In the fall of 2008, as higher education administrators contemplated financial restructuring in light of the economic downturn, then president of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Myles Brand offered a prescient reminder that if funding for men’s sport were eliminated or cut back, Title IX should not be blamed. Whereas Dr. Brand’s reminder may well have been anchored in what the National Women’s Law Center (2007) referred to as a false conflict between men’s minor sports and women’s sports, the manner in which the college sport community has responded to the economic downturn suggests a landscape in flux. While some colleges appear to be proceeding with plans to resolve existing Title IX compliance problems, such as the College of Marin, where the goal of adding two women’s sports rather than reducing men’s programs was the preferred option in February of 2009, other institutions such as Kutztown University and the University of Cincinnati opted to cut men’s sports citing Title IX concerns during roughly the same window of time. To compound matters further, the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics reported findings from interviews with 96 college presidents indicating that increased commercialism due to escalating reliance on outside sources of funding such as television rights impaired the ability of individual presidents to act in the best interest of their institutions (Berkowitz, 2009). Although some have suggested that this finding represents a call for collective action on the part of higher education administrators, others have viewed this to mean that college presidents are admitting that they have little control over big-time programs. In this presentation, intersections between Title IX compliance, the impact of the economic downturn, and efforts to reign in escalating costs in athletics will be considered. The basis for the presentation will be findings from a study examining the impact of the economic downturn on intercollegiate athletic budgets which was distributed to NCAA college and university directors of athletics in all three divisions in the spring of 2009 (N = 228). Among the findings from that study dealing with Title IX, 12% of respondents indicated that their programs were not in compliance with Title IX while 15% anticipated problems complying with Title IX as a result of the economic downturn. Three fundamental questions will be explored. First, what steps can higher education administrators take to ensure that inadvertent gender inequities that violate Title IX are not made in the process of restructuring? Second, how might the opportunity to reexamine the financial underpinnings of every area within higher education, be used as a way of more fully addressing gender equity concerns with college and university athletic program budgets? Third, does a viable model for sustainable athletic funding stabilization and growth require sound principles of gender equity?