

EXHIBIT

9

Hayes
8/15/2020

Athletics Review Committee

April 17, 2019

Review from last meeting

- **Goals**

- Improve competitiveness of Brown varsity athletics
- Improve club sports
- Provide equal opportunity to male and female athletes

- **Consent Decree**

- Eliminating any woman's reduces variance from 3.5% to 2.25%
- Currently, about 53% of Brown students are women

Data in tables

- **Roster size**
 - Brown: average at Brown over 5 years
 - Winning: average over 5 years of rosters of championship teams
 - Optimal: roster needed at Brown to promote competitiveness (Jack's view)
- **Support slots**
 - Brown: average slots given over 5 years
 - Optimal: slots needed to support optimal roster (Jack's view)
- **Diversity**: Fraction athletes who are HUG (Black, Latinex, Native/Indigenous)

Baseline, men's

Sport	Roster			Support slots	
	Brown	Winning	Optimal	Brown	Optimal
Baseball	28	32	32		
Basketball	14	16	16		
Crew	51	52	50		
Fencing	12	15	12		
Football	107	120	120		
Golf	8	9	10		
Ice Hockey	27	28	28		
Lacrosse	38	50	50		
Soccer	26	28	28		
Squash	12	14	12		
Swim-dive	27	36	36		
Tennis	12	12	12		
Track, Field & CC	100	100	100		
Water polo	18	18	18		
Wrestling	25	36	30		
CC ALONE	20	15	15		
Sailing (coed)	0	12	12		
SUBTOTAL MENS	526	593	581	119	142

Blue=varsity

Yellow=not
varsity

Note: CC Alone is "Cross country alone". This is included because we could choose to drop track and field and keep cross country.

Baseline, women's

Sport	Roster			Support slots	
	Brown	Winning	Optimal	Brown	Optimal
Basketball	14	16	16		
Crew	54	54	54		
Equestrian	33	33	33		
Fencing	14	15	12		
Field Hockey	22	24	26		
Golf	9	9	10		
Gymnastics	17	20	24		
Ice Hockey	23	28	28		
Lacrosse	30	32	32		
Rugby	30	32	36		
Skiing	8	12	10		
Soccer	25	30	30		
Softball	18	20	20		
Squash	13	14	12		
Swim-dive	31	40	40		
Tennis	10	12	12		
Track, Field & CC	129	110	110		
Volleyball	18	17	20		
Water polo	22	20	20		
CC ALONE	30	20	25		
Sailing (coed)	0	18	18		
Sailing (womens)	0	18	18		
SUBTOTAL WOMENS		550	594	606	102

Baseline summary

	Current	Implement optimal
#sports	38	38
#athletes, total	1075	1099
#athletes, men	526	554
#athletes, women	550	545
% women	51.1%	49.6%
#slots, total	220	263
#slots, men	119	133
#slots, women	102	129
%women	46.1%	49.2%
diversity	18.8%	19.5%

Notes:

- If no changes were made to the number of varsity sports, but we implemented optimal roster sizes and support slots, we would need to have 262 support slots per year (32 over current maximum) and add 24 student athletes
- This demonstrates one reason why we are not competitive: we are stretching support slots too thinly across too many sports
- Note that about 19% of student-athletes are HUG. The overall at Brown for undergrads is 21%

Two scenarios

Blue: Common across both scenarios
Red: Different across scenarios 1 and 2

Scenario 1

Major change: cut both men's and women's track and field

Covert to club or cut

- Fencing (m/w)
- Golf (m/w)
- Skiing (w)
- Squash (m/w)
- Tennis (m)
- Track & field (m/w)
- Cross country (m)

Add

- Sailing (coed, w)
- Cross country alone (w)

Scenario 2

Major change: Keep women's track and field, cut both men's and women's tennis

Covert to club or cut

- Fencing (m/w)
- Golf (m/w)
- Skiing (w)
- Squash (m/w)
- Tennis (m/w)
- Track & field (m)
- Equestrian (w)

Add

- Sailing (coed, w)
- Cross-country alone (m)

Scenario 1a (note: sports in blue are cut or added in all scenarios, red differ across scenarios)

Covert to club or cut

- Fencing (m/w)
- Golf (m/w)
- Skiing (w)
- Squash (m/w)
- Tennis (m)
- Track & field (m/w)
- Cross country (m)

Add

- Sailing (coed, w)
- Cross country alone (w)

Notes

- Gender balance too low
- Slots under 230 maximum
- Diversity declines

	Current	Implement optimal
#sports	38	28
#athletes, total	1075	872
#athletes, men	526	420
#athletes, women	550	452
% women	51.1%	51.8%
#slots, total	220	227
#slots, men	119	111
#slots, women	102	115
%women	46.1%	50.9%
diversity	18.8%	16.7%

Scenario 1b: Same as Scenario 1a but reduce football roster from 120 to 100

Covert to club or cut

- Fencing (m/w)
- Golf (m/w)
- Skiing (w)
- Squash (m/w)
- Tennis (m)
- Track & field (m/w)
- Cross country (m)

Add

- Sailing (coed, w)
- Cross country alone (w)

Notes

- Gender balance is good
- Slots are under 230 maximum
- Diversity declines

	Current	Implement optimal
#sports	38	28
#athletes, total	1075	852
#athletes, men	526	400
#athletes, women	550	452
% women	51.1%	53.1%
#slots, total	220	222
#slots, men	119	106
#slots, women	102	115
%women	46.1%	52.0%
diversity	18.8%	16.4%

Scenario 1a & 1b comments

Advantages

- Frees up space in OMAC for other sports
- No need to maintain track at football stadium when field is turfed
- 12 fewer existing varsity teams to support
- Added teams (sailing) have excellent facilities and are already well-supported

Disadvantages

- Gender balance works only if football roster reduced
- Keeps a number of weaker women's teams, most notably equestrian
- Worse on diversity

Scenario 2a

Covert to club or cut

- Fencing (m/w)
- Golf (m/w)
- Skiing (w)
- Squash (m/w)
- Tennis (m/w)
- Track & field (m)
- Equestrian (w)

Add

- Sailing (coed, w)
- Cross-country alone (m)

Notes

- Gender balance is good
- Diversity largely unchanged
- Support slots over maximum by 7

	Current	Implement optimal
#sports	38	29
#athletes, total	1075	927
#athletes, men	526	435
#athletes, women	550	492
% women	51.1%	53.1%
#slots, total	220	237
#slots, men	119	117
#slots, women	102	119
%women	46.1%	50.4%
diversity	18.8%	18.3%

Scenario 2b: Same as 2a but football roster reduced from 120 to 100

Covert to club or cut

- Fencing (m/w)
- Golf (m/w)
- Skiing (w)
- Squash (m/w)
- Tennis (m/w)
- Track & field (m)
- Equestrian (w)

Add

- Sailing (coed, w)
- Cross-country alone (m)

Notes

- Gender balance is excellent
- Diversity down very slightly
- Support slots over maximum by 2

	Current	Implement optimal
#sports	38	29
#athletes, total	1075	907
#athletes, men	526	415
#athletes, women	550	492
% women	51.1%	54.2%
#slots, total	220	232
#slots, men	119	112
#slots, women	102	119
%women	46.1%	51.5%
diversity	18.8%	18.0%

Scenario 2a & 2b

Advantages

- Eliminating tennis for men and women opens up the 4th floor of the Pizzatola for basketball court (used by numerous sports)
- Maintains women's track and field as the large women's sport that balances football—become “the” place for women's track and field?
- Able to cut weaker women's teams that would have been maintained under Scenario 1
- Gender balance is good, even without reducing football roster, and is excellent with reduction in football roster

Disadvantages

- Have to maintain track and field space in OMAC and football field—which is not suitable for large competitions
- Would have to set support slots slightly below “optimal” for some sports

Final list of sports under scenarios 1 & 2

Scenario 1		Scenario 2	
Mens	Womens	Mens	Womens
1. Baseball	1. Basketball	1. Baseball	1. Basketball
2. Basketball	2. CC ALONE	2. Basketball	2. Crew
3. Crew	3. Crew	3. Crew	3. Field Hockey
4. Football	4. Equestrian	4. CC ALONE	4. Gymnastics
5. Ice Hockey	5. Field Hockey	5. Football	5. Ice Hockey
6. Lacrosse	6. Gymnastics	6. Ice Hockey	6. Lacrosse
7. Sailing (coed)	7. Ice Hockey	7. Lacrosse	7. Rugby
8. Soccer	8. Lacrosse	8. Sailing (coed)	8. Sailing (coed)
9. Swim-dive	9. Rugby	9. Soccer	9. Sailing (womens)
10. Water polo	10. Sailing (coed)	10. Swim-dive	10. Soccer
11. Wrestling	11. Sailing (womens)	11. Water polo	11. Softball
	12. Soccer	12. Wrestling	12. Swim-dive
	13. Softball		13. Track, Field & CC
	14. Swim-dive		14. Volleyball
	15. Tennis		15. Water polo
	16. Volleyball		
	17. Water polo		