



**The California State University**  
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

---

# Voluntary Self-Monitoring Report regarding Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students

Annual Report  
2005-2006

June 4, 2007

The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor

[www.calstate.edu](http://www.calstate.edu)

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1-2
Summary of 2005-2006 Data – System Level.....	3
Summary of 2005-2006 Data – Campus Level.....	4
Part I: Report for Academic Year 2005-2006.....	5-6
Part II: Report for Academic Year 2005-2006 Non-NCAA campuses.....	7
Part III: Five Year Review of NCAA Member Campuses Meeting Goals.....	8
Part IV: NCAA Member Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals For Two Consecutive Years.....	9
Part V: Recap on Results of Corrective Action Plans Submitted For Results In 2005-2006 Reporting.....	10-12
Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee.....	13
Table 1: NCAA Eligible Men and Women.....	14
Table 2: Athletics Participants by Campus 2005-2006.....	15
Table 3a: Expenditures by Campus 2005-2006 (NCAA Campuses).....	16
Table 3b: Expenditures by Campus 2005-2006 (Non-NCAA Campuses).....	17
Table 4a: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2005-2006 (NCAA Campuses).....	18
Table 4b: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2005-2006 (Non-NCAA Campuses).....	19
Table 5: California Community Colleges: Five-Year Comparison on Men’s And Women’s Sport Participation.....	20
High School Participation Numbers.....	21-22
High School Most Popular Sports: 2002-2003.....	23

**Executive Summary**  
**Report on Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students (former CSU/CA NOW Consent Decree)**

**The California State University**  
**2005-2006**

**Background Information**

On October 15, 1993, the California State University and the California National Organization for Women (CA NOW) entered into a consent decree in order to increase participation of female students in intercollegiate athletics on NCAA-member campuses, to increase expenditures for women's athletic programs, and to increase grants-in-aid and scholarships for female student athletes. The CSU entered into this decree because it believed strongly that female and male students should have an equal opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

Annual reports on progress made within the CSU and on NCAA-member campuses were completed for the 1994-1995, 1995-1996, 1996-1997, 1997-1998 and 1998-1999 academic years. These reports were reviewed annually by the CSU Board of Trustees and by CA NOW representative Linda Joplin. In March of 2000, following a review of the 1998-1999 system wide and campus data, it was agreed by CA NOW and the CSU that major progress had been made in each of the areas of participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid for female athletes (see CSU/CA NOW Report for 1998-1999, the final report established under the consent decree). In March of 2000, it was determined that the consent decree had been satisfied.

In the spring of 2000, the Chancellor of the CSU and the CSU presidents made the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring of the former CSU/CA NOW consent decree in order to continue to monitor progress in the area of female athletes' participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid. The report which follows for the 2005-2006 academic year, is the seventh annual report issued following the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring.

It should be noted that, beginning with the 2001-2002 report, the Presidential Monitoring Committee for Gender Equity in Athletics made the decision to compile data for the CSU's annual gender equity reports based on data submitted by campuses annually according to the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA). This decision was made in order to streamline data collection and reporting requirements. Data not included in the NCAA/EADA survey but collected by campuses are reported in Table 3, Non-Comparable Expenses.

In October of 2004 the CSU Monitoring Committee and CA NOW agreed to a revision in the calculation of non-comparable expenses. Campuses may report certain non-comparable expenses, recognizing that certain sports have expenses that are unique or are, because of circumstances beyond campus control, much more expensive than similar services for other sports. Fan attendance, market differences and equipment costs are a few examples of these unique costs. For the purpose of calculating non-comparable costs, a campus should total legitimate non-comparable expenses for football and men's basketball and subtract them from the total costs of the men's program. The non-comparable costs for women's basketball and the

other sport for which the highest non-comparable expenses are identified should be subtracted from the costs of the women's program. Once calculated, amended men's and women's expenses are added together and percentages are computed for men's and women's expenditures.

Starting in the fall of 2004, the previously used Excel-based EADA reporting tool is no longer being used by the NCAA to collect athletically-related revenues and expenses and the subsequent reporting to the U.S. Department of Education. A new online system has replaced the Excel-based tool that streamlines the overall collection and reporting processes and integrates with changes made to the NCAA agreed-upon procedures. The NCAA extended the deadline for submitting data to January 15<sup>th</sup> following each fiscal year. NCAA changed its report date because of changes to its reporting procedures.

The CSU report includes data taken from the NCAA/EADA 2006 Reports, submitted January 15, 2007 to the NCAA with a copy to the CSU.

## **Summary of 2005-2006 Data – CSU System Level**

### **1. Participation**

At the systemwide level, the number of female participants in intercollegiate athletics within the CSU increased from 1,862 in 1992-93 to 3,840 in 2005-2006 on the nineteen NCAA member campuses, an increase of 106.2% over the past thirteen years. During the previous year, 112 more females participated in intercollegiate athletics, a one-year increase of 3.0%. The data also indicates that 55.9% of all intercollegiate athletic participants within the CSU in 2005-2006 are female, compared to 34.7% in 1992, the year before the CSU entered into the consent decree with the California National Organization for Women. During this same thirteen-year period, male intercollegiate athletic participation decreased 23.1% from 3,733 in 1992-93 to 3,033 in 2005-2006. During 2005-2006, twenty-five fewer males participated in intercollegiate athletics than in 2004-05, a one year decrease of 0.82%.

Community college comparison data supplied by the California Community Colleges Commission on Athletics was updated for 2005-2006. The 2005-2006 data reflects participation rates at 67% for male athletes and 33% for female athletes. See page 20 for the six-year comparison data.

The California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) administers a biennial CIF participation survey of high school athletes. The 2007 survey results will be available in July 2007.

The 2005 CIF participation survey is included in this report until the 2007 survey results are available. The 2005 high school participation numbers for male and female athletes are reported on pages 21-22 of this report. Participation percentages for male athletes at the high school level are 58.9% and female athletes are 41.1%.

### **2. Expenditures**

Expenditures for women's intercollegiate athletic programs on the CSU's nineteen NCAA member campuses increased from \$11.2 million in 1992-1993 to \$76.3 million in 2005-2006. This represents an increase of 581% over the past thirteen years. The total increase over the previous year was \$7.4 million, a 10.7% increase. During this same period, expenditures for men's athletic programs grew from \$33.4 million to \$77.9 million, an increase of 133.2%. The total increase over the past year was \$8.5 million, a 12.2% increase.

### **3. Grants-In-Aid**

Funds allocated for grants-in-aid for female athletes on the CSU's nineteen NCAA member campuses within the CSU increased from \$2.5 million in 1992-1993 to \$12.2 million in 2005-2006. This represents an increase of 388% over a thirteen-year period. The increase in grants-in-aid over the past year was \$769,035, for a 6.7% increase. Grants-in-aid for male student athletes during the same period increased from \$4.6 million to \$11.5 million, which represents an increase of 150%. The increase over the past year was \$1,157,730 for an 11.1% increase.

## **Summary of 2005-2006 Data – Campus Level**

Under the consent decree, each campus of the California State University System was required to achieve gender equity in its campus intercollegiate athletic program within five years by addressing specific goals and taking specific actions related to those goals. The following are goals for each category.

**Participation:** Participation by men and women athletes on each campus will be within five percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible women and men undergraduates on that campus;

**Expenditures:** Expenditures will be within ten percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible women and men undergraduates, with the deduction for non-comparable expenses for two men's and two women's sports; and

**Grants-In-Aid:** Grants-in-aid will be within five percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible women and men undergraduates.

### **1. Participation**

At the campus level, during the 2005-2006 academic year, the report indicated that eighteen of the nineteen (18/19) NCAA-member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in the area of women's participation in intercollegiate athletics.

### **2. Expenditures**

In the area of expenditures, seventeen of the nineteen (17/19) NCAA member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in expenditures for women's athletic programs.

### **3. Grants-In-Aid**

In the area of grants-in-aid, fourteen out of the nineteen (14/19) NCAA member campuses met or exceeded their goals for scholarship and grant aid to female student athletes.

### **4. Campuses Meeting Target Goals in All Areas**

Fourteen (14) campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures, and grants-in-aid during the 2005-2006 academic year.

**Part 1: Report for Academic Year 2005-2006 – NCAA Member Campuses (19) – Based on the NCAA/EADA Report for 2006, submitted to the NCAA on January 15, 2007**

---

**Participation, Expenditures, and Grants-In-Aid**

Fourteen (14) campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures, and grants-in-aid during the 2005-2006 academic year.

Bakersfield	Los Angeles
Chico	Northridge
Dominguez Hills	Pomona
East Bay	San Francisco
Fullerton	San Jose
Humboldt	San Luis Obispo
Long Beach	Stanislaus

**Participation**

Eighteen (18) campuses met their target goals in participation in 2005-2006.

Bakersfield	Northridge
Chico	Pomona
Dominguez Hills	Sacramento
East Bay	San Diego
Fresno	San Francisco
Fullerton	San Jose
Humboldt	San Luis Obispo
Long Beach	Sonoma
Los Angeles	Stanislaus

One (1) campus did not meet its target goals for participation:

San Bernardino -3.4%

## **Expenditures**

Seventeen (17) campuses met their target goals in expenditures in 2005-2006.

Bakersfield	Northridge
Chico	Pomona
Dominguez Hills	Sacramento
East Bay	San Bernardino
Fresno	San Francisco
Fullerton	San Jose
Humboldt	San Luis Obispo
Long Beach	Stanislaus
Los Angeles	

Two (2) campuses did not meet their target goals for expenditures:

San Diego	-1.3%
Sonoma	-0.9%

## **Grants-In-Aid**

Fourteen (14) of the campuses met their target goals in grants-in-aid in 2005-2006.

Bakersfield	Los Angeles
Chico	Northridge
Dominguez Hills	Pomona
East Bay (no grants given)	San Francisco
Fullerton	San Jose
Humboldt	San Luis Obispo
Long Beach	Stanislaus

Five (5) campuses did not meet their target goals for grants-in-aid:

Fresno	-7.8%
Sacramento	-1.3%
San Bernardino	-2.5%
San Diego	-6.4%
Sonoma	-0.5%

**Part II: Report for Academic Year 2005-2006 – Non-NCAA Member Campuses (3) –  
Based on Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) report**

---

**Participation – 2005-2006**

Maritime Academy	-0.9%
Monterey Bay	-5.3
San Marcos	-18%

**Expenditures – 2005-2006**

Maritime Academy	Target met
Monterey Bay	Target met
San Marcos	-6.4%

**Grants-In-Aid – 2005-2006**

Maritime Academy	Target met
Monterey Bay	Target met
San Marcos	-2.1%

Note: For 2006-2007 reporting, the Monitoring Committee will ask the San Marcos campus to prepare corrective action plan.

### **Part III: Six Year Review of Nineteen (19) NCAA Member CSU Campuses Meeting Target Goals**

---

The following information provides an overview of the number of NCAA member CSU campuses that met their target goals in one or more areas over the last six years:

#### **Participation, Expenditures and Grants-In-Aid**

1999-2000: 9 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 7 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 6 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 10 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 11 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 11 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 14 of 19 campuses

#### **Participation**

1999-2000: 12 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 10 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 7 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 12 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 17 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 15 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 18 of 19 campuses

#### **Expenditures**

1999-2000: 17 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 13 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 12 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 19 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 18 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 15 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 17 of 19 campuses

#### **Grants-In-Aid**

1999-2000: 13 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 11 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 13 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 13 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 14 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 15 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 14 of 19 campuses

**Part IV: NCAA Member CSU Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals Over Two Consecutive Years (2004-2005 – 2005-2006)**

---

The CSU Presidential Monitoring Committee on Gender Equity in Athletics has recommended that the annual self-monitoring report identify campuses that do not meet their target goals for two consecutive years. These campuses are asked to submit a plan to the Monitoring Committee, indicating how the campus plans to meet their target goals in the future.

**Participation:** One NCAA member CSU campus that did not meet its targets in participation of women athletes during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years:

<b>Campus</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>
San Bernardino	-2.6%	-3.4%

**Expenditures:** Two NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their targets in expenditures for women’s athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2004-2005 and 2005-2006.

<b>Campus</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>
San Diego	-1.4%	-1.3%
Sonoma	-2.0%	-0.9%

**Grants-In-Aid:** Three NCAA member CSU campuses that did not meet their targets in grants-in-aid for women’s athletic programs during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years:

<b>Campus</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>
Fresno	-6.6%	-7.8%
Sacramento	-1.4%	-1.3%
San Diego	-2.5%	-6.4%

**Part V: Recap on Results of Corrective Action Plans Submitted in 2004-2005 for Results in 2005-2006 Reporting**

---

Campuses that did not meet their target goals for two consecutive years; 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, were asked to submit a plan to the Monitoring Committee, indicating how the campus planned to meet their target goals in the future. Below is a report on actions taken by those campuses that were out of compliance for two consecutive years as reported in the 2004-2005 annual self-monitoring report.

**2005-2006 Reporting**

<b>Fullerton</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>
Participation	-3.3%	-1.4%

The corrective action plan to develop additional target squad size numbers for the largest male sports: baseball, wrestling and men’s track and field. Baseball will have no more than thirty-eight student-athletes on the squad as of the first date of competition instead of the thirty-nine for the past three years. Wrestling will have no more than thirty-four student-athletes on the squad as of the first date of competition as opposed to thirty-eight student-athletes last year. Men’s Track and Field will have no more student-athletes on the squad list as of the first date of competition than does Women’s Track and Field. Additionally, the University’s Gender Equity Committee is developing first date of competition participation goals for each sport based on coaches’ squad size preferences and gender balance.

Participation target goals were met for 2005-2006

<b>Fresno</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>
Grants-In-Aid	-7.97%	-6.57%

The corrective action plan called for new guidelines established by the University to address recruitment/scholarship targets, summer school financial aid policies and post-eligibility athletes aid policies.

- Recruitment/scholarship targets to provide some restrictions in the recruitment of out-of-state student-athletes.
  - Men’s and women’s basketball may recruit players without regard to residency status.
  - Football will have eighty percent scholarship student-athletes with in-state residency.
  - Men’s and women’s tennis will have at least fifty percent scholarship student-athletes from the United States within the next four years (preferably in-state).
  - All other sports should recruit to a seventy-five percent goal for in-state scholarship student-athletes.

- Summer school financial aid policies have been rewritten so that criteria are gender neutral and all aid is from the department. Any discretionary awards beyond the criteria will be filtered for budget and equity.
- Post-eligibility athletics aid policies have been rewritten to assist equivalency-sport student-athletes in total grant-in-aid rather than the previous equivalency of tuition and fees only in the post-eligibility year.

Additionally, in 2006-07 the NCAA has increased the scholarship limit in women’s soccer by two, therefore the percentage of maximum grant-in-aid awards for men and women in the sport offerings at Fresno State University will be 58.5% and 41.5% respectively.

Further, the University continues to work with a roster management program to provide quality participation opportunities in-line with the enrollment figures at the institution. Finally, the institution will continue to evaluate its sports programming annually and assess whether the addition of a women’s sport will be a viable option in the future.

Grant-In-Aid targets were not met for 2005-06 (-7.8%).

<b>Sacramento</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>
Participation	-1.2%	-3.2%

The action plan called for continued use of a roster management plan to achieve the desired percentages of men and women participating on the twenty sports that Sacramento State offers.

Participation target goals were met for 2005-2006

<b>San Diego</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>
Grants-In-Aid	-0.79%	-2.48%

The corrective action plan called for the continuation of allocating the number of athletic scholarships at the NCAA allowable maximum for both men’s and women’s programs, continue allocating the number of out-of-state scholarships at an equitable level for both men’s and women’s programs, and continue offering summer school aid to student-athletes based on academic priorities.

Grant-In-Aid targets were not met for 2005-06 (-6.4%). San Diego State offers the maximum grants-in-aid allowed by the NCAA for its women’s sports, which currently outnumber men’s sports two to one.

<b>San Marcos</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>
Participation	-15.1%	-26.2%
Expenditure	-3.0%	-6.9%

The corrective action plan for participation called for an equitable allocation of student-athletes in the men’s and women’s golf program, and consideration of adding a women’s only team in

the near future. For expenditures, the campus restructured the golf program resulting in more equitable coaches salary, recruitment and grant-in-aid expenditures.

The Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee made a recommendation to San Marcos to work with an outside consultant to develop and resubmit a more comprehensive and effective corrective action plan.

Participation and expenditure target goals were not met for 2005-2006.

<b><u>Sonoma</u></b>	<b><u>2003-04</u></b>	<b><u>2004-05</u></b>
Expenditure	-2.37%	-2.02%

The corrective action plan called for the Athletics Department to work with the men's soccer and baseball programs to reduce the expenditures for the men's soccer tournament and baseball camps. In addition, the department will increase the expenditures for several women's teams to assist in meeting the target in 2006-07.

Expenditure targets were not met for 2005-06 (-0.9%).

<b><u>Stanislaus</u></b>	<b><u>2003-04</u></b>	<b><u>2004-05</u></b>
Participation	*	-10.2%

The corrective action plan called for the Athletics Department to return to the former calculation method that allowed for counting dual sport athletes, which resulted in participation and expenditure rates within compliance.

The campus is presently undertaking additional steps to improve opportunities for female athletes, which will satisfy the CSU guidelines overseen by the committee. During the 2006-2007 year, the campus will pursue the following steps:

1. Research methods to increase the undergraduate male student population and begin to implement such methods.
2. Cap men's team rosters at or near the suggested NCAA minimum participation numbers necessary to field a team.
3. Research new athletic opportunities for female students.
4. Review the potential for reducing the scope of our men's athletics program offerings.

All of these options will involve significant campus consultation. By considering these options and implementing appropriate interventions, we believe that we can meet the guidelines for gender equity in 2007-2008.

The Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee made a recommendation to Stanislaus to closely monitor the use of dual sport athletes.

Participation target goals were met for 2005-2006

*\*The Stanislaus University President determined that errors had been made in calculating participation rates in 2003-04.*

**The California State University  
Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee**

---

Dr. John D. Welty, Chair  
President  
California State University, Fresno

Dr. F. King Alexander  
President  
California State University, Long Beach

Dr. Ruben Armiñana  
President  
Sonoma State University

Dr. Milton A. Gordon  
President  
California State University, Fullerton

Dr. Dianne F. Harrison  
President  
California State University, Monterey Bay

Dr. Albert K. Karnig  
President  
California State University, San Bernardino

Dr. Jolene Koester  
President  
California State University, Northridge

**Committee Staff**

Mr. Allison G. Jones  
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support  
The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor

Mr. Ray Murillo  
Associate Director, Student Programs  
The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor

**NCAA Eligible Men and Women on CSU Campuses  
NCAA Member Institutions 2005-2006**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>No. Women</b>	<b>No. Men</b>	<b>Total Eligible</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Bakersfield	3,211	1,667	4,878	65.8%	34.2%
Chico	6,915	6,164	13,079	52.9%	47.1%
Dominguez Hills	6,117	2,826	8,943	68.4%	31.6%
East Bay	4,507	2,755	7,262	62.1%	37.9%
Fresno	10,160	7,268	17,428	58.3%	41.7%
Fullerton	12,282	8,936	21,218	57.9%	42.1%
Humboldt	3,105	2,587	5,692	54.6%	45.4%
Long Beach	13,891	8,744	22,635	61.4%	38.6%
Los Angeles	6,779	4,093	10,872	62.4%	37.6%
Northridge	12,227	8,411	20,638	59.2%	40.8%
Pomona	6,274	8,184	14,458	43.4%	56.6%
Sacramento	10,360	7,504	17,864	58.0%	42.0%
San Bernardino	6,820	3,514	10,334	66.0%	34.0%
San Diego	12,497	8,831	21,328	58.6%	41.4%
San Francisco	10,762	7,155	17,917	60.1%	39.9%
San Jose	8,355	8,311	16,666	50.1%	49.9%
San Luis Obispo	7,229	9,362	16,591	43.6%	56.4%
Sonoma	3,685	2,170	5,855	62.9%	37.1%
Stanislaus	2,957	1,542	4,499	65.7%	34.3%
<b>Totals</b>	148,133	110,024	258,157	58.5%	41.5%
<b>Non-NCAA Member Institutions*</b>					
<b>Campus</b>	<b>No. Women</b>	<b>No. Men</b>	<b>Total Eligible</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Maritime Academy	103	580	683	15.1%	84.9%
Monterey Bay	1,724	1,332	3,056	56.4%	43.6%
San Marcos	2,914	1,744	4,658	62.6%	37.4%
<b>Totals</b>	4,741	3,656	8,397	44.7%	55.3%

\*The CSU's three non-NCAA member campuses began voluntary reporting of data beginning Fall 1999. Enrollment data for non-NCAA campuses obtained from CSU Office of Analytic Studies, Statistical Reports

**CSU Intercollegiate Women and Men  
Athletics Participants by Campus 2005-2006**

**NCAA Member Institutions**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>No. Women</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>No. Men</b>	<b>% Men</b>	<b>Total</b>
Bakersfield	254	68.5%	117	31.5%	371
Chico	180	49.3%	185	50.7%	365
Dominguez Hills	142	64.8%	77	35.2%	219
East Bay	125	58.4%	89	41.6%	214
Fresno	343	58.8%	240	41.2%	583
Fullerton	237	57.2%	177	42.8%	414
Humboldt	169	50.3%	167	49.7%	336
Long Beach	256	57.4%	190	42.6%	446
Los Angeles	148	60.9%	95	39.1%	243
Northridge	245	55.1%	200	44.9%	445
Pomona	94	45.2%	114	54.8%	208
Sacramento	316	55.4%	254	44.6%	570
San Bernardino	119	57.8%	87	42.2%	206
San Diego	326	59.8%	219	40.2%	545
San Francisco	147	59.8%	99	40.2%	246
San Jose	176	47.8%	192	52.2%	368
San Luis Obispo	221	42.3%	301	57.7%	522
Sonoma	165	58.9%	115	41.1%	280
Stanislaus	177	60.6%	115	39.4%	292
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,840</b>	<b>55.9%</b>	<b>3,033</b>	<b>44.1%</b>	<b>6,873</b>

**Non-NCAA Member Institutions**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>No. Women</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>No. Men</b>	<b>% Men</b>	<b>Total</b>
Maritime Academy	19	12.7%	131	87.3%	150
Monterey Bay	113	47.9%	123	52.1%	236
San Marcos	38	39.6%	58	60.4%	96
<b>Totals</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>35.3%</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>64.7%</b>	<b>482</b>

NCAA Member Institutions

Expenditures by CSU Campuses on Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2005-06

Table 3a

Campus	Women	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Men	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Total
Bakersfield	3,557,172		3,557,172	61.3%	2,249,427		2,249,427	38.7%	5,806,599
Chico	2,162,618		2,162,618	48.2%	2,322,156		2,322,156	51.8%	4,484,774
Dominguez Hills	1,179,110		1,179,110	60.8%	758,959		758,959	39.2%	1,938,069
East Bay	1,160,668		1,160,668	62.0%	712,780		712,780	38.0%	1,873,448
Fresno	10,749,473	423,044	10,326,429	49.1%	14,884,613	4,167,489	10,717,124	50.9%	21,043,553
Fullerton	4,762,916		4,762,916	53.5%	4,133,248		4,133,248	46.5%	8,896,164
Humboldt	1,914,534		1,914,534	49.5%	1,950,305		1,950,305	50.5%	3,864,839
Long Beach	6,216,168		6,216,168	55.3%	5,015,383		5,015,383	44.7%	11,231,551
Los Angeles	2,008,962		2,008,962	59.4%	1,372,335		1,372,335	40.6%	3,381,297
Northridge	4,169,121		4,169,121	53.9%	3,560,516		3,560,516	46.1%	7,729,637
Pomona	1,602,660		1,602,660	47.2%	1,795,799		1,795,799	52.8%	3,398,459
Sacramento	6,283,742		6,283,742	51.2%	5,983,480		5,983,480	48.8%	12,267,222
San Bernardino	1,546,992		1,546,992	56.2%	1,228,534	21,000	1,207,534	43.8%	2,754,526
San Diego	13,749,647	481,276	13,268,371	47.0%	17,166,423	2,217,359	14,949,064	53.0%	28,217,435
San Francisco	1,306,718		1,306,718	55.6%	1,076,837	32,215	1,044,622	44.4%	2,351,340
San Jose	6,853,606	291,040	6,562,566	41.2%	10,293,259	923,902	9,369,357	58.8%	15,931,923
San Luis Obispo	5,127,786		5,127,786	39.3%	7,909,912		7,909,912	60.7%	13,037,698
Sonoma	1,992,930		1,992,930	51.9%	1,849,264		1,849,264	48.1%	3,842,194
Stanislaus	1,217,845		1,217,845	55.5%	977,949		977,949	44.5%	2,195,794
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>77,562,668</b>	<b>1,195,360</b>	<b>76,367,308</b>	<b>49.5%</b>	<b>85,241,179</b>	<b>7,361,965</b>	<b>77,879,214</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>154,246,522</b>

For the purpose of calculating non-comparable costs, a campus should total legitimate non-comparable expenses for football and men's basketball and subtract them from the total costs of the men's program. The non-comparable costs for women's basketball and the other sport for which the highest non-comparable expenses are identified should be subtracted from the costs of the women's program. Once calculated, add the amended men's and women's expenses together and compute percentages for each. \*Total expenditures for campuses reporting non-comps are as follows: Fresno (\$25,634,086); San Bernardino (\$2,775,526), San Diego (\$30,916,070), San Francisco (2,383,555); and San Jose (\$17,146,865)

\*Non-Comparable Expenses are based on the provision of the consent decree that allowance may be made for differences in costs of certain programs, including, but not limited to, football.

**Expenditures by CSU Campuses on Men's and  
Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2005-2006**

Table 3b

**Non-NCAA Member Institutions**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Non-Comp.*</b>	<b>Adj. Total</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Non-Comp.*</b>	<b>Adj. Total</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
Maritime Academy	\$69,716		\$69,716	14.0%	\$428,799		\$428,799	86.0%	498,515
Monterey Bay	\$736,057		\$736,057	52.5%	\$666,992		\$666,992	47.5%	1,403,049
San Marcos	\$413,645		\$413,645	46.2%	\$481,857		\$481,857	53.8%	895,502
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,219,418</b>		<b>\$1,219,418</b>	43.6%	<b>\$1,577,648</b>		<b>\$1,577,648</b>	56.4%	2,797,066

\*Non-Comparable Expenses are based on the provision of the former consent decree that allowance may be made for differences in costs of certain programs, including, but not limited to, football.

**Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for  
Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams  
2005-2006**

NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	Women					Men				
	# of FTE Grants	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant	% of Grants	% of Dollars	# of FTE Grants	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant	% of Grants	% of Dollars
Bakersfield	50.92	\$531,890.00	\$10,445.60	64.6%	61.5%	27.94	\$333,414.00	\$11,933.21	35.4%	38.5%
Chico	20.11	\$209,986.20	\$10,441.88	47.9%	49.4%	21.85	\$215,283.00	\$9,852.77	52.1%	50.6%
Dominguez Hills	23.00	\$218,421.00	\$9,496.57	63.7%	63.8%	13.10	\$123,849.00	\$9,454.12	36.3%	36.2%
East Bay	No Grants Given									
Fresno	96.91	\$1,484,522.00	\$15,318.56	42.5%	46.3%	131.19	\$1,724,545.00	\$13,145.40	57.5%	53.7%
Fullerton	70.03	\$876,298.00	\$12,513.18	64.2%	63.9%	39.13	\$495,350.00	\$12,659.09	35.8%	36.1%
Humboldt	16.66	\$194,777.00	\$11,691.30	49.4%	51.7%	17.08	\$181,948.00	\$10,652.69	50.6%	48.3%
Long Beach	70.32	\$969,192.00	\$13,782.59	61.0%	63.9%	44.90	\$548,392.00	\$12,213.63	39.0%	36.1%
Los Angeles	24.34	\$259,101.00	\$10,645.07	57.8%	57.8%	17.77	\$189,215.00	\$10,648.00	42.2%	42.2%
Northridge	82.14	\$994,640.00	\$12,109.08	61.7%	62.9%	50.93	\$585,664.00	\$11,499.39	38.3%	37.1%
Pomona	27.62	\$239,130.00	\$8,657.86	53.5%	52.9%	24.01	\$213,022.00	\$8,872.22	46.5%	47.1%
Sacramento	103.33	\$1,183,231.00	\$11,450.99	50.6%	51.7%	100.78	\$1,106,126.00	\$10,975.65	49.4%	48.3%
San Bernardino	25.33	\$267,281.00	\$10,551.95	58.6%	58.7%	17.90	\$188,094.00	\$10,508.04	41.4%	41.3%
San Diego	127.36	\$2,083,456.00	\$16,358.79	50.4%	46.9%	125.54	\$2,356,614.00	\$18,771.82	49.6%	53.1%
San Francisco	10.69	\$157,448.00	\$14,728.53	60.0%	58.8%	7.13	\$110,098.00	\$15,441.51	40.0%	41.2%
San Jose	97.75	\$1,268,762.00	\$12,979.66	44.1%	45.5%	123.67	\$1,516,964.00	\$12,266.22	55.9%	54.5%
San Luis Obispo	65.89	\$947,261.00	\$14,376.40	38.4%	39.0%	105.87	\$1,481,325.00	\$13,991.92	61.6%	61.0%
Sonoma	13.10	\$146,211.00	\$11,161.15	58.0%	57.3%	9.47	\$108,829.00	\$11,491.97	42.0%	42.7%
Stanislaus	13.91	\$172,400.00	\$12,393.96	61.8%	61.8%	8.58	\$106,350.00	\$12,395.10	38.2%	38.2%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>939.41</b>	<b>\$12,204,007.20</b>	<b>\$12,991.14</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>51.3%</b>	<b>886.84</b>	<b>\$11,585,082.00</b>	<b>\$13,063.33</b>	<b>48.6%</b>	<b>48.7%</b>

**Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for  
Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams  
2005-2006**

Table 4b

Non-NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	Women					Men				
	# of FTE Grants	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant	% of Grants	% of Dollars	# of FTE Grants	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant	% of Grants	% of Dollars
Maritime Academy	N/A	\$10,000.00	N/A	N/A	50.0%	N/A	\$10,000.00	N/A	N/A	50.0%
Monterey Bay	N/A	\$125,836.00	N/A	N/A	57.3%	N/A	\$93,624.00	N/A	N/A	42.7%
San Marcos	N/A	\$61,950.00	N/A	N/A	55.5%	N/A	\$49,767.00	N/A	N/A	44.5%
Totals		\$197,786.00			56.3%		\$153,391.00			43.7%

N/A denotes data not available



California Community Colleges  
**Commission on Athletics**

## Six-Year Comparison Men's and Women's Sport Participation

SPORT	2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
	MEN'S	WOMEN'S	MEN'S	WOMEN'S	MEN'S	WOMEN'S	MEN'S	WOMEN'S	MEN'S	WOMEN'S	MEN'S	WOMEN'S
Baseball	2311		2328		2268		2348		2349		2518	
Badminton		123		116		130		126		128		98
Softball		1080		1160		974		1093		1098		1156
Basketball	1302	1010	1242	985	1114	965	1244	1006	1724	1024	1349	1060
Cross Country	643	534	649	491	556	499	554	457	593	538	593	544
Football	4868		4827		4556		4845		5409		5636	
Golf	433	149	464	163	383	161	435	161	393	155	397	124
Soccer	1355	1327	1359	1375	1279	1321	1358	1368	1498	1422	1667	1579
Swimming	523	616	522	549	574	567	550	589	624	625	620	650
Tennis	456	443	461	447	402	383	396	382	381	364	368	390
Track & Field	1503	783	1435	867	1226	759	1249	723	1457	790	1458	806
Water Polo	530	565	482	520	489	466	510	527	530	526	563	558
Wrestling	276		427		401		400		411		428	
Volleyball	176	907	185	932	160	856	177	916	183	869	184	945
Totals M or W	14376	7537	14381	7605	13408	7081	14066	7348	15552	7539	15781	7910
Totals M & W	21913		21986		20489		21414		23091		23691	
Percentages	66%	34%	65%	35%	65%	35%	66%	34%	67%	33%	67%	33%



www.cifstate.org

# State Media Release

State CIF Office 1320 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 140, Alameda, CA 94502

Phone: 510-521-4447 Fax: 510-521-4449

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

**Date: Thursday, June 30, 2005**

**Contact: Emmy Zack, Director of Communications**

**ezack@cifstate.org**

## ***2005 CIF PARTICIPATION SURVEY SHOWS INCREASE FOR BOYS AND GIRLS***

**ALAMEDA** – The number of boys and girls participating in high school athletics in California has increased by nearly 25,000 athletes, according to the 2005 CIF Sports Participation Survey. The survey, conducted by the CIF and completed by member schools, is part of the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS) nationwide survey that measures the number of students competing in sports across the country.

Despite the state's ongoing budget crisis, the survey shows a total of 676,968 high school student-athletes are participating in sports, an increase of 3.8 percent from 2003, the last time the CIF conducted such a survey. Single-gender numbers for both boys and girls are also at all-time highs after increases of 4.3% and 3.0%, respectively, from two years ago. There are 398,684 boys participating in sports, an increase of 16,576 from two years ago. Meanwhile, an additional 8,059 girls have become active, bringing the total to 278,284.

“I am encouraged by the overall increases in participation as compared to our 2003 survey. These increases are a direct reflection of the extent to which school boards, administrators, parents and students value the benefits of educational athletics,” said Marie M. Ishida, CIF Executive Director. “Now, more than ever, we must continue to promote the values and life skills that can be learned through participation in high school sports.

“As we review these statewide participation numbers, we must recognize and applaud our local school board and school site leadership. During these challenging fiscal times, so many of our member schools and school districts continue to maintain and, indeed, grow athletic opportunities for our students.”

Based on number of participants, football remains the most popular sport for boys with 99,079 players, a 3.7% increase since the last survey in 2003. With more than 3,500 athletes (8.9%) from two years ago, and a current participation total of 45,038, track and field moves from fourth place to second among boys. Basketball (42,061) remained in third place. Among the top 10 sports by participation, swimming/diving enjoyed the highest percentage increase at 11.7%, followed closely by cross country at 11.3%.

-- more --

Soccer, which picked up more than 2,000 players (5.8%) since 2003, retains its position as the most popular sport for girls with 37,424 participants. Track and field (36,113) remains in second place while volleyball (34,015) jumps into third place. Among the top 10 sports by participation, cross country saw the largest increase by percentage among girls at 9.3%. Golf (7.7%) and water polo (7.5%) also enjoyed significant percentage increases.

A list of participation by sport follows. Only CIF-approved sports are listed individually.

### 2004-05 PARTICIPATION CHART

SPORT	BOYS 1998	BOYS 2001	BOYS 2003	BOYS 2005	GIRLS 1998	GIRLS 2001	GIRLS 2003	GIRLS 2005
Badminton	3,387	3,572	3,627	3,521	4,462	4,722	4,929	4,500
Baseball	40,102	42,942	41,392	40,676	412*	826*	662*	417*
Basketball	39,846	42,267	41,784	42,061	30,979	33,831	33,912	33,596
Cross Country	18,668	19,593	20,465	22,782	14,245	16,060	16,618	18,159
Field Hockey	12	36	36	52	2,111	2,629	2,170	2,952
Football 11-player	91,301	97,236	95,504	99,079	200	313*	236*	253*
Football 8- player	1,280	1,263	1,129	1,623	0	0	0	1*
Football 9- player	190	246	251	166	0	0	0	0
Football 6- player	9	82	96	47	1*	55*	3*	30*
Golf	10,783	11,990	11,764	11,459	1,447	4,588	5,547	5,972
Gymnastics	12	19	91	3	1,230	1,260	859	896
Lacrosse			2,240	3,608			1,834	2,286
Skiing	390	582	414	617	243	389	222	432
Soccer	35,537	38,053	38,501	39,453	30,222	34,663	35,380	37,424
Softball	580	1,129	963	456	28,979	31,992	30,118	30,055
Swimming and Diving	14,687	15,685	15,731	17,579	25,157	24,596	23,255	24,508
Tennis	15,380	15,804	16,716	17,238	17,383	18,812	19,496	19,847
Track and Field	39,262	40,843	41,349	45,038	29,682	33,153	34,378	36,113
Volleyball	11,660	13,326	12,156	13,133	30,879	34,194	32,756	34,015
Water Polo	10,725	11,411	11,500	12,570	9,487*	12,257*	12,185*	13,099*
Wrestling	23,163	24,326	22,007	23,318	494*	752*	957*	1,230*
Other			1,103	1,663			726	756
<b>Total</b>	<b>356,974</b>	<b>**386,248</b>	<b>**382,108</b>	<b>**398,684</b>	<b>227,613</b>	<b>**271,214</b>	<b>**270,225</b>	<b>**278,284</b>
<p><b>*Whenever a school provides only a team for boys in a particular sport, girls are permitted to qualify for the "student" team (s). **Note: As part of the National Federation survey, the CIF measures participation in all sports and activities. The above list does not comprise all sports/activities sponsored by schools and required in the NFHS survey.</b></p>								

## 2004-05 CIF MOST POPULAR SPORTS

### BOYS

<i>Sport</i>	<i>Participants</i>	<i>% Increase (since 2003)</i>
1. Football (11-player)	99,079	3.7
2. Track & Field	45,038	8.9
3. Basketball	42,061	0.7
4. Baseball	40,676	-1.7
5. Soccer	39,453	2.5
6. Wrestling	23,318	6.0
7. Cross Country	22,782	11.3
8. Swimming/Diving	17,579	11.7
9. Tennis	17,238	3.1
10. Volleyball	13,133	8.0

### GIRLS

<i>Sport</i>	<i>Participants</i>	<i>% Increase (since 2003)</i>
1. Soccer	37,424	5.8
2. Track & Field	36,113	5.0
3. Volleyball	34,015	3.8
4. Basketball	33,596	-0.9
5. Softball	30,055	-0.2
6. Swimming/Diving	24,508	5.4
7. Tennis	19,847	1.8
8. Cross Country	18,159	9.3
9. Water Polo	13,099	7.5
10. Golf	5,972	7.7