

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: **3:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 13, 2010**
 Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Debra S. Farar, Chair
Carol R. Chandler, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
Nicole M. Anderson
Kenneth Fong
Margaret Fortune
George G. Gowgani
Melinda Guzman
William Hauck
Raymond W. Holdsworth
Linda A. Lang
A. Robert Linscheid
Peter G. Mehas
Henry Mendoza
Lou Monville
Glen O. Toney

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 11-12, 2010

Discussion Item

1. Report on Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students, *Information*

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

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

March 17, 2010

Members Present

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Carol R. Chandler
Debra S. Farar
Margaret Fortune
George G. Gowgani
Melinda Guzman
William Hauck
Raymond W. Holdsworth
Linda A. Lang
Robert Linscheid
Peter G. Mehas
Lou Monville
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Russel Statham
Glen O. Toney

Trustee Roberta Achtenberg called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 17, 2010, were approved as submitted.

Community Engagement in the California State University

Ms. Judy Botelho, director for the Center for Community Engagement, provided an overview of the California State University's great success in the 2008-2009 academic year in increasing the opportunities available for students to participate in community engagement activities.

Elaine Ikeda, executive director of the California Campus Compact, spoke about the Campus Compact, a successful partnership of more than 20 years that exists to ensure students are engaged in service to their communities. Ikeda presented Dr. Richard Rush, president of CSU Channel Islands, with an acknowledgement for serving on the Campus Compact Executive Board.

Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation

Dr. Beverly Young, assistant vice chancellor for teacher education and school programs, presented the annual report on the work being done throughout the CSU on the preparation of public school teachers. Dr. Young shared results from this year's data that shows significant improvement in the most important evaluation areas. CSU Fullerton was identified as having strong, consistent results in the area of secondary reading. Young presented an update about the value-added research that is being completed with the support of the Carnegie Foundation, linking teacher preparation with student achievement.

California State University Mathematics and Science Teacher Initiative

Dr. Beverly Young, provided an update on the CSU Mathematics and Science Teacher Initiative (MSTI), a systemwide effort to increase the number of teachers in those areas. Dr. Young noted that despite California's current budget climate, there is still a shortage of qualified math and science teachers. In recognition of the critical nature of the problem, the state has increased the initial allocation to the CSU to grow its teacher numbers in these areas. To date, CSU campuses increased the number of math and science teachers by almost 80 percent.

Dr. Joan Bissel, director of teacher education and school programs, noted that the remarkable growth of math and science teachers in the CSU has been recognized nationally. Campuses are doing increased work in professional development for experienced teachers: new Master's degree programs have been established, and new partnerships with the math, science and business communities have flourished.

California State University Education Doctorate

Dr. Young, provided an update on the CSU Education Doctorate (Ed.D.). Dr. Young noted that program implementation has been highly effective, with 11 campus programs now serving 576 students: 333 preparing to be P-12 educational leaders and 243 preparing for community college leadership positions.

Report from the Select Committee on Mental Health

This item was presented by Dr. Lori Varlotta, vice president for student affairs at CSU Sacramento and Dr. Martin Bragg, director of health and counseling services at Cal Poly Pomona. Drs. Varlotta and Bragg spoke about the data collection and analysis of the CSU's mental health needs compared to nationwide needs. The data collection resulted in the largest dataset of its type in the nation: information was gathered from students, third party research and an assessment firm. A review of published literature within the past five to six years was also done, and showed in a very prominent way the four major trends that are coming out of college counseling centers throughout the country: risk management, budget challenges, increase demand, and competing pressure in dealing with social adjust disorders. The busiest times, or

“peak time,” for health centers on CSU campuses are right after midterms, before Thanksgiving, Spring semester, and around the middle part of the academic year before Spring break.

Dr. Varlotta and Dr. Bragg presented the board with recommendations for CSU counseling centers: (1) develop an executive order for counseling centers, (2) identify adequate funding for basic services, (3) review of the classification in bargaining unit of the CSU mental health counselors, (4) work with the counseling center structure, (5) obtain clarification regarding the release of student information, (6) name the committee the Mental Health Committee instead of the Implication Committee (7) organize data collection, and (8) integrate counseling centers with other campus departments to promote a model of wellness.

Trustee Guzman asked if there was any correlation between what was learned to incidents that are reported to the office of judicial affairs or discipline and if there has been an increase in these incidents. Dr. Bragg responded that counseling centers are involved with the judicial affairs offices in dealing with students who are disruptive in the classroom due to mental health problems. Dr. Bragg noted that, although an increase in incidents cannot be assessed; there has been an increase in concern about student behavior in the classroom. Trustee Guzman asked that those cases be documented for further analysis.

Trustee Monville asked about national data regarding clients seen a day, on average, compared to the findings, and what some of the accreditation bodies think the standard should be. Dr. Bragg replied that there is not a national comparison, and that the productivity question is difficult since many of the counselors are busy doing other things aside from just counseling.

Trustee Monville also asked about the conflict between case load, time to follow up and how it is managed, and what the function is of those with specialized training. Dr. Bragg replied that the committee recommended that assessment stipulate how case managers are responsible for providing services to students as appropriate.

Chair Carter expressed concern about the number of clients served per day and the amount of time students may have to wait for service. He asked that this information be looked at further.

Trustee Lang asked if campuses that were pushing the range are being looked at and whether they are taking immediate action to rectify the situation. Dr. Varlotta responded that campuses are reviewing the data and taking action as appropriate. She noted that campuses are being asked to review client load and waiting times before requesting approval to implement a mental health fee. Trustee Lang asked about access to Proposition 63 funds to help support the work being done at the CSU. Karen Zamarripa responded that the CSU has been working on getting funding for the past two years and that there are \$60 million set aside to provide services in this regard.

4

Ed. Pol.

Chair Achtenberg requested that staff return to the board with more specific recommendations which the board can review.

President Rosser requested that the report get restructured and vetted through the presidents for their input.

Chair Achtenberg adjourned the committee.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

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

Presentation By

Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Academic Officer

John D. Welty
President
California State University, Fresno

Ray Murillo
Associate Director, Student Programs
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 2000, following a review of the 1998-1999 systemwide 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 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 following report for the 2008-2009 academic year is the ninth annual report issued following the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring.

2008-2009 Report Summary

The CSU report for 2008-2009 includes data taken from the NCAA/EADA 2009 Reports, submitted January 15, 2010 to the NCAA with a copy to the CSU. During 2007, the CSU Monitoring Committee agreed to a recommendation made by CA NOW to require campuses to submit the current year corrective action plan with the NCAA/EADA report. The corrective action plans are listed in Part V in this report. In addition, the CSU currently has 20 NCAA member campuses.

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 10 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 5 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 1992-1993 to 4,165 in 2008-2009, on the 20 NCAA member campuses, an increase of 123.7 percent over the past 16 years. During the previous year, 59 more females participated in intercollegiate athletics, a one-year increase of 1.4 percent.

In 1992, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 53.2 percent and a female student athlete participation of 34.7 percent, which resulted in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 18.5 percent. As of fall 2008, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 56.6 percent and a female student athlete participation of 56.2 percent, resulting in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 0.4 percent.

Overall, CSU expenditures for women's athletics increased from \$11.2 million in 1992-1993 to \$95.3 million in 2008-2009. The total increase over the previous year was \$4.5 million, a 5.0 percent increase. Funds allocated for grants-in-aid for female athletes increased from \$2.5 million in 1992-1993 to \$15.4 million in 2008-2009. The increase in grants-in-aid over the past year was just over \$1 million, for a 7.4 percent increase.

Campus Impact

Participation - During 2008-2009, 20 of the 20 NCAA-member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in participation.

Expenditures – All 20 campuses met or exceeded their target goals in expenditures for women's athletic programs.

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

Four campuses did not meet their target goals: Bakersfield, -1.6 percent; Fresno, -7.1 percent; San Diego, -2.8 percent; and San Jose, -1.4 percent.

Campus Challenges in Achieving Target Goal for Grants-in-Aid

All campuses have met their target goals for participation and expenditures for female student athletes. However, four campuses experienced difficulty in achieving the target goal for grants-in-aid. The contributing factors impacting the campuses' ability to achieve grants-in-aid compliance are the CSU enrollment increase in female student undergraduates from 1992 to 2008 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 205,132 in 2008-2009. This reflects a 39 percent increase for female undergraduate students compared to a 21 percent increase for male undergraduate students during that same

time period. The rise in female undergraduate enrollment results in campuses increasing female student athlete 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.

NCAA Member CSU Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals for Two Consecutive Years (2007-2008 and 2008-2009)

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: There were no NCAA member CSU campuses that did not meet their target in participation for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.

Expenditures: There were no NCAA member CSU campuses that did not meet their target in expenditures for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.

Grants-In-Aid: Three NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in grants-in-aid for women's athletic programs during the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 academic years:

Campus	2007-2008	2008-2009
Fresno	-7.1%	-7.1%
San Diego	-5.3%	-2.8%
San Jose	-2.1%	-1.4%

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.

2008-2009 Final Report

The following pages include the full report, Voluntary Self-Monitoring Regarding Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students, which was publicly issued on July 1, 2010.

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

Annual Report
2008-2009

July 1, 2010

The California State University
Office of the Chancellor

www.calstate.edu

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Summary of 2008-2009 Data – System Level

Summary of 2008-2009 Data – Campus Level

Part I: Report for Academic Year 2008-2009: NCAA Campuses

Part II: Report for Academic Year 2008-2009: Non-NCAA Campuses

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

Part IV: NCAA Member Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals for Two
Consecutive Years (2007-2008 and 2008-2009)

Part V: Corrective Action Plans from Non-Compliance Campuses for
Results in 2009-2010 Reporting

Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee

Table 1: NCAA Eligible Men and Women

Table 2: Athletics Participants by Campus 2008-2009

Table 3: Expenditures by Campus 2008-2009 (NCAA Campuses)

Table 3a: Expenditures by Campus 2008-2009 (Non-NCAA Campuses)

Table 4: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2008-2009 (NCAA Campuses)

Table 4a: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2008-2009 (Non-NCAA Campuses)

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

High School Participation Numbers & Most Popular Sports

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
2008-2009

Background Information

On October 15, 1993, the California State University (CSU) 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 Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee 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 2008-2009 academic year, is the tenth 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 2008-2009 includes data taken from the NCAA/EADA 2009 Reports, submitted January 15, 2010 to the NCAA with a copy to the CSU. Beginning with the 2007-2008 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 corrective action plans are in Part V in this report. In addition, the CSU currently has twenty NCAA member campuses.

The Office of the Chancellor will continue to report the systemwide efforts regarding equal opportunity in athletics for women students to the CSU Board of Trustees.

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 2008-2009 Data – CSU System Level

The system level data are the cumulative totals of participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid from NCAA-member campuses. Beginning in 2006-2007 the data represent twenty NCAA-member campuses. Reports from 2005-2006 and earlier years included data reported by only nineteen CSU NCAA-members.

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 4,165 in 2008-2009 on the twenty NCAA member campuses, an increase of 123.7% over the past sixteen years. During the previous year, 59 more females participated in intercollegiate athletics, a one-year increase of 1.4%. During this same sixteen-year period, male intercollegiate athletic participation decreased 15.1% from 3,733 in 1992-93 to 3,242 in 2008-2009. During 2008-2009, 48 more males participated in intercollegiate athletics than in 2007-2008, a one year increase of 1.5%. The 2008-2009 athletics participants by campus can be found on table 2.

The data also indicate that 56.2% of all intercollegiate athletic participants within the CSU in 2008-2009 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 had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 53.2% and a female student athlete participation of 34.7%, which resulted in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 18.5%. As of fall 2008, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 56.6% and a female student athlete participation of 56.2% resulting in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 0.4%.

Community college comparison data supplied by the California Community Colleges Athletic Association were updated in 2006-2007. The 2006-2007 data reflect participation rates at 67% for male athletes and 33% for female athletes. The six-year comparison data can be found at the end of the report.

The California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) administers a biennial CIF participation survey of high school athletes. The 2009 survey results were made available in August 2009.

The 2009 CIF participation survey is included in this report. The 2009 high school participation numbers for male and female athletes are reported at the end of the report. 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 \$95.3 million in 2008-2009. This represents an increase of 751% over the past sixteen years. The total increase over the previous year was \$4.5 million, a 5.0% increase. During this same period, expenditures for men's athletic programs grew from \$33.4 million to \$95.5 million, an increase of 185.9%. The total increase over the past year was \$6.7 million, a 7.5% 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 Background Information on page 1. 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 \$1,624,728, and the total non-comparable expenditure for men's athletic teams is \$10,618,905. The 2008-2009 expenditures by campus can be found on tables 3 and 3a.

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 \$15.4 million in 2008-2009. This represents an increase of 516% over a sixteen-year period. The increase in grants-in-aid over the past year was \$1,063,819, for a 7.4% increase. Grants-in-aid for male student athletes during the same period increased from \$4.6 million to \$14.0 million, which represents an increase of 204%. The increase over the past year was \$1,058,319 for an 8.2% increase. The 2008-2009 grants-in-aid by campus can be found on tables 4 and 4a.

Summary of 2008-2009 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 2008-2009 academic year, the report indicated that twenty of the twenty (20/20) 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, twenty of the twenty (20/20) 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, sixteen of the twenty (16/20) 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

Sixteen campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures, and grants-in-aid during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Part I: Report for Academic Year 2008-2009 – NCAA Member Campuses (20) – Based on the NCAA/EADA Report for 2009, submitted to the NCAA on January 15, 2010

Participation, Expenditures, and Grants-In-Aid

Sixteen (16) campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures, and grants-in-aid during the 2008-2009 academic year.

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

Four (4) campuses did not meet at least one of the three target goals:

Bakersfield
Fresno
San Diego
San Jose

Participation

All twenty (20) campuses met their target goals in participation in 2008-2009.

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

Expenditures

All twenty (20) campuses met their target goals in expenditures in 2008-2009.

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

Grants-In-Aid

Sixteen (16) campuses met their target goals in grants-in-aid in 2008-2009.

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

Four (4) campuses did not meet their target goals for grants-in-aid:

Bakersfield	-1.6%
Fresno	-7.1%
San Diego	-2.8%
San Jose	-1.4%

**Part II: Report for Academic Year 2008-2009 – Non-NCAA Member Campuses (2) –
Based on Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) report**

Participation – 2008-2009

Maritime Academy	Target met
San Marcos	Target met

Expenditures – 2008-2009

Maritime Academy	Target met
San Marcos	Target met

Grants-In-Aid – 2008-2009

Maritime Academy	Target met
San Marcos	Target met

Part III: Ten-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 nine 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
2007-2008: 13 of 20 campuses
2008-2009: 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
2007-2008: 19 of 20 campuses
2008-2009: 20 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
2007-2008: 17 of 20 campuses
2008-2009: 20 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
2007-2008: 15 of 20 campuses
2008-2009: 16 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 (2007-2008 – 2008-2009)

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: There were no NCAA member CSU campuses that did not meet their target in participation for women’s athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.

Expenditures: There were no NCAA member CSU campuses that did not meet their target in expenditures for women’s athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.

Grants-In-Aid: Three NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in grants-in-aid for women’s athletic programs during the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 academic years:

Campus	2007-2008	2008-2009
Fresno	-7.1%	-7.1%
San Diego	-5.3%	-2.8%
San Jose	-2.1%	-1.4%

Part V: Corrective Action Plans from Non-Compliance Campuses for Results in 2009-2010 Reporting

Campuses that did not meet their target goals for two consecutive years (2007-2008 and 2008-2009) 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.

2008-2009 Reporting

Fresno	2007-2008	2008-2009
Grants-In-Aid	-7.1%	-7.1%

As noted in last year's response, the institution is implementing a plan to meet Title IX athletics financial aid compliance, which will allow the University to meet the CA NOW athletic grant-in-aid target when fully implemented.

In 2008-2009 Fresno State added two new women's sports: lacrosse and swimming and diving. The plan to phase-in scholarships for these new sports in 2008-09 included seven (7) scholarships in swim and dive and six (6) scholarships in lacrosse.

The CA NOW/athletics grant-in-aid (athletic scholarship dollars) target is to be within 5% of the institution's undergraduate representation of males and females. In 2009-10 the institution will continue with its three-year plan for additional scholarships into the new women's programs. Additionally, the plan will reduce the men's track and field program to a scholarship limit below the NCAA maximum. These actions should result in compliance with CA NOW guidelines by 2010-11.

San Diego	2007-2008	2008-2009
Grants-In-Aid	-5.3%	-2.8%

San Diego State University is submitting the following plan for meeting the target goals in the area of female grants-in-aid (GIA) rates.

As stated in the plan submitted last year, the university is proceeding with the addition of women's lacrosse program starting competition during 2011-12 fiscal year. The hiring process for the head coach has begun and expected to be completed no later than June 2010.

The coach will begin recruiting and forming a coaching staff during the 2010-11 fiscal year as well as creating a game schedule for 2011-12. For 2011-12 fiscal year, the team would be fully functioning and would phase in the twelve (12) grants-in-aid beginning with the 2010-11 recruiting class. With the addition of women's lacrosse, our GIA total would be compliant with the target goal.

In addition, we will continue to pursue the addition of Women's Sand Volleyball, but NCAA approval has not been finalized. Until those limits are published, the university can meet its target relying on a three-part approach as follows:

1. Addition of Women's lacrosse, which is on course to do with the hiring of the coach in FY 2009/10; and
2. Regulation of the number of out of state scholarships awarded to men and women athletes such that the budget targets are met; and
3. Recognition that the percentage of female students in the enrolled population has declined such that the university will be able to meet or exceed our compliance target.

San Jose	2007-2008	2008-2009
Grants-In-Aid	-2.1%	-1.4%

Please note, that San Jose State Athletics is fully committed to gender equity and the 1993 CAL Now Consent Decree. San Jose State University has been in compliance with the Consent Decree until recently in 2007-08 (-2.1%) and 2008-2009 (-1.4%) we did not meet the requirements that pertain to allocation of Grants in Aid. After the 2007-08 shortfall, the campus implemented a revised min/max roster level that helped decrease the gap it shows between 2007-08 and 2008-09.

Under the guidelines established by the President's monitoring committee, the campus now submits a plan of action to meet the financial aid levels established under the CAL NOW Consent Decree.

The variance regarding the financial aid report is directly tied to the following factors:

- A. The following women's athletic programs did not award their full allocation of financial aid due to a variety of factors including incoming student-athletes not qualifying, student-athletes transferring, student-athletes quitting, etc.

Women's Soccer	2.19 scholarships not distributed
Women's Tennis	2.0 scholarships not distributed
Swimming & Diving	1.98 scholarships not distributed
Women's Cross Country	.96 scholarships not distributed

Women's Golf

.92 scholarships not distributed

- B. Over the next 18 months, San Jose State Athletics will mandate that all head coaches in women's programs award the entire financial aid maximum allocated for their program.
- C. San Jose State Athletics will closely monitor the women's athletic programs and focus on the recruiting practices and retention of female student-athletes so that all awarded aid is actually disbursed throughout the year. If NCAA permissible, aid of departed student-athletes will be awarded to other student-athletes within the program.

**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
 2008-2009

NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	No. Women	No. Men	Total Eligible	% Women	% Men
Bakersfield	3,132	1,596	4,728	66.2%	33.8%
Chico	7,357	7,016	14,373	51.2%	48.8%
Dominguez Hills	3,533	1,915	5,448	64.8%	35.2%
East Bay	5,435	3,542	8,977	60.5%	39.5%
Fresno	8,989	6,701	15,690	57.3%	42.7%
Fullerton	13,305	9,773	23,078	57.7%	42.3%
Humboldt	3,291	2,873	6,164	53.4%	46.6%
Long Beach	15,346	10,095	25,441	60.3%	39.7%
Los Angeles	7,205	4,486	11,691	61.6%	38.4%
Monterey Bay	2,036	1,427	3,463	58.8%	41.2%
Northridge	13,237	10,016	23,253	56.9%	43.1%
Pomona	6,867	9,011	15,878	43.2%	56.8%
Sacramento	13,686	10,348	24,034	56.9%	43.1%
San Bernardino	7,615	4,190	11,805	64.5%	35.5%
San Diego	14,005	10,482	24,487	57.2%	42.8%
San Francisco	11,978	8,047	20,025	59.8%	40.2%
San Jose	13,005	12,182	25,187	51.6%	48.4%
San Luis Obispo	7,703	9,912	17,615	43.7%	56.3%
Sonoma	4,268	2,598	6,866	62.2%	37.8%
Stanislaus	4,442	2,464	6,906	64.3%	35.7%
Totals	166,435	128,674	295,109	57.6%	42.4%
Non-NCAA Member Institutions²					
Campus	No. Women	No. Men	Total Eligible	% Women	% Men
Maritime Academy	121	615	736	16.4%	83.6%
San Marcos	3,679	2,371	6,050	60.8%	39.2%
Totals	3,800	2,986	6,786	38.6%	61.4%

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

²The 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.

Table 2

**CSU Intercollegiate Women and Men
 Athletics Participants by Campus 2008-2009
 NCAA Member Institutions**

Campus	No. Women	% Women	No. Men	% Men	Total
Bakersfield	313	67.9%	148	32.1%	461
Chico	180	48.3%	193	51.7%	373
Dominguez Hills	140	62.5%	84	37.5%	224
East Bay	125	57.6%	92	42.4%	217
Fresno	317	57.1%	238	42.9%	555
Fullerton	204	55.0%	167	45.0%	371
Humboldt	189	49.3%	194	50.7%	383
Long Beach	218	54.6%	181	45.4%	399
Los Angeles	166	61.9%	102	38.1%	268
Monterey Bay	143	55.9%	113	44.1%	256
Northridge	277	56.6%	212	43.4%	489
Pomona	100	45.5%	120	54.5%	220
Sacramento	312	56.7%	238	43.3%	550
San Bernardino	148	64.9%	80	35.1%	228
San Diego	369	60.7%	239	39.3%	608
San Francisco	165	59.8%	111	40.2%	276
San Jose	231	51.8%	215	48.2%	446
San Luis Obispo	220	42.3%	300	57.7%	520
Sonoma	152	58.2%	109	41.8%	261
Stanislaus	196	64.9%	106	35.1%	302
Totals	4,165	56.2%	3,242	43.8%	7,407

Non-NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	No. Women	% Women	No. Men	% Men	Total
Maritime Academy	39	21.2%	145	78.8%	184
San Marcos	160	58.0%	116	42.0%	276
Totals	199	43.3%	261	56.7%	460

Table 3
Expenditures by CSU Campuses on Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2008-2009

Campus	Women	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Men	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Total
Bakersfield	\$5,512,019		\$5,512,019	60.0%	\$3,667,801		\$3,667,801	40.0%	\$9,179,820
Chico	\$2,456,719		\$2,456,719	46.8%	\$2,795,994		\$2,795,994	53.2%	\$5,252,713
Dominguez Hills	\$1,334,543		\$1,334,543	58.2%	\$958,956		\$958,956	41.8%	\$2,293,499
East Bay	\$1,755,907		\$1,755,907	60.5%	\$1,148,399		\$1,148,399	39.5%	\$2,904,306
Fresno	\$12,917,939	\$403,850	\$12,514,089	49.7%	\$15,727,304	\$3,086,866	\$12,640,438	50.3%	\$25,154,527
Fullerton	\$5,027,048		\$5,027,048	50.9%	\$4,849,246		\$4,849,246	49.1%	\$9,876,294
Humboldt	\$2,441,492		\$2,441,492	47.7%	\$2,681,731		\$2,681,731	52.3%	\$5,123,223
Long Beach	\$7,276,884		\$7,276,884	53.9%	\$6,212,777		\$6,212,777	46.1%	\$13,489,661
Los Angeles	\$2,481,771		\$2,481,771	60.2%	\$1,642,611		\$1,642,611	39.8%	\$4,124,382
Monterey Bay	\$1,703,619		\$1,703,619	56.0%	\$1,336,483		\$1,336,483	44.0%	\$3,040,102
Northridge	\$4,981,902		\$4,981,902	52.5%	\$4,511,087		\$4,511,087	47.5%	\$9,492,989
Pomona	\$1,896,143		\$1,896,143	46.4%	\$2,190,203		\$2,190,203	53.6%	\$4,086,346
Sacramento	\$7,886,575	\$403,957	\$7,482,618	53.7%	\$7,851,335	\$1,409,010	\$6,442,325	46.3%	\$13,924,943
San Bernardino	\$2,337,570		\$2,337,570	60.7%	\$1,510,962		\$1,510,962	39.3%	\$3,848,532
San Diego	\$14,486,190	\$583,189	\$13,903,001	47.1%	\$20,569,038	\$4,983,050	\$15,585,988	52.9%	\$29,488,989
San Francisco	\$1,930,934		\$1,930,934	56.9%	\$1,471,842		\$1,461,380	43.1%	\$3,392,314
San Jose	\$7,405,745	\$233,732	\$7,172,013	43.6%	\$10,403,908	\$1,129,517	\$9,274,391	56.4%	\$16,446,404
San Luis Obispo	\$8,646,736		\$8,646,736	39.8%	\$13,053,430		\$13,053,430	60.2%	\$21,700,166
Sonoma	\$2,802,458		\$2,802,458	52.4%	\$2,546,648		\$2,546,648	47.6%	\$5,349,106
Stanislaus	\$1,598,583		\$1,598,583	60.8%	\$1,032,069		\$1,032,069	39.2%	\$2,630,652
TOTALS	\$96,880,777	\$1,624,728	\$95,256,049	49.9%	\$106,161,824	\$10,618,905	\$95,542,919	50.1%	\$190,798,968

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 (\$28,645,243), Sacramento (\$15,737,910), San Diego (\$36,065,228), San Francisco (\$3,402,776), and San Jose (\$17,809,653)

*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 2008-2009

Non-NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	Women	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Men	Non-Comp.*	Adj. Total	%	Total
Maritime Academy	\$152,348		\$152,348	25.6%	\$443,252		\$443,252	74.4%	595,600
San Marcos	\$993,974		\$993,974	57.8%	\$725,369		\$725,369	42.2%	1,719,343
Totals	\$1,146,322	\$0	\$1,146,322	49.5%	\$1,168,621	\$0	\$1,168,621	50.5%	2,314,943

*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.

Table 4

**Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for
 Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams
 2008-2009**

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	71.28	\$970,039.00	\$13,608.85	60.7%	60.1%	46.15	\$643,912.00	\$13,952.59	39.3%	39.9%
Chico	21.54	\$252,381.00	\$11,716.85	47.9%	48.6%	23.39	\$267,311.00	\$11,428.43	52.1%	51.4%
Dominguez Hills	20.63	\$219,902.00	\$10,659.33	59.7%	62.9%	13.92	\$129,593.00	\$9,309.84	40.3%	37.1%
East Bay	No Grants Given									
Fresno	104.79	\$1,699,889.00	\$16,221.86	45.4%	46.3%	125.88	\$1,975,453.00	\$15,693.14	54.6%	53.7%
Fullerton	62.09	\$1,001,098.00	\$16,123.34	62.3%	61.0%	37.54	\$639,452.00	\$17,033.88	37.7%	39.0%
Humboldt	21.21	\$282,502.00	\$13,319.28	48.8%	49.0%	22.23	\$294,256.00	\$13,236.89	51.2%	51.0%
Long Beach	76.24	\$1,112,925.00	\$14,597.65	62.3%	62.9%	46.19	\$656,315.00	\$14,209.03	37.7%	37.1%
Los Angeles	36.69	\$496,543.00	\$13,533.47	61.2%	61.2%	23.26	\$314,905.00	\$13,538.48	38.8%	38.8%
Monterey Bay	16.01	\$169,289.00	\$10,573.95	61.1%	59.9%	10.18	\$113,392.00	\$11,138.70	38.9%	40.1%
Northridge	77.05	\$1,075,200.00	\$13,954.57	61.3%	59.6%	48.57	\$727,846.00	\$14,985.51	38.7%	40.4%
Pomona	16.87	\$243,808.00	\$14,452.16	48.3%	46.2%	18.05	\$284,177.00	\$15,743.88	51.7%	53.8%
Sacramento	107.69	\$1,652,640.00	\$15,346.27	52.2%	54.8%	98.72	\$1,362,453.00	\$13,801.19	47.8%	45.2%
San Bernardino	33.54	\$378,035.00	\$11,271.17	65.7%	64.4%	17.53	\$208,710.00	\$11,905.88	34.3%	35.6%
San Diego	123.09	\$2,470,196.00	\$20,088.21	51.5%	49.3%	115.75	\$2,542,478.00	\$21,965.25	48.5%	50.7%
San Francisco	12.29	\$202,500.00	\$16,476.81	59.0%	58.9%	8.53	\$141,100.00	\$16,541.62	41.0%	41.1%
San Jose	94.82	\$1,432,676.00	\$15,093.51	46.9%	44.9%	107.42	\$1,758,734.00	\$16,372.50	53.1%	55.1%
San Luis Obispo	75.28	\$1,263,970.00	\$16,790.25	41.5%	42.6%	106.08	\$1,701,101.00	\$16,036.02	58.5%	57.4%
Sonoma	19.11	\$230,500.00	\$12,061.75	68.0%	64.3%	8.98	\$127,969.00	\$14,250.45	32.0%	35.7%
Stanislaus	20.88	\$225,262.00	\$10,788.41	62.8%	67.2%	12.53	\$110,000.00	\$8,778.93	37.5%	32.8%
Totals	1,011.20	\$15,379,355.00	\$15,209.01	53.2%	52.3%	890.90	\$13,999,157.00	\$15,713.50	46.8%	47.7%

Table 4a

Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for
 Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams
 2008-2009

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	0.70	\$20,000.00	\$28,571.43	50.0%	50.0%	0.70	\$20,000.00	\$28,571.43	50.0%	50.0%
San Marcos	6.80	\$119,234.00	\$17,534.41	64.5%	57.4%	3.75	\$65,771.00	\$17,538.93	35.5%	42.6%
Totals	7.50	\$139,234.00	\$18,564.53	62.8%	61.9%	4.45	\$85,771.00	\$46,110.36	37.2%	38.1%

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	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	4888		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%



CIF State Office, 4658 Duckhorn Drive, Sacramento, CA 95834
Phone: 916-239-4477 Fax: 916-239-4478

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Date: August 3, 2009

Contact: Quwan Spears, Sports Information Officer
qspears@cifstate.org

***HIGH SCHOOL SPORTS PARTICIPANTION REMAINS STEADY DESPITE
ECONOMIC DOWNFALL***

SACRAMENTO --- The number of boys and girls participating in high school athletics in California remains steady, despite difficult economic times, according to the 2009 California Interscholastic Federation Sports Participation Survey.

The survey shows a total of 736,727 high school student-athletes participating in sports, an increase of 1.6% or 1,224 competitors from 2007, the last time the CIF conducted such an overview.

“The increase, although slight, is still a testament to the fact that our California schools and student-athletes are very much interested in increasing the athletic programs we have.” CIF Executive Director Marie M. Ishida said.

The survey, completed by the CIF’s 1,442 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 in the country.

Additionally, single-gender numbers for both boys and girls slightly increased from two years ago. There are 438,561 boys involved compared to 437,592 in 2007. Meanwhile, an additional 255 girls have become active during the same period, raising the 2009 total to 298,166.

-- more --

The sport of lacrosse experienced a huge increase with a combined gender-participation total of 12,321 (7,365 boys; 4,956 girls). It's an increase of 45 percent measured to the 2007 sum of 8,477 (5,323 boys; 3,154 girls).

Among the top 10 sports by participation, swimming and diving enjoyed the highest percentage increase at 14.1%, followed by volleyball (7.6%) and wrestling (6.1%) for boys. On the girls' side, track and field heads the list at 7.5% followed closely by swimming and diving at 7.3%.

Track and field, moreover, replaces soccer (41,727) as the most popular sport for girls with 41,736 athletes. Football remains the top sport for boys, despite a 3.4% drop in participation, with 104,224 players. Track and field is second with 51,689 participants, followed by basketball (42,521) and baseball (42,064).

Cross country, golf, lacrosse, soccer, tennis, track and field, and wrestling, enjoyed steady increases in participation since 1998 for girls. Five sports (cross country, lacrosse, tennis, track and field, and water polo) have seen increases in participation over the same time for boys.

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.

BOYS' BREAK DOWN

SPORT	BOYS 1998	BOYS 2001	BOYS 2003	BOYS 2005	BOYS 2007	BOYS 2009
Badminton	3,387	3,572	3,627	3,521	3,512	4,036
Baseball	40,102	42,942	41,392	40,676	42,835	42,064
Basketball	39,846	42,267	41,784	42,061	44,722	42,521
Cross Country	18,668	19,593	20,465	22,782	25,790	26,766
Field Hockey	12	36	36	52	193	123
Football 11-player	91,301	97,236	95,504	99,079	107,916	104,224
Football 8 - player	1,280	1,263	1,129	1,623	1,784	2,507
Football 9 - player	190	246	251	166	246	0
Football 6 - player	9	82	96	47	0	0
Golf	10,783	11,990	11,764	11,459	11,897	11,295
Gymnastics	12	19	91	3	37	79
Lacrosse	0	0	2,240	3,608	5,323	7,365
Skiing	390	582	414	617	761	671
Soccer	35,537	38,053	38,501	39,453	44,730	44,705
Softball	580	1,129	963	456	743	311
Swimming and Diving	14,687	15,685	15,731	17,579	18,852	21,518
Tennis	15,380	15,804	16,716	17,238	19,139	19,266
Track and Field	39,262	40,843	41,349	45,038	49,911	51,689
Volleyball	11,660	13,326	12,156	13,133	14,532	15,638
Water Polo	10,725	11,411	11,500	12,570	14,064	14,852
Wrestling	23,163	24,326	22,007	23,318	25,896	27,469
Other	0	0	1,103	1,663	1,472	1,462
Total	356,974	**386,248	**382,108	**398,684	**437,592	438,561

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

Top 10 Boys Sports	Participants	Increase or Decrease (Since 2007)
1. Football (11 players)	104,224	-3.4
2. Track & Field	51,689	+3.5
3. Soccer	44,705	-0.1
4. Basketball	42,521	-4.9
5. Baseball	42,064	-1.7
6. Wrestling	27,469	+6.1
7. Cross Country	21,766	+3.7
8. Swimming & Diving	21,518	+14.1
9. Tennis	19,266	+0.6
10. Volleyball	15,638	+7.6

GIRLS' BREAK DOWN

SPORT	GIRLS 1998	GIRLS 2001	GIRLS 2003	GIRLS 2005	GIRLS 2007	GIRLS 2009
Badminton	4,462	4,722	4,929	4,500	4,491	5,219
Baseball	412	826	662	417	385	325
Basketball	30,979	33,831	33,912	33,596	34,991	32,980
Cross Country	14,245	16,060	16,618	18,159	20,873	21,901
Field Hockey	2,111	2,629	2,170	2,952	3,654	3,925
Football 11-player	200	313	236	253	149	141
Football 8 - player	0	0	0	1	15	46
Football 9 - player	0	0	0	0	0	0
Football 6 - player	1	55	3	30	0	0
Golf	1,447	4,588	5,547	5,972	6,652	7,017
Gymnastics	1,230	1,260	859	896	732	1,039
Lacrosse	0	0	1,834	2,286	3,154	4,956
Skiing	243	389	222	432	544	565
Soccer	30,222	34,663	35,380	37,424	40,895	41,727
Softball	28,979	31,992	30,118	30,055	31,306	31,801
Swimming and Diving	25,157	24,596	23,255	24,508	25,115	26,965
Tennis	17,383	18,812	19,496	19,847	21,818	22,908
Track and Field	29,682	33,153	34,378	36,113	38,817	41,736
Volleyball	30,879	34,194	32,756	34,015	36,499	38,920
Water Polo	9,487	12,257	12,185	13,099	13,482	13,871
Wrestling	494	752	957	1,230	1,142	1,493
Other	0	0	726	756	684	631
Total	227,613	**271,214	**270,225	**278,284	**297,911	298,166

*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

Top 10 Girls Sports	Participants	Increase or Decrease (Since 2007)
1. Track & Field	41,736	+7.5
2. Soccer	41,727	+2.0
3. Volleyball	38,920	+6.6
4. Basketball	32,980	-5.7
5. Softball	31,801	+1.5
6. Swimming & Diving	26,965	+7.3
7. Tennis	22,908	+4.9
8. Cross Country	21,901	+4.9
9. Water Polo	13,871	+2.8
10. Golf	7,017	+5.4