

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 1:15 p.m., Tuesday, July 15, 2008
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Herbert L. Carter, Chair
Roberta Achtenberg, Vice Chair
Carol R. Chandler
Debra S. Farar
Kenneth Fong
Margaret Fortune
George G. Gowgani
Curtis Grima
William Hauck
Peter G. Mehas
Lou Monville
Craig R. Smith
Glen O. Toney

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 13, 2008

Discussion Items

1. Proposed Revision to Title 5 Relative to Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate Admission Criteria, *Action*
2. Former Foster Youth, *Information*
3. Report on Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students, *Information*

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Trustees of The California State University
Office of the Chancellor
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

May 13, 2008

Members Present

Herbert L. Carter, Chair
Carol R. Chandler, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg, Chair of the Board
Jeffrey L. Bleich
George G. Gowgani
William Hauck
Peter G. Mehas
Lou Monville
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Jennifer Reimer
Craig R. Smith
Glen O. Toney

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 11, 2008 were approved by consent as submitted.

International Programs in the California State University

The California State University has a long history of providing opportunities whereby students may achieve international competencies through activities both here in California, and through study opportunities abroad. This information item, presented by Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, Gary W. Reichard, summarized the California State University's mission, vision, and strategic plan with regards to the CSU's international programs. A video presentation focused on student mobility and introduced the committee to several recent CSU students who spent a part of their degree program abroad. Further committee discussion included the CSU's ever-present concern for student safety, travel opportunities provided by the Peace Corps, and pending legislation that could approve travel funds for students prior to graduation.

California State University Mathematics and Science Teacher Initiative

This item, presented for information by Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education and Public School Programs,

In 1992, the CSU system had a difference of 18.5 percent between the female undergraduate student enrollment (53.2 percent) and female student athlete participation (34.7 percent). As of fall 2006, this difference was decreased to 1.4 percent having a female undergraduate enrollment of 57.1 percent and a female student athlete participation rate of 55.7 percent.

Overall, CSU expenditures for women's athletics increased from \$11.2 million in 1992-93 to \$83.3 million in 2006-07. The total increase over the previous year was \$7 million, a 9.2 percent increase. Funds allocated for grants-in-aid for female athletes increased from \$2.5 million in 1992-93 to \$13.2 million in 2006-07. The increase in grants-in-aid over the past year was just over \$1 million, for an 8.5 percent increase.

Campus Impact

Participation - During 2006-07, 16 of the 20 NCAA-member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in participation including: Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma, Stanislaus.

The campuses not in compliance and the percentage by which they missed the goal are: Dominguez Hills, 1.5; Long Beach, .8; Monterey Bay, 2.0; and San Bernardino, 3.4.

Expenditures - Eighteen campuses met or exceeded their targets goals in expenditures including: Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo and Stanislaus.

Two campuses were less than two percent from compliance: Dominguez Hills, 1.7 and Sonoma, .8.

Grants-In-Aid - Seventeen campuses met or exceeded their target goals in grants-in-aid including: Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma and Stanislaus.

Three campuses did not meet their target goals including Dominguez Hills, 2.9, Fresno, 8.0 and San Diego, 6.8.

Campus Challenges in Achieving Target Goals

Although the CSU system has made tremendous improvements to increase participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid for female student athletes, some campuses have experienced

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Proposed Revision to Title 5 Relative to Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate Admission Criteria

Presentation By

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Christine Helwick
General Counsel

Summary

This action item, submitted for information in March, proposes a revision to Title 5 §41000, which specifies the criteria that qualify applicants for admission to a campus as a post-baccalaureate student or graduate student. Existing regulations specify that an applicant may be admitted if the applicant meets all three of the following criteria. The applicant: (1) has earned an appropriate baccalaureate degree (or equivalent preparation), and (2) has attained a grade-point average (GPA) of 2.5 in the last 60 semester units of study attempted, and (3) is in good standing at the last institution attended.

Research conducted by the CSU Graduate Deans Council on over 1,000 CSU graduate admission applications demonstrated that this three-criteria structure requires admissions offices to confirm more information than necessary to make a responsible graduate admission decision. Further, the current regulations cause delays in admission decisions while staff conduct transcript research and GPA calculations. Under current regulations, the multiple criteria may serve to disqualify a student who holds an acceptable bachelor's degree but who may not have done well in post-baccalaureate coursework (courses taken for professional development or personal interest).

The proposed revision maintains the requirements that applicants will have completed a baccalaureate degree program and will have been in good academic standing at the last institution attended. Additional required criteria will allow admission offices to evaluate eligibility by confirming that (1) the student either holds a graduate degree or (2) has a 2.5 minimum GPA in an acceptable earned baccalaureate degree, or (3) has a grade point average of at least 2.5 in the last 60 semester units (90 quarter units) attempted. The regulations continue to set the minimum criteria for systemwide post-baccalaureate and graduate admissions. Per §41050, campuses may establish more stringent local requirements for post-baccalaureate and graduate admission. Title 5 §41001 remains in effect and allows admission by special action, as decided by the appropriate campus authority. The greater flexibility afforded by this revision will better serve prospective students, admissions staff, and graduate programs.

Title 5, California Code of Regulations
Division 5 -- Board of Trustees of the California State Universities
Chapter 1 -- California State University
Subchapter – 3 Admission Requirements
Article 8 -- Admission of Post-Baccalaureate and Graduate Students

§41000. Admission to Post-Baccalaureate Standing: Unclassified

An applicant may be admitted to a campus as an unclassified post-baccalaureate student if the applicant satisfies the requirements of each of the three following lettered subdivisions:

(a) The applicant holds an acceptable baccalaureate degree earned at an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association, or the applicant has completed equivalent academic preparation as determined by the appropriate campus authority; and

(b) The applicant has satisfied any one of the following three numbered conditions:

(1) The applicant has attained a grade point average of at least 2.5 in an acceptable earned baccalaureate degree.

(2) The applicant has attained a grade point average of at least 2.5 in the last 60 semester units (90 quarter units) attempted;.

(3) The applicant holds an acceptable post-baccalaureate degree earned at an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association;

(c) And the applicant was in good standing at the last ~~college~~ institution of higher education attended.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Former Foster Youth

Presentation By

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Allison G. Jones
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support

Summary

For over a decade, California State University campuses have answered the call for increasing the persistence and graduation of former foster youth. Their collective efforts have established models, which are now emulated by other states. Private and public partnerships with philanthropic organizations such as the Stuart Foundation have created a vast network of safety nets to improve outcomes for youth exiting the foster care system.

As programs develop and celebrate their graduates, efforts are underway for a system-wide assessment of intervention strategies and how these efforts contribute to the retention and graduation of this unique population. Much has been achieved in implementing the objectives set forth in the initial and subsequent legislation. The CSU is and will continue to be a leader in enrolling and graduating former foster youth.

Background

AB 2463 (Louis Caldera, 1996) called upon the California State University and the California Community Colleges to expand access and retention programs to include outreach services to emancipated foster youth in order to encourage their enrollment in a California State University or a California Community College.

At that time, the California State University was providing technical support to assist prospective foster youth students in completing admission applications and financial aid applications for students who voluntarily disclosed their status as former emancipated foster youth. All CSU campuses were assisting foster youth on a case-by-case basis through the Educational Opportunity Program and the offices of financial aid. However, it was noted that the identification of emancipated foster youth was difficult because many of these students did

not wish to disclose their status. This presented an obstacle in providing services to foster youth. In spite of this challenge, EOP eligibility criteria were expanded to include foster youth and the ward of the court status was added to the CSU admission application, EOP application and FAFSA application.

Stuart Foundation Foster Youth Grant

Recognizing the success of CSU campus programs to support former foster youth, the California State University was awarded \$200,000, the first installment of a three year \$600,000 grant request, from the Stuart Foundation to create the CSU Foster Youth in Higher Education project to help students attending colleges and universities in California and the state of Washington. The program will help support the following activities:

- the recruitment and identification of college campuses interested in implementing
- successful strategies that result in increased retention and graduation of former foster youth;
- working with campuses to implement self-assessment protocols;
- conducting assessment of the project's objections;
- helping to facilitate a peer-to-peer network of college and university programs work with campuses to develop strategies and materials to support joint marketing and outreach; and
- working with the University of California, California Community Colleges and institutions of higher education in Washington state to increase the quality and number of former foster youth programs.

The Stuart Foundation established the following outcome measurements of success:

- increase enrollment of foster youth in higher education by five percent per year;
- develop effective research assessment tools for former foster youth support programs;
- increase financial aid awarded to foster youth;
- measure annual academic unit completion and degrees awarded;
- increase the number of foster youth support programs on university campuses; and
- increase funding from grants and donors.

The ultimate goal of the grant program is to ensure that former foster youth experiences and opportunities in college mirror the general student population. Key partners include the Stuart Foundation, Walter S. Johnson Foundation, John Burton Foundation, California Youth Connection, Orangewood Children's Foundation, Silicon Valley Children's Fund, San Diego Child Abuse Prevention Foundation, United Friends of the Children and Casey Family Programs.

Former Foster Youth Support Programs

In 2004, approximately 4,255 children aged out of foster care in California and sixty-five percent were homeless within six months of leaving the foster care system. As wards of the court, foster youth are emancipated at age 18 and forced to make a difficult transition to adulthood alone without the support most students receive from their families. The statistics for this population are disturbing. According to various national studies, fewer than thirty-seven percent of former foster youth attend college (both two and four-year institutions combined) compared to fifty-one percent of the general population. Out of the one hundred and fifty thousand who have graduated from high school and qualify for admission into a college, only thirty thousand foster youth are attending higher education institutions nationally (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2007). The more troubling statistic however, is that of those who attend four-year colleges, only three percent earn a baccalaureate compared to twenty-eight percent of the general population (Casey Family Programs, 2006). Thus, the majority of former foster youth do not have access to postsecondary educational opportunities. Of those youth who do attend college, an overwhelming majority of them often face barriers that severely undermine their ability to complete a degree.

The Guardian Scholars program at California State University,, Fullerton, launched in 1998, was the first program in the nation to support the academic and personal aspirations of college-ready former foster youth. Throughout California, a number of CSU campuses are making special efforts to support former foster youth on campus. With the benchmark set by the Guardian Scholars program at California State University,, Fullerton, which boasts a sixty-five percent retention rate and with fifty-one graduates earning their degrees, these developing programs are striving to improve access and facilitate graduation for all youth exiting the foster care system.

During 2006-2007, CSU outreach personnel worked with one thousand and eleven current foster youth who expressed a desire to attend college. Currently, there are approximately two hundred foster youth who are participating in programs within the CSU system. Due to economic and social hardships foster youth face, these students receive financial aid awards that cover their costs of attendance.

Campus access and retention programs assist eligible foster youth in applying to CSU campuses and provide services to support their persistence to graduation. CSU campuses have developed former foster youth program models that are unique to their organizational structure and availability of resources. The models provide youth with academic and personal support specific to their transition and ongoing needs. Services include direct contact with caring staff members, continuing academic monitoring and intervention, opportunities to build relationships in a community setting, and connections to campus clubs and organizations. Many of these

programs are modeled after the Guardian Scholars Program launched at California State University, Fullerton.

The following campuses have adopted the term “Guardian Scholars” to signal the presence of a support program for foster youth:

- San Francisco State University,
- California State University, Sacramento, and
- San Diego State University.

Other program names include Renaissance Scholars:

- California State Polytechnic University Pomona,
- California State University, East Bay, and
- California State University, Fresno,

Additional programs are administered at the following campuses:

- The Connect Motivate Educate (CME) Society at San José State University,
- Promise Scholars at CSU Stanislaus, and
- ACE Scholars at CSU San Marcos.

Some programs reside in the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP) such as California State University, San Bernardino. These on-campus support programs serve as a “home base” for students throughout the duration of their undergraduate journey at the CSU. In collaboration with all student support offices on campus and community services off campus, these programs have been successful in increasing the admission, retention and graduation of former foster youth.

A fine example of community collaboration is the San José State University, Connect, Motivate, Education (CME) Society. This program was developed by the campus to address the needs of foster youth in Santa Clara County through a network of support services for both current and former foster youth who want to complete their education at San José State University. At CME Society, current foster youth in middle school receive college preparation services through early academic outreach efforts and intervention. These students are given additional education resources that ensure their transition into college.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Renaissance Scholars is also an example of an innovative on-campus support program that is striving to increase admission for foster youth by collaborating with existing campus support programs for at-risk students. The Renaissance Scholars have served over eighty former foster youth and have graduated fifteen students since 2002.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Report on Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students

Presentation By

Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

John D. Welty
President
California State University, Fresno

Allison G. Jones
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support

Brief History and Introduction

In 1976, the California Legislature adopted Education Code Sections 89240 through 89242. This law expressed a legislative intent concerning intercollegiate athletics, stating “that opportunities for participation in athletics be provided on as nearly an equal basis to male and female students as is practicable, and that comparable incentives and encouragements be offered to females to engage in athletics.” This article of the Code further called upon the CSU Trustees to ensure that reasonable amounts of General Fund monies would be allocated to male and female students, “except that allowances may be made for differences in the costs of various athletic programs.” These California statutes echoed Federal legislation (Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972), which prohibits discrimination based on sex, including in the athletics programs of educational institutions.

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.

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. 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 2006-2007 academic year, is the eighth annual report issued following the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring.

2006-2007 Report Summary

The CSU report for 2006-2007 includes data taken from the NCAA/EADA 2007 Reports, submitted January 15, 2008 to the NCAA with a copy to the CSU. For the 2006-2007 reporting, the CSU Monitoring Committee agreed to a recommendation made by the CA NOW to require campuses to submit the current year corrective action plan with the NCAA/EADA report. The change is reflected in Part V in this report. In addition, the CSU currently has twenty NCAA member campuses with CSU Monterey Bay becoming a full NCAA member as of the 2006-2007 academic year.

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 female and male 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 female and male 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 female and male undergraduates.

Systemwide Impact

At the CSU systemwide level, the number of female participants in intercollegiate athletics has increased from 1,862 in 1992-93 to 3,999 in 2006-07, on the twenty NCAA member campuses, an increase of 114.8 percent over the past 14 years. During the previous year, 159 more females participated in intercollegiate athletics, a one-year increase of 4.1 percent.

In 1992, the CSU system had a difference of 18.5 percent between the female undergraduate student enrollment (53.2 percent) and female student athlete participation (34.7 percent). As of fall 2006, this difference was decreased to 1.4 percent having a female undergraduate enrollment of 57.1 percent and a female student athlete participation rate of 55.7 percent.

Overall, CSU expenditures for women's athletics increased from \$11.2 million in 1992-93 to \$83.3 million in 2006-07. The total increase over the previous year was \$7 million, a 9.2 percent increase. Funds allocated for grants-in-aid for female athletes increased from \$2.5 million in 1992-93 to \$13.2 million in 2006-07. The increase in grants-in-aid over the past year was just over \$1 million, for an 8.5 percent increase.

Campus Impact

Participation - During 2006-07, 16 of the 20 NCAA-member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in participation including: Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma, Stanislaus.

The campuses not in compliance and the percentage by which they missed the goal are: Dominguez Hills, 1.5; Long Beach, .8; Monterey Bay, 2.0; and San Bernardino, 3.4.

Expenditures - Eighteen campuses met or exceeded their target goals in expenditures including: Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo and Stanislaus.

Two campuses were less than two percent from compliance: Dominguez Hills, 1.7 and Sonoma, .8.

Grants-In-Aid - Seventeen campuses met or exceeded their target goals in grants-in-aid including: Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma and Stanislaus.

Three campuses did not meet their target goals including Dominguez Hills, 2.9, Fresno, 8.0 and San Diego, 6.8.

Campus Challenges in Achieving Target Goals

Although the CSU system has made tremendous improvements to increase participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid for female student athletes, some campuses have experienced

difficulty in achieving full-compliance. The contributing factors impacting the campuses' ability to achieve gender equity compliance are the CSU enrollment increase in female student undergraduates from 1992 to 2006 and the NCAA grants-in-aid maximum limit for each sport.

The CSU female undergraduate enrollment increased from 147,566 female students in 1992-1993 to 196,764 in 2006-2007. This reflects a thirty-three percent increase for female undergraduate students compared to a fourteen percent increase for male undergraduate students during that same time period. The rise in female undergraduate enrollment results in campuses increasing female student athlete participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid at a faster pace.

According to the NCAA Operating Bylaw 15.5, campuses are prohibited to award grants-in-aid above the maximum limit for each sport. Several campuses, particularly those with football, are issuing the maximum allowable number of grants-in-aid but remain unable to achieve their target goal.

Despite these challenges, the CSU campuses received high grades in participation in a report entitled, *Who's Playing College Sports? Trends in Participation*, issued in 2007 by the Women's Sports Foundation. The foundation assigned grades to the NCAA based on national participation rates. Division I received a grade of B-, division II received a grade of D+ and division III received a grade of C. The CSU campuses received an average grade of B+ in each NCAA division (I, II and III), which is above the NCAA national grades. In addition, sixty-five percent of the CSU campuses that are NCAA members received a grade for female student athlete participation of either an A or A-.

NCAA Member CSU Campuses Not Meeting Target goals for Two Consecutive Years (2005-06 and 2006-07)

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

Participation: Two NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in participation of women athletes during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 academic years:

Campus	2005-2006	2006-2007
Monterey Bay	-5.3	-2.0
San Bernardino	-3.4%	-3.2%

Expenditures: One NCAA member CSU campus did not meet its target in expenditures for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2005-2006 and 2006-2007.

Campus	2005-2006	2006-2007
Sonoma	-0.9%	-0.8%

Grants-In-Aid: Two NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in grants-in-aid for women's athletic programs during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 academic years:

Campus	2005-2006	2006-2007
Fresno	-7.8%	-8.0%
San Diego	-6.4%	-6.8%

These campuses were required to submit a corrective action plan at the same time the report was due to the Office of the Chancellor indicating how the campus plans to meet its target goals in the future. Campus corrective plans are provided in the attached report.

2006-2007 Final Report

The proceeding pages include the full report on the Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students, which was publicly issued on July 1, 2008.

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

Annual Report
2006-2007

July 1, 2008

The California State University
Office of the Chancellor

www.calstate.edu

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Summary of 2006-2007 Data – System Level

Summary of 2006-2007 Data – Campus Level

Part I: Report for Academic Year 2006-2007: NCAA Campuses

Part II: Report for Academic Year 2006-2007: Non-NCAA Campuses

Part III: Eight Year Review of the NCAA Member CSU Campuses Meeting
Target Goals

Part IV: NCAA Member Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals For Two
Consecutive Years (2005-2006 and 2006-2007)

Part V: Corrective Action Plans from Non-Compliance Campuses for
Results in 2007-2008 Reporting

Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee

Table 1: NCAA Eligible Men and Women

Table 2: Athletics Participants by Campus 2006-2007

Table 3: Expenditures by Campus 2006-2007 (NCAA Campuses)

Table 3a: Expenditures by Campus 2006-2007 (Non-NCAA Campuses)

Table 4: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2006-2007 (NCAA Campuses)

Table 4a: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2006-2007 (Non-NCAA Campuses)

Table 5: California Community Colleges: Six-Year Comparison on Men's
And Women's Sport Participation

High School Participation Numbers

High School Most Popular Sports: 2006-2007

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 2006-2007

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 2006-2007 academic year, is the eighth 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.

At the suggestion of the CA NOW in October of 2004, the CSU Monitoring Committee decided to revise 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 NCAA decided that it would no longer utilize the Excel-based EADA reporting tool to collect athletically-related revenues and expenses. 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 15th following each fiscal year. NCAA changed its report date because of changes to its reporting procedures.

The CSU report for 2006-2007 includes data taken from the NCAA/EADA 2007 Reports, submitted January 15, 2008 to the NCAA with a copy to the CSU. For the 2006-2007 reporting, the CSU Monitoring Committee agreed to a recommendation made by the CA NOW to require campuses to submit the current year corrective action plan with the NCAA/EADA report. The change is reflected in Part V in this report. In addition, the CSU currently has twenty NCAA member campuses with CSU Monterey Bay becoming a full NCAA member as of the 2006-2007 academic year.

Questions regarding the Voluntary Self-Monitoring Report regarding Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students may be addressed to Mr. Allison G. Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support, at (562) 951-4744 or ajones@calstate.edu or Mr. Ray Murillo, Associate Director, Student Programs, Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support, at (562) 951-4707 or rmurillo@calstate.edu.

Summary of 2006-2007 Data – CSU System Level

For the areas of participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid, the 2006-2007 data are presented for twenty campuses whereas only data for nineteen campuses were presented in prior reports. CSU Monterey Bay was awarded full NCAA membership in 2007 as the twentieth CSU campus.

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 3,999 in 2006-2007 on the twenty NCAA member campuses, an increase of 114.8% over the past fourteen years. During the previous year, 159 more females participated in intercollegiate athletics, a one-year increase of 4.1%. During this same fourteen-year period, male intercollegiate athletic participation decreased 17.3% from 3,733 in 1992-93 to 3,182 in 2006-2007. During 2006-2007, 149 more males participated in intercollegiate athletics than in 2005-2006, a one year increase of 4.9%.

The data also indicate that 55.7% of all intercollegiate athletic participants within the CSU in 2006-2007 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. In 1992, the CSU system had a difference of 18.5 percent between the female undergraduate student enrollment (53.2 percent) and female student athlete participation (34.7 percent). As of fall 2006, this difference has been decreased to 1.4 percent having a female undergraduate enrollment of 57.1 percent and a female student athlete participation rate of 55.7 percent.

Community college comparison data supplied by the California Community Colleges Commission on Athletics were updated in 2005-2006. The 2005-2006 data reflect participation rates at 67% for male athletes and 33% for female athletes.

The California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) administers a biennial CIF participation survey of high school athletes. The 2007 survey results were made available in August 2007.

The 2007 CIF participation survey is included in this report. The 2007 high school participation numbers for male and female athletes are reported on pages 24-27. Participation percentages for male athletes at the high school level are 59.5% and female athletes are 40.5%.

2. Expenditures

Expenditures for women's intercollegiate athletic programs on the CSU's twenty NCAA member campuses increased from \$11.2 million in 1992-1993 to \$83.3 million in 2006-2007. This represents an increase of 644% over the past fourteen years. The total increase over the previous year was \$7 million, a 9.2% increase. During this same period, expenditures for men's athletic programs grew from \$33.4 million to \$82.4 million, an increase of 146.7%. The total increase over the past year was \$4.5 million, a 5.8% increase.

In October 2004, the CA NOW and the CSU Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee agreed to a revision in the calculation of non-comparable expenses as discussed in the Executive Summary. The expenditures reported above are the adjusted totals, which are total expenditures minus the non-comparable expenditures. The total non-comparable expenditure for women's athletic teams is \$631,270, and the total non-comparable expenditure for men's athletic teams is \$8,416,067.

3. Grants-In-Aid

Funds allocated for grants-in-aid for female athletes on the CSU's twenty NCAA member campuses within the CSU increased from \$2.5 million in 1992-1993 to \$13.2 million in 2006-2007. This represents an increase of 428% over a fourteen-year period. The increase in grants-in-aid over the past year was \$1,038,322, for an 8.5% increase. Grants-in-aid for male student athletes during the same period increased from \$4.6 million to \$12.2 million, which represents an increase of 165%. The increase over the past year was \$603,849 for a 5.2% increase.

Summary of 2006-2007 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 female and male 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 female and male 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 female and male undergraduates.

1. Participation

At the campus level, during the 2006-2007 academic year, the report indicated that sixteen of the twenty (16/20) 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, eighteen of the twenty (18/20) 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, seventeen out of the twenty (17/20) 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

Thirteen campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures, and grants-in-aid during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Part I: Report for Academic Year 2006-2007 – NCAA Member Campuses (20) – Based on the NCAA/EADA Report for 2007, submitted to the NCAA on January 15, 2008

Participation, Expenditures, and Grants-In-Aid

Thirteen (13) campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures, and grants-in-aid during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Bakersfield	Pomona
Chico	Sacramento
East Bay	San Francisco
Fullerton	San Jose
Humboldt	San Luis Obispo
Los Angeles	Stanislaus
Northridge	

Participation

Sixteen (16) campuses met their target goals in participation in 2006-2007.

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

Four (4) campuses did not meet their target goals for participation:

Dominguez Hills	-1.5%
Long Beach	-0.8%
Monterey Bay	-2.0%
San Bernardino	-3.4%

Expenditures

Eighteen (18) campuses met their target goals in expenditures in 2006-2007.

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

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

Dominguez Hills	-1.7%
Sonoma	-0.8%

Grants-In-Aid

Seventeen (17) campuses met their target goals in grants-in-aid in 2006-2007.

Bakersfield	Pomona
Chico	Sacramento
East Bay (no grants given)	San Bernardino
Fullerton	San Francisco
Humboldt	San Jose
Long Beach	San Luis Obispo
Los Angeles	Sonoma
Monterey Bay	Stanislaus
Northridge	

Three (3) campuses did not meet their target goals for grants-in-aid:

Dominguez Hills	-2.9%
Fresno	-8.0%
San Diego	-6.8%

**Part II: Report for Academic Year 2006-2007 – Non-NCAA Member Campuses (2) –
Based on Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) report**

Participation – 2006-2007

Maritime Academy	Target met
San Marcos	-12.6%

Expenditures – 2006-2007

Maritime Academy	Target met
San Marcos	-3.7%

Grants-In-Aid – 2006-2007

Maritime Academy	Target met
San Marcos	-0.7%

Part III: Eight Year Review of the 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 eight 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
2006-2007: 13 of 20 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
2006-2007: 16 of 20 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
2006-2007: 18 of 20 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
2006-2007: 17 of 20 campuses

(* Effective in 2006-2007, CSU Monterey Bay was moved to the NCAA member table as a result of being a full NCAA member.)

Part IV: NCAA Member CSU Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals for Two Consecutive Years (2005-2006 – 2006-2007)

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 were required to submit a corrective action plan at the same time the report was due to the Office of the Chancellor indicating how the campus plans to meet its target goals in the future.

Participation: Two NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in participation of women athletes during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 academic years:

Campus	2005-2006	2006-2007
Monterey Bay	-5.3	-2.0
San Bernardino	-3.4%	-3.2%

Expenditures: One NCAA member CSU campus did not meet its target in expenditures for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2005-2006 and 2006-2007.

Campus	2005-2006	2006-2007
Sonoma	-0.9%	-0.8%

Grants-In-Aid: Two NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in grants-in-aid for women's athletic programs during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 academic years:

Campus	2005-2006	2006-2007
Fresno	-7.8%	-8.0%
San Diego	-6.4%	-6.8%

Part V: Corrective Action Plans from Non-Compliance Campuses for Results in 2007-2008 Reporting

Campuses that did not meet their target goals for two consecutive years (2005-2006 and 2006-2007) were required to submit a plan to the Office of the Chancellor indicating how the campus plans to meet its target goals in the future. Below are the corrective action plans from those campuses that were out of compliance for two consecutive years as reported in this annual self-monitoring report.

2006-2007 Reporting

Fresno	2005-06	2006-07
Grants-In-Aid	-7.8%	-8.0%

A Gender Equity Plan Task Force (GEPTF) was named in August of 2007 with a charge to review the present Title IX compliance status of the athletics department and create a plan to correct any deficiencies and assure a sustainable compliant program for the next five years. Though the GEPTF has not completed its final plan as of this date, it is acknowledged that with the present sports menu, California State University, Fresno cannot meet the Federal guidelines for equitable distribution of athletics scholarships without significantly impacting the scholarship allocations to men's sports.

This circumstance additionally translates into non-compliance with the grant-in-aid guideline of the CA NOW report. It is interesting that this deficiency exists despite the fact that the present sports menu meets the proportionality and expense requirements of CA NOW. In fact, the athletics program at Fresno State is one of the few Division IA institutions that meet the proportionality prong of the interests and abilities requirement of Title IX.

Rather than decimate the scholarships for men's athletic teams, the GEPTF has recommended the addition of two women's sports which will allow the institution, with some adjustment to its roster management program, to remain in compliance with participation proportionality while moving into compliance with the athletics aid requirement. It is planned that the new sports, women's swimming and diving and women's lacrosse will compete in 2008-09 and the scholarships (26) will be phased in over a three-year period. As the institution moves toward this goal, the result should translate into similar progress in meeting the CA NOW grant-in-aid target.

The implementation details will be released as part of the final 2008-2013 Gender Equity Plan, however the announcement of the new sports was made on January 7, 2008. A subcommittee of the Athletics Advisory Council in conjunction with the institution's Title IX coordinator will monitor the plan's progress.

Monterey Bay	2005-06	2006-07
Participation	-5.3%	-2.0%

The corrective action plan to meet the participation target calls for establishing a roster management program. Men’s teams will annually be allocated a maximum participation target and women’s teams will annually be allocated a minimum participation target. Participation numbers will be monitored on an ongoing basis.

Roster management was implemented in spring 2006 to take effect in 2007-08. For example, the baseball team which carried fifty-eight players in 2006-07 is capped at forty for 2007-08. Early indications on squad sizes from fall 2007 indicate that this strategy will be successful. The Athletic Advisory Board has endorsed this approach to achieving proportionality at CSU Monterey Bay.

San Bernardino	2005-06	2006-07
Participation	-3.4%	-3.2%

CSU San Bernardino proposes to address the participation rate of females in the athletic programs by instituting three steps during the 2007-2008 academic year. First, the Athletics Department will hire full-time coaches for women’s soccer and softball. This will allow the program continuity and enhance recruiting efforts to increase participation in these two woman’s sports. Second, an additional \$100,000.00 of new scholarship money will be made available to assist coaches for all women’s teams in their recruiting efforts. Finally, the squad size for most women’s teams will be increased to help reach the participation goal.

The summary tables for squad size and proportional percentages below indicate that CSUSB will be in full compliance with Gender Equity in Athletics requirements during the 2007-2008 academic year if the campus is successful in meeting all of its goals.

CSUSB Squad Size

Men’s Teams	2006-07	Percentage	2007-08	Percentage
Basketball	18		18	
Baseball	31		30	
Soccer	28		28	
Golf	9		9	
Total Men’s	86	42.4%	85	39.7%

San Marcos¹	2005-06	2006-07
Participation	-18.0%	-12.6%
Expenditure	-6.4%	-3.7%
Grants-In-Aid	-2.1%	-0.7%

To meet the gender equity targets, Cal State San Marcos has taken the following actions:

- In August of 2006, the Athletics department announced that effective the 2007-08 academic year, team roster sizes will be fixed at a 60% - 40% (female-male) ratio for all sports with women's and men's teams within the same program (golf, cross-country, soccer, track and field). The one-year lead time in announcing the changes was needed to allow the coaching staff to make the necessary changes in recruiting.
- The men's baseball and women's softball rosters will be capped at thirty-two and twenty-five, respectively. Baseball rosters are larger than softball rosters, owing primarily to the larger number of pitchers a baseball team must carry as compared to a softball squad. It is therefore impossible to require that softball and baseball programs adhere to the 60% - 40% female-male ratio. The men's indoor track team was eliminated to offset the baseball and softball imbalance. As of 2007-2008, there is only a women's indoor track team.
- The operating and grant-in-aid budgets for all programs will be allocated (again, effective 2007-08) according to the same 60% - 40% ratio to each program; baseball and softball are, again, the exceptions.

These steps should enable Cal State San Marcos to be within the gender equity target ranges. If the steps outlined above do not bring the campus into compliance with the gender equity goals by the end on 2007-08, the campus will cut a men's team from the roster and add a women's sport should resources be available.

Sonoma	2005-06	2006-07
Expenditure	-0.9%	-0.8%

2006-07 OPERATIONS

In the area of operations, two of the men's sports, soccer and baseball have two annual outreach events that dramatically increase the expenditures and revenues for the overall operation of men's

¹ CSU San Marcos is a member of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA). Although the campus is not a NCAA member, the CSU Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee requires the campus to comply with the CSU/CA NOW reporting requirements.

sport's teams for 2006-07. Men's Soccer has conducted a massive outreach event on our campus each summer titled the "Seawolves Six-A-Side Tournament." This soccer tournament is open to all youth age groups for both boys and girls. Over 300 teams from all over California attend this event that is staged on two weekends on campus in July each year. This is a great outreach event for the campus because it is attracting future, potential students, both male and female to the campus. A number of student-athletes on Sonoma State University's current men's and women's soccer teams have participated in the "Six-A-Side" tournament as a youth soccer player. Because the tournament is operated by the men's soccer program, all the expenses and revenues are processed through the men's soccer team's operations. This alters the balance the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics is attempting to achieve with the distribution of operations expenses and revenues covering all thirteen of the campus's intercollegiate sports.

The same situation exists with the Sonoma State University baseball program. There is a fall baseball camp, which is sold out each year. Similar to men's soccer, all expenses and revenues for the baseball camp are processed through the baseball team operational accounts thus further contributing to the imbalance in expenses and operations between men's and women's sports.

The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics has been working with all of the current women's teams to develop bigger and better outreach events to match up to the expenses and revenues generated by men's soccer and baseball. Softball has instituted several tournaments, camps and clinics, which are increasing expenditures and revenues in that sport. Women's volleyball, women's soccer, women's basketball and women's water polo are working on increasing their outreach events to generate more expenditures and revenues. Sonoma's goal is to have the coordinated efforts of the above-referenced women's programs meet and exceed the expenditures and revenues that are being generated by men's soccer, baseball and the three other men's sports offered by Sonoma State University.

**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

Table 1

**NCAA Eligible¹ Men and Women on CSU Campuses
 2006-2007**

NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	No. Women	No. Men	Total Eligible	% Women	% Men
Bakersfield	3,078	1,631	4,709	65.4%	34.6%
Chico	7,053	6,419	13,472	52.4%	47.6%
Dominguez Hills	3,787	1,778	5,565	68.1%	31.9%
East Bay	4,604	2,883	7,487	61.5%	38.5%
Fresno	8,848	6,330	15,178	58.3%	41.7%
Fullerton	12,599	9,152	21,751	57.9%	42.1%
Humboldt	3,074	2,576	5,650	54.4%	45.6%
Long Beach	17,862	11,714	29,576	60.4%	39.6%
Los Angeles	7,030	4,266	11,296	62.2%	37.8%
Monterey Bay	1,899	1,477	3,376	56.3%	43.8%
Northridge	16,584	11,697	28,281	58.6%	41.4%
Pomona	6,459	8,426	14,885	43.4%	56.6%
Sacramento	10,524	7,610	18,134	58.0%	42.0%
San Bernardino	7,058	3,750	10,808	65.3%	34.7%
San Diego	13,426	9,803	23,229	57.8%	42.2%
San Francisco	15,655	10,899	26,554	59.0%	41.0%
San Jose	12,275	10,457	22,732	54.0%	46.0%
San Luis Obispo	7,349	9,464	16,813	43.7%	56.3%
Sonoma	3,595	2,092	5,687	63.2%	36.8%
Stanislaus	3,021	1,576	4,597	65.7%	34.3%
Totals	165,780	124,000	289,780	58.3%	41.7%
Non-NCAA Member Institutions²					
Campus	No. Women	No. Men	Total Eligible	% Women	% Men
Maritime Academy	134	702	836	16.0%	84.0%
San Marcos	3,093	1,915	5,008	61.8%	38.2%
Totals	3,227	2,617	5,844	38.9%	61.1%

¹The term "NCAA eligible" means full-time, baccalaureate, degree-seeking students as defined in the NCAA/EADA report.

²The CSU's two non-NCAA member campuses began voluntary reporting of data beginning Fall 1999. Enrollment data for non-NCAA member campuses are obtained from CSU Office of Analytic Studies, Statistical Reports. Effective in 2006-2007, CSU Monterey Bay was moved to the NCAA member table as a result of being a full NCAA member.

Table 2

**CSU Intercollegiate Women and Men
 Athletics Participants by Campus 2006-2007
 NCAA Member Institutions**

Campus	No. Women	% Women	No. Men	% Men	Total
Bakersfield	250	67.2%	122	32.8%	372
Chico	175	48.3%	187	51.7%	362
Dominguez Hills	112	61.9%	69	38.1%	181
East Bay	125	57.6%	92	42.4%	217
Fresno	323	59.4%	221	40.6%	544
Fullerton	266	59.6%	180	40.4%	446
Humboldt	175	50.0%	175	50.0%	350
Long Beach	229	55.6%	183	44.4%	412
Los Angeles	135	59.0%	94	41.0%	229
Monterey Bay	128	49.4%	131	50.6%	259
Northridge	254	55.2%	206	44.8%	460
Pomona	125	48.3%	134	51.7%	259
Sacramento	282	54.5%	235	45.5%	517
San Bernardino	107	57.8%	78	42.2%	185
San Diego	331	59.5%	225	40.5%	556
San Francisco	165	61.6%	103	38.4%	268
San Jose	214	50.2%	212	49.8%	426
San Luis Obispo	244	44.7%	302	55.3%	546
Sonoma	170	59.2%	117	40.8%	287
Stanislaus	189	62.0%	116	38.0%	305
Totals	3,999	55.7%	3,182	44.3%	7,181

Non-NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	No. Women	% Women	No. Men	% Men	Total
Maritime Academy	32	19.5%	132	80.5%	164
San Marcos	99	45.0%	121	55.0%	220
Totals	131	34.1%	253	65.9%	384

Table 3
Expenditures by CSU Campuses on Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2006-07

Campus	Women	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Men	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Total
Bakersfield	\$4,283,076		\$4,283,076	59.7%	\$2,887,347		\$2,887,347	40.3%	\$7,170,423
Chico	\$2,076,700		\$2,076,700	47.2%	\$2,326,006		\$2,326,006	52.8%	\$4,402,706
Dominguez Hills	\$1,226,536		\$1,226,536	56.7%	\$938,305		\$938,305	43.3%	\$2,164,841
East Bay	\$1,205,768		\$1,205,768	61.7%	\$749,910		\$749,910	38.3%	\$1,955,678
Fresno	\$11,277,075	\$458,974	\$10,818,101	49.0%	\$14,594,878	\$3,316,395	\$11,278,483	51.0%	\$22,096,584
Fullerton	\$5,240,165		\$5,240,165	56.3%	\$4,073,970		\$4,073,970	43.7%	\$9,314,135
Humboldt	\$2,068,189		\$2,068,189	49.9%	\$2,074,215		\$2,074,215	50.1%	\$4,142,404
Long Beach	\$7,006,533		\$7,006,533	54.8%	\$5,772,570		\$5,772,570	45.2%	\$12,779,103
Los Angeles	\$2,176,851		\$2,176,851	57.2%	\$1,630,567		\$1,630,567	42.8%	\$3,807,418
Monterey Bay	\$1,161,533		\$1,161,533	54.3%	\$977,207		\$977,207	45.7%	\$2,138,740
Northridge	\$4,504,678		\$4,504,678	53.7%	\$3,886,608		\$3,886,608	46.3%	\$8,391,286
Pomona	\$1,709,116		\$1,709,116	47.9%	\$1,856,086		\$1,856,086	52.1%	\$3,565,202
Sacramento	\$6,555,626		\$6,555,626	50.7%	\$6,369,995		\$6,369,995	49.3%	\$12,925,621
San Bernardino	\$1,889,404		\$1,889,404	57.2%	\$1,415,993		\$1,415,993	42.8%	\$3,305,397
San Diego	\$12,999,912		\$12,999,912	49.5%	\$17,440,441	\$4,165,257	\$13,275,184	50.5%	\$26,275,096
San Francisco	\$1,608,518		\$1,608,518	57.1%	\$1,223,804	\$14,271	\$1,209,533	42.9%	\$2,818,051
San Jose	\$6,717,589	\$172,296	\$6,545,293	41.1%	\$10,290,490	\$920,144	\$9,370,346	58.9%	\$15,915,639
San Luis Obispo	\$6,598,998		\$6,598,998	41.8%	\$9,179,622		\$9,179,622	58.2%	\$15,778,620
Sonoma	\$2,275,056		\$2,275,056	52.1%	\$2,092,601		\$2,092,601	47.9%	\$4,367,657
Stanislaus	\$1,344,705		\$1,344,705	57.7%	\$986,302		\$986,302	42.3%	\$2,331,007
TOTALS	\$83,926,028	\$631,270	\$83,294,758	50.3%	\$90,766,917	\$8,416,067	\$82,350,850	49.7%	\$165,645,608

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 (\$25,871,953), San Diego (\$30,440,353), San Francisco (\$2,832,322), and San Jose (\$17,008,079)

*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.

Table 3A
 Expenditures by CSU Campuses on Men's and
 Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2006-2007

Non-NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	Women	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Men	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Total
Maritime Academy	\$103,792		\$103,792	18.5%	\$456,725		\$456,725	81.5%	560,517
San Marcos	\$801,158	\$1,441	\$799,717	48.9%	\$842,876	\$6,912	\$835,964	51.1%	1,635,681
Totals	\$904,950	\$1,441	\$903,509	41.1%	\$1,299,601	\$6,912	\$1,292,689	58.9%	2,196,198

*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. Total expenditures for campuses reporting non-comps are as follows: San Marcos (\$1,644,034)

Table 4

**Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for
 Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams
 2006-2007**

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	72.46	\$703,076.00	\$9,702.95	68.3%	64.7%	33.69	\$384,057.00	\$11,399.73	31.7%	35.3%
Chico	20.89	\$214,190.00	\$10,253.23	49.7%	50.2%	21.13	\$212,411.00	\$10,052.58	50.3%	49.8%
Dominguez Hills	22.61	\$217,552.00	\$9,621.94	60.2%	60.5%	14.96	\$141,988.00	\$9,491.18	39.8%	39.5%
East Bay	No Grants Given									
Fresno	96.84	\$1,437,061.00	\$14,839.54	43.4%	45.3%	126.11	\$1,734,229.00	\$13,751.72	56.6%	54.7%
Fullerton	70.47	\$932,513.00	\$13,232.77	63.1%	65.7%	41.27	\$486,421.00	\$11,786.31	36.9%	34.3%
Humboldt	19.07	\$230,192.00	\$12,070.90	48.6%	49.7%	20.16	\$232,670.00	\$11,541.17	51.4%	50.3%
Long Beach	69.75	\$959,939.00	\$13,762.57	62.5%	64.7%	41.90	\$523,826.00	\$12,501.81	37.5%	35.3%
Los Angeles	24.08	\$345,151.00	\$14,333.51	52.0%	61.8%	22.24	\$213,536.00	\$9,601.44	48.0%	38.2%
Monterey Bay	16.97	\$147,450.00	\$8,688.86	62.9%	59.9%	10.02	\$98,900.00	\$9,870.26	37.1%	40.1%
Northridge	86.79	\$1,150,151.00	\$13,252.11	63.3%	63.6%	50.24	\$657,646.00	\$13,090.09	36.7%	36.4%
Pomona	25.22	\$228,166.00	\$9,047.03	52.5%	48.5%	22.82	\$242,282.00	\$10,617.09	47.5%	51.5%
Sacramento	99.25	\$1,329,365.00	\$13,394.11	50.8%	53.4%	96.11	\$1,158,022.00	\$12,048.92	49.2%	46.6%
San Bernardino	27.59	\$270,276.00	\$9,796.16	58.3%	56.5%	19.71	\$208,303.00	\$10,568.39	41.7%	43.5%
San Diego	120.55	\$2,139,693.00	\$17,749.42	48.7%	46.8%	127.12	\$2,434,689.00	\$19,152.68	51.3%	53.2%
San Francisco	11.94	\$157,448.00	\$191,634.00	62.2%	57.2%	7.27	\$117,610.00	\$16,177.44	37.8%	42.8%
San Jose	95.72	\$1,321,986.00	\$13,810.97	45.3%	45.6%	115.54	\$1,574,990.00	\$13,631.56	54.7%	54.4%
San Luis Obispo	75.00	\$1,107,640.00	\$14,768.53	41.5%	41.8%	105.94	\$1,539,806.00	\$14,534.70	58.5%	58.2%
Sonoma	16.27	\$177,288.00	\$10,896.62	61.9%	59.1%	10.01	\$122,866.00	\$12,274.33	38.1%	40.9%
Stanislaus	14.34	\$173,192.00	\$12,077.55	62.3%	62.3%	8.67	\$104,679.00	\$12,073.70	37.7%	37.7%
Totals	985.81	\$13,242,329.00	\$13,432.94	52.4%	52.1%	894.91	\$12,188,931.00	\$13,620.29	47.6%	47.9%

Table 4a

Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for
 Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams
 2006-2007

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%
San Marcos	N/A	\$109,431.00	N/A	N/A	56.9%	N/A	\$92,890.00	N/A	N/A	43.1%
Totals		\$119,431.00			56.3%		\$92,890.00			43.7%

N/A denotes data not available

Table 5



California Community Colleges
Commission on Athletics

SPORT	2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
	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: Wednesday, August 1, 2007

Contact: Emmy Zack, Director of Communications
ezack@cifstate.org

2007 CIF PARTICIPATION SURVEY INDICATES MORE THAN 700,000 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT-ATHLETES IN CALIFORNIA

ALAMEDA – The number of boys and girls participating in high school athletics in California has increased by nearly 60,000 students in the last two years, according to the 2007 CIF Sports Participation Survey. The survey, conducted by the CIF and completed by its 1,425 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.

The survey shows a total of 735,503 high school student-athletes are participating in sports, an increase of 8.6 percent from 2005, 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 9.8% and 7.1%, respectively, from two years ago. There are 437,592 boys participating in sports, an increase of 38,908 from two years ago. Meanwhile, an additional 19,627 girls have become active during the same time frame, bringing the total to 297,911.

“I am encouraged by the overall increases in participation as compared to our 2005 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. So many of our member schools and school districts continue to maintain and, indeed, grow athletic opportunities for our students.”

-- more --

2006-07 CIF Participation Survey

Based on number of participants, football remains the most popular sport for boys with 107,916 players, an 8.9% increase since the last survey in 2005. With more than 5,000 athletes (13.4%) from two years ago, and a current participation total of 44,730, soccer moves from fifth place to third among boys. Track and Field (49,911) remained in second place. Basketball is fourth with 44,722 participants. Among the top 10 sports by participation, soccer enjoyed the highest percentage increase at 13.4%, followed closely by cross country at 13.2%. Lacrosse increased by 47.5% to 5,323 participants.

Soccer, which picked up nearly 3,500 players (9.3%) since 2005, retains its position as the most popular sport for girls with 40,895 participants. Track and field (38,817) and volleyball (36,499) remain in second and third place, respectively. Among the top 10 sports by participation, cross country saw the largest increase by percentage among girls at 14.9%, followed by golf at 11.4%. Lacrosse increased by 38% to 3,154 while field hockey jumped 23.8% to 3,654.

In addition, the CIF also surveyed schools on the number of coaches working with their teams. A total of 61,950 coaches are currently working with CIF student-athletes. The speculation of the trend going toward off-campus walk-on coaches was supported by this survey, as 61% of coaches (37,679) are not school employees while 39% (24,271) teach or work on campus. Nearly 50,000 of the coaches (80%) are paid while 12,264 (20%) contribute their time and knowledge on a volunteer basis.

A chart indicating results from the last five participation surveys follows. Only CIF-approved sports are listed individually. Also on subsequent pages is a summary of the top 10 sports, by gender, based on participation numbers.

2006-07 CIF Participation Survey

2006-07 PARTICIPATION CHART

SPORT	BOYS 1998	BOYS 2001	BOYS 2003	BOYS 2005	BOYS 2007	GIRLS 1998	GIRLS 2001	GIRLS 2003	GIRLS 2005	GIRLS 2007
Badminton	3,387	3,572	3,627	3,521	3,512	4,462	4,722	4,929	4,500	4,491
Baseball	40,102	42,942	41,392	40,676	42,835	412*	826*	662*	417*	385*
Basketball	39,846	42,267	41,784	42,061	44,722	30,979	33,831	33,912	33,596	34,991
Cross Country	18,668	19,593	20,465	22,782	25,790	14,245	16,060	16,618	18,159	20,873
Field Hockey	12	36	36	52	193	2,111	2,629	2,170	2,952	3,654
Football 11-player	91,301	97,236	95,504	99,079	107,916	200	313*	236*	253*	149*
Football 8- player	1,280	1,263	1,129	1,623	1,784	0	0	0	1*	15*
Football 9- player	190	246	251	166	246	0	0	0	0	0
Football 6- player	9	82	96	47	0	1*	55*	3*	30*	0
Golf	10,783	11,990	11,764	11,459	11,897	1,447	4,588	5,547	5,972	6,652
Gymnastics	12	19	91	3	37	1,230	1,260	859	896	732
Lacrosse			2,240	3,608	5,323			1,834	2,286	3,154
Skiing	390	582	414	617	761	243	389	222	432	544
Soccer	35,537	38,053	38,501	39,453	44,730	30,222	34,663	35,380	37,424	40,895
Softball	580	1,129	963	456	743	28,979	31,992	30,118	30,055	31,306
Swimming and Diving	14,687	15,685	15,731	17,579	18,852	25,157	24,596	23,255	24,508	25,115
Tennis	15,380	15,804	16,716	17,238	19,139	17,383	18,812	19,496	19,847	21,818
Track and Field	39,262	40,843	41,349	45,038	49,911	29,682	33,153	34,378	36,113	38,817
Volleyball	11,660	13,326	12,156	13,133	14,532	30,879	34,194	32,756	34,015	36,499
Water Polo	10,725	11,411	11,500	12,570	14,064	9,487*	12,257*	12,185*	13,099*	13,482*
Wrestling	23,163	24,326	22,007	23,318	25,896	494*	752*	957*	1,230*	1,142*
Other			1,103	1,663	1,472			726	756	684
Total	356,974	**386,248	**382,108	**398,684	**437,592	227,613	**271,214	**270,225	**278,284	**297,911

*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.

2006-07 CIF Participation Survey

2006-07 CIF MOST POPULAR SPORTS

BOYS		
<i>Sport</i>	<i>Participants</i>	<i>% Increase (since 2005)</i>
1. Football (11-player)	107,916	+8.9
2. Track & Field	49,911	+10.8
3. Soccer	44,730	+13.4
4. Basketball	44,722	+6.3
5. Baseball	42,835	+5.3
6. Wrestling	25,896	+11.1
7. Cross Country	25,790	+13.2
8. Tennis	19,139	+11.0
9. Swimming/Diving	18,852	+7.2
10. Volleyball	14,532	+10.7

GIRLS		
<i>Sport</i>	<i>Participants</i>	<i>% Increase (since 2005)</i>
1. Soccer	40,895	+9.3
2. Track & Field	38,817	+7.5
3. Volleyball	36,499	+7.3
4. Basketball	34,991	+4.2
5. Softball	31,306	+4.2
6. Swimming/Diving	25,115	+2.5
7. Tennis	21,818	+9.9
8. Cross Country	20,873	+14.9
9. Water Polo	13,482	+2.9
10. Golf	6,652	+11.4