with Title IX."

Still, such big-picture progress provided little solace to the three dozen West Virginia runners who learned that their team was being disbanded. "We told them their scholarships would still be honored. We gave them blanket transfers. We tried to make the transition as easy as possible," recalls Howes. "But there was not a whole heck of a lot we could say to them. They were devastated."

In a world of unlimited athletic budgets, schools might simply comply with Title IX by adding women's programs. With today's tight economic times, though, relatively few universities enjoy that option. Unfortunately, this almost certainly means that more men's track programs will soon find themselves on the chopping block.

Adam Buckley Cohen runs and writes in Norman, Oklahoma. A former university attorney, he has written about law and sports for such publications as Men's Journal, The American Lawyer and the Los Angeles Times.

Running Times
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The first thing Jamie Moffatt wants to make clear is that he is not trying to trash Title IX. But he firmly believes Title IX is broken and needs to be repaired.

"These are perilous times," said Brand. "The future of Title IX is uncertain. We do not know what Secretary Paige will do with the recommendations of the Commission on Opportunity in Athletics."

Title IX improving the application of current Federal standards for measuring equal opportunity."
Part 1  Women enjoy a distinct advantage over men in college athletics.
Part 2  Bakke believed that his rejections were in direct violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th amendment.
Part 3  Football seems to be the issue when dealing with scholarships. A school is permitted 85 scholarships for football.
Part 4  When Title IX was created it was crafted with intent to make it easy for schools to comply with its guidelines.
Part 5  For the first time since 1968, the USA freestyle wrestlers failed to win a single gold medal.
Part 6  Every college is required to have a designated Title IX coordinator.
Part 7  Over 110,000 women participated in intercollegiate sports. Where as in 1971 just about 25,000 participated.