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## A REPORT ON SELECT NCAA DIVISION-I INSTITUTIONS

2015-2016

This longitudinal research series, now in its fourth year (2012-16), is a partnership between the Tucker Center for Research on Girls \& Women in Sport at the University of Minnesota-the first research center of its kind in the world-and the Alliance of Women Coaches, an organization dedicated to increasing the number of women in the coaching profession.

In the first benchmark report of this longitudinal research series, The Decline of Women Coaches in Collegiate Athletics: A Report on Select NCAA Division-I FBS Institutions, 2012-13 (LaVoi, 2013), we detailed the historical decline in the percentage of women head coaches in the 40+ years following the passage of Title IX, explained why this research and women coaches matter and how minority status in the workplace can affect individuals, provided rationale for why examining employment patterns in "big time" athletics programs is important, and reported the percentage of women in all coaching positions in select NCAA-I institutions by sport and conference. Additionally, we assigned a grade to each institution, sport, and conference based on the percentage of women head coaches of women's teams and detailed the process and rationale for our data collection, methodology, and grading criteria. We also raised a number of important questions and highlighted missing information in the current body of knowledge that would help us answer a critical question: What can be done to retain and increase the percentage of women who are in the coaching profession?

## Purpose

The purpose of this research series is multifaceted: 1) to document and benchmark the percentage of women coaches of women's teams in "big time" college athletics; 2) to provide evidence that will help retain and increase the percentage of women who are in the coaching profession; 3) to track the effectiveness of initiatives aimed at reversing the decline of the percentage of women in coaching; and 4) to bring awareness while providing an evidencebased starting point for a national discussion on this important issue. In this report we answer the following research question: What percentage of women occupy head coach positions for women's sport teams in 86 select "big time" athletics programs during the 2015-16 academic year?

## Methodology

Documenting and adhering to a rigorous methodology is important for transparency, replication, comparison to other data, and consistency in tracking and reporting over time. For a detailed account of our methodology, coding key, data collection, reliability processes, and how we determined and developed grading criteria, see the 2012-13 report (LaVoi, 2013) which can be downloaded free of charge at www.TuckerCenter.org.

Data for this report was collected from November 1 through November 20, 2015 by visiting each institution's athletics website and reviewing the coaching roster/staff for the 2015-16 academic year for each women's NCAA-sponsored and NCAA-emerging sport team listed. Our goal was to achieve $100 \%$ accuracy and many efforts were undertaken to ensure reliable data. As with any data, the numbers reported herein may have a small (less than $\pm .15 \%$ ) margin of error.

All individuals listed on the coaching roster as head coach, including interim head coaches, were recorded. Diving coaches were coded as head coaches. A director of sport, common in track \& field and swimming \& diving, was coded as the head coach if no head women's coach was listed in the staff roster or noted specifically within any of the coach biographies. A director of sport was not counted/included if a head coach was present by title or within the text of a coach biography. An individual who occupied the head coach position for two sports (e.g., head coach for track \& field and cross country) was coded as two separate coaches. In some cases the number of head coaches is greater (due to co-head coaches, and inclusion of diving) or less (due to unfilled positions at the time of data collection) than the number of sports offered at a particular institution.

## SAMPLE

The 2015-16 dataset included all head coaches of women's teams ( $N=967$ ) at 86 institutions of higher education in all geographic regions of the United States that were current members of seven select NCAA Division-I "big time" conferences: American Athletic Conference (AAC), Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), Big 12, Big East, Big Ten, Pacific-12 (Pac-12), and Southeastern Conference (SEC). Appendix A summarizes the distribution of schools by conference for 2015-16.

For this year's report, lightweight crew, included in past reports, was deleted as it is not an NCAA-sponsored or emerging sport. This resulted in deletion of two coaches from the 2014-15 database: Lisa Schlenker, Wisconsin, and Derek Byrnes, Stanford. In 2015-16 three positions were eliminated ( 1 male, 2 females): Temple cut its softball team ( -1 male head coach), and Missouri volleyball and Baylor soccer both went from a husband-wife cohead coach structure to one male head coach ( -2 female head coaches). Two positions, both females, were added in 2015-16: Arizona State softball added a co-head coach and Virginia Tech added a golf team and hired a head coach.

## GRADE CRITERIA

The scale used to assign grades is as follows: $\mathrm{A}=\mathbf{7 0 - 1 0 0} \%, \mathrm{~B}=\mathbf{5 5 - 6 9} \%, \mathrm{C}=\mathbf{4 0 - 5 4 \%}, \mathrm{D}=$ $\mathbf{2 5 - 3 9} \%, \mathrm{~F}=\mathbf{0}-\mathbf{2 4} \%$ of female head coaches of women's teams. If rounding up the decimal resulted in moving up a grade level, the institution, sport, or conference was placed in the higher grade bracket. Institutions with the same female head coach percentage were ordered alphabetically.

## Results

## TOTAL HEAD COACHES

A total of 967 head coaches of women's teams from 86 institutions comprised this sample. No positions remained unfilled. The percentage of women head coaches improved slightly ( $0.9 \%$ ) for the third year in a row from 2013-14 (39.6\%) to 2014-15 (40.2\%) to 2015-16 (41.1\%)(see Table 1).

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

| Position | Schools | Female |  | Male |  | Total Coaches |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | $\%$ | $n$ | $\%$ | $n$ | $N$ |
| 2012-13 Head Coaches | 76 | 40.2 | 356 | 59.8 | 530 | 886 |
| 2013-14 Head Coaches | 76 | 39.6 | 352 | 60.4 | 536 | 888 |
| 2014-15 Head Coaches | 86 | 40.2 | 390 | 59.8 | 579 | 969 |
| $2015-16$ Head Coaches | 86 | 41.1 | 397 | 58.9 | 570 | 967 |

## HEAD COACH TURNOVER

In the 2015-16 academic year, 76 out of $967(7.9 \%)$ existing head coach positions turned over, which is a rate consistent with past years. Over the past three years of this report, from 2013 to 2016, the turnover rate for head coaches is remarkably consistent ranging from 7.4\% to $8.8 \%$. In Table 2 the gender composition of the former coach-new coach hire dyad is summarized (e.g., if a male coach was replaced by a female, that was coded as male-female). In over half of all vacant positions ( 41 of $76,53.9 \%$ ) a male was hired. Based on the data, a net gain (+7) of female head coaches was recorded for this year.

Over half ( 52 of $86,60.5 \%$ ) of the institutions in the sample experienced coach turnover: 35 institutions had one coach change; 11 institutions had two coach changes; five schools (Houston, Mississippi, Notre Dame, Villanova, Xavier) had three changes, and Georgia was the only school with four head coach changes in one academic year.

TABLE 2. GENDER COMPOSITION OF HEAD COACH VACANCY HIRES FROM 2014-15 TO 2015-16

| Former Coach-New Coach <br> Gender Dyad | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Male-Male | 26 | 34.2 |
| Female-Male | 13 | 17.1 |
| Male-Female | 21 | 27.6 |
| Female-Female | 16 | 21.1 |
| TOTAL | 76 | 100 |

## BY SPORT

The percentage of women head coaches in 23 NCAA-sponsored sports varied greatly (see Table 3). Field hockey (100\%), lacrosse ( $92.6 \%$ ), and golf ( $78.9 \%$ ) continued to have a large majority of female head coaches. Two sports-water polo and alpine skiing-sustained all male coaches for a third year in a row. Nearly twice as many sports received failing grades of Ds or Fs $(n=13)$ as received As or Bs ( $n=7$ ). Eight sports had no change in percentage of female head coaches; nine sports increased in percentage including four sports (gymnastics, ice hockey, softball, sand volleyball) that moved up a grade level; four sports decreased in percentage (diving, rowing, soccer, volleyball), but no sport dropped a grade level. Table 4 contains the breakdown of coach hires by gender dyad and sport.

TABLE 3. GRADE BY SPORT FOR PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE HEAD COACHES FOR 2015-16

| Grade | \% | Sport |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 100-70 | field hockey ( $100 \%$ ), lacrosse ( $92.6 \%$ ), golf ( $+78.9 \%$ ), equestrian ( $+77.8 \%$ ), softball ( $\uparrow 70.4 \%$ ) |
| B | 69-55 | basketball (+64\%), gymnastics ( $\uparrow 58.8 \%$ ) |
| C | 54-40 | nordic skiing ( $50 \%$ ), sand volleyball ( $\uparrow 42.9 \%$ ), tennis ( $41.9 \%$ ) |
| D | 39-25 | rifle (37.5\%), rowing ( $-35.9 \%$ ), volleyball ( $-34.5 \%$ ), bowling ( $33.3 \%$ ), fencing ( $27.3 \%$ ), soccer (-26.5\%), ice hockey ( $\uparrow 25 \%$ ), |
| F | 24-0 | cross country ( $17.4 \%$ ), swimming ( $+15.6 \%$ ), track \& field ( $+12 \%$ ), diving ( $-8.5 \%$ ), water polo (0\%), alpine skiing (0\%) |

$\downarrow$ Sport decreased percentage of women head coaches and moved down a grade from 2014-15 to 2015-16

- Sport decreased percentage of women head coaches, but did not move down a grade
+ Sport increased percentage of women head coaches, but did not move up a grade
$\uparrow$ Sport increased percentage of women head coaches and moved up a grade

TABLE 4. HEAD COACH NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE ALPHABETICALLY BY SPORT, GENDER, AND HIRING DYADS FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

|  | Head Coaches |  |  |  |  | Former Coach-New Coach Gender Dyad Hires |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female |  | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sport | \% | $n$ | \% | $n$ | $N$ | malemale | malefemale | femalefemale | femalemale | TOTAL HIRES |
| Basketball | 64.0 | 55 | 36.0 | 31 | 86 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 3 |
| Bowling | 33.3 | 1 | 66.7 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross Country | 17.4 | 15 | 82.6 | 71 | 86 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| Diving | 8.5 | 5 | 91.5 | 54 | 59 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 | 5 |
| Equestrian | 77.8 | 7 | 22.2 | 2 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fencing | 27.3 | 3 | 72.7 | 8 | 11 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Field Hockey | 100 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Golf | 78.9 | 60 | 21.1 | 16 | 76 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 3 |
| Gymnastics | 58.8 | 20 | 41.2 | 14 | 34 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 4 |
| Ice Hockey | 25 | 2 | 75 | 6 | 8 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Lacrosse | 92.6 | 25 | 7.4 | 2 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rifle | 37.5 | 3 | 62.5 | 5 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rowing | 35.9 | 14 | 64.1 | 25 | 39 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Sand Volleyball | 42.9 | 6 | 57.1 | 8 | 14 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Skiing-Alpine | 0 | 0 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Skiing-Nordic | 50 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soccer | 26.5 | 22 | 73.5 | 61 | 83 | 7 |  |  |  | 7 |
| Softball | 70.4 | 50 | 29.6 | 21 | 71 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| Swimming | 15.6 | 10 | 84.4 | 54 | 64 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 5 |
| Tennis | 41.9 | 36 | 58.1 | 50 | 86 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| Track \& Field | 12.0 | 10 | 88.0 | 73 | 83 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 6 |
| Volleyball | 34.5 | 29 | 65.5 | 55 | 84 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| Water Polo | 0 | 0 | 100 | 8 | 8 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| TOTAL | 41.1 | 397 | 58.9 | 570 | 967 | 26 | 21 | 16 | 13 | 76 |

## BY INSTITUTION

The range for percentage of women head coaches by institution varied dramatically from the highest ( $88.9 \%$ Central Florida) to the lowest ( $9.1 \%$ Syracuse, West Virginia) (see Table 5). Based on the percentage of women head coaches, only two ( $2.3 \%$ ) of the 86 institutions received an A for being above average compared to peer institutions-the same two as in this report's previous year: Central Florida (88.9\%) and Cincinnati (80\%). Cincinnati is the only institution to have earned an A all four years of this report card.

Table 5 contains the grade assigned to each institution, including which institutions moved up or down a grade level, which institutions had increased or decreased in percentage of head female coaches, and how many female and male head coaches are employed at each institution. From 2014-15 to 2015-16, one-fifth of institutions in this sample (18 of $86,20.9 \%$ ) increased their percentage of female head coaches. Of those 18,13 institutions

TABLE 5. GRADES BY INSTITUTION FOR PERCENT OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES OF WOMEN'S TEAMS

|  |  |  | Female |  | Male |  | School | A-F | $\Delta$ | Female |  | Male |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School | A-F | $\Delta$ | \% | n | \% | n |  |  |  | \% | n | \% | n |
| Central Florida | A |  | 88.9 | 8 | 11.1 | 1 | Oregon State | C |  | 40 | 4 | 60 | 6 |
| Cincinnati | A | - | 80 | 8 | 20 | 2 | Penn State | C |  | 40 | 6 | 60 | 9 |
| SMU | B | + | 63.6 | 7 | 36.4 | 4 | Tulane | C |  | 40 | 4 | 60 | 6 |
| South Florida | B | $\uparrow$ | 62.5 | 5 | 37.5 | 3 | Georgetown | D | $\downarrow$ | 38.5 | 5 | 61.5 | 8 |
| Miami | B |  | 60 | 6 | 40 | 4 | Indiana | D |  | 38.5 | 5 | 61.5 | 8 |
| Ohio State | B | $\uparrow$ | 58.8 | 10 | 41.2 | 7 | Notre Dame | D | $\downarrow$ | 38.5 | 5 | 61.5 | 8 |
| LSU | B |  | 58.3 | 7 | 41.7 | 5 | USC | D |  | 38.5 | 5 | 61.5 | 8 |
| Northwestern | B | $\uparrow$ | 58.3 | 7 | 41.7 | 5 | Utah | D | + | 38.5 | 5 | 61.5 | 8 |
| Minnesota | B |  | 57.1 | 8 | 42.9 | 6 | Texas Tech | D |  | 37.5 | 3 | 62.5 | 5 |
| UCLA | B |  | 57.1 | 8 | 42.9 | 6 | Wake Forest | D |  | 37.5 | 3 | 62.5 | 5 |
| Stanford | B | $\uparrow$ | 55.6 | 10 | 44.4 | 8 | Iowa State | D |  | 36.4 | 4 | 63.6 | 7 |
| Washington State | B |  | 55.6 | 5 | 44.4 | 4 | Texas | D | $\downarrow$ | 36.4 | 4 | 63.6 | 7 |
| Florida State* | B |  | 54.5 | 6 | 45.5 | 5 | Texas A\&M | D |  | 36.4 | 4 | 63.6 | 7 |
| Maryland* | B |  | 54.5 | 6 | 45.5 | 5 | Arizona State | D | - | 35.7 | 5 | 64.3 | 9 |
| Temple* | B | $\uparrow$ | 54.5 | 6 | 45.5 | 5 | Nebraska | D |  | 35.7 | 5 | 64.3 | 9 |
| Michigan State | C |  | 53.8 | 7 | 46.2 | 6 | Rutgers | D | + | 35.7 | 5 | 64.3 | 9 |
| Tennessee | C |  | 53.8 | 7 | 46.2 | 6 | Arizona | D | + | 33.3 | 4 | 66.7 | 8 |
| Colorado | C |  | 50 | 5 | 50 | 5 | Auburn | D |  | 33.3 | 4 | 66.7 | 8 |
| Florida | C |  | 50 | 6 | 50 | 6 | Butler | D |  | 33.3 | 3 | 66.7 | 6 |
| Georgia Tech | C |  | 50 | 4 | 50 | 4 | Connecticut | D | - | 30.8 | 4 | 69.2 | 9 |
| Kansas State | C |  | 50 | 4 | 50 | 4 | Virginia | D |  | 30.8 | 4 | 69.2 | 9 |
| Oklahoma | C |  | 50 | 5 | 50 | 5 | Clemson | D | $\downarrow$ | 30 | 3 | 70 | 7 |
| Oregon | C |  | 50 | 5 | 50 | 5 | East Carolina | D |  | 30 | 3 | 70 | 7 |
| Michigan | C |  | 46.7 | 7 | 53.3 | 8 | Houston | D |  | 30 | 3 | 70 | 7 |
| Duke | C |  | 46.2 | 6 | 53.8 | 7 | Pittsburgh | D |  | 30 | 3 | 70 | 7 |
| lowa | C |  | 46.2 | 6 | 53.8 | 7 | Purdue | D |  | 30 | 3 | 70 | 7 |
| Louisville | C |  | 46.2 | 6 | 53.8 | 7 | DePaul | D |  | 28.6 | 2 | 71.4 | 5 |
| Villanova | C | $\uparrow$ | 46.2 | 6 | 53.8 | 7 | Missouri | D | - | 27.3 | 3 | 72.7 | 8 |
| Illinois | C | $\downarrow$ | 45.5 | 5 | 54.5 | 6 | Virginia Tech | D | $\uparrow$ | 27.3 | 3 | 72.7 | 8 |
| Providence | C | $\uparrow$ | 45.5 | 5 | 54.5 | 6 | Alabama | D |  | 25 | 3 | 75 | 9 |
| Washington | C |  | 45.5 | 5 | 54.5 | 6 | Creighton | D |  | 25 | 2 | 75 | 6 |
| Memphis | C |  | 44.4 | 4 | 55.6 | 5 | Mississippi State | D | - | 25 | 2 | 75 | 6 |
| Mississippi | C | $\uparrow$ | 44.4 | 4 | 55.6 | 5 | Xavier | D | $\uparrow$ | 25 | 2 | 75 | 6 |
| Seton Hall | C | $\uparrow$ | 44.4 | 4 | 55.6 | 5 | Baylor | F | $\downarrow$ | 22.2 | 2 | 77.8 | 7 |
| St. John's | C |  | 44.4 | 4 | 55.6 | 5 | Tulsa | F |  | 22.2 | 2 | 77.8 | 7 |
| Boston College | C |  | 43.8 | 7 | 56.2 | 9 | Vanderbilt | F |  | 22.2 | 2 | 77.8 | 7 |
| UC Berkeley | C |  | 43.8 | 7 | 56.2 | 9 | Arkansas | F | + | 18.2 | 2 | 81.8 | 9 |
| Marquette | C |  | 42.9 | 3 | 57.1 | 4 | Kansas | F | $\downarrow$ | 18.2 | 2 | 81.8 | 9 |
| Georgia | C | $\uparrow$ | 41.7 | 5 | 58.3 | 7 | Kentucky | F |  | 16.7 | 2 | 83.3 | 10 |
| South Carolina | C | $\uparrow$ | 41.7 | 5 | 58.3 | 7 | NC State | F |  | 16.7 | 2 | 83.3 | 10 |
| TCU | C | - | 41.7 | 5 | 58.3 | 7 | Oklahoma State | F |  | 12.5 | 1 | 87.5 | 7 |
| Wisconsin | C | - | 41.7 | 5 | 58.3 | 7 | Syracuse | F | - | 9.1 | 1 | 90.9 | 10 |
| North Carolina | C |  | 40 | 6 | 60 | 9 | West Virginia | F | - | 9.1 | 1 | 90.9 | 10 |

* Decimal rounded up causing institution to be placed in higher grade level
$\downarrow$ Institution decreased percentage of women head coaches and moved down a grade from 2014-15 to 2015-16
- Institution decreased percentage of women head coaches, but did not move down a grade
+ Institution increased percentage of women head coaches, but did not move up a grade
$\uparrow$ Institution increased percentage of women head coaches and moved up a grade from 2014-15 to 2015-16
moved up a grade level: five moved from C to B (Ohio State, Northwestern, Stanford, South Florida, Temple), five moved from D to C (Georgia, Providence, Seton Hall, South Carolina, Villanova), and two moved up from F to D (Virgina Tech, Xavier). Xavier, which had 0\% in 2014-15, improved to $25 \%$ by hiring two women head coaches. Mississippi moved up two grades from an F to a C. Sixteen institutions (16 of 86, 18.6\%) registered a decrease in their percentage of women head coaches. Of those 16 , seven institutions recevied a lower grade: one moved down from a B to C (Illinois), four moved down from C to D (Clemson, Georgetown, Notre Dame, Texas), and two moved down from D to F (Baylor, Kansas).

Just over half of the institutions ( 52 of 86, 60.5\%) maintained their percentage of women head coaches and remained in the same grade category. The lack of change by institution can be attributed to three reasons: 1) no coach turnover occured; 2) a same-sex individual was hired to replace the outgoing coach (male-male, female-female); or 3) multiple coach hires in the same institution offset each other (e.g., male-female, female-male).

For the first time in four years more institutions received As and Bs (17.4\%) as received a failing grade of $\mathrm{F}(11.6 \%)$ (see Table 6), indicating a slight trend of improvement. While the same number of institutions received As ( $n=2$ ), the most significant gain occurred in the B grade, which rose from 9 to 13 institutions in one year, a figure that has more than doubled from six since the 2012-13 inception of this report card. A significant majority of institutions ( $74.3 \%$ ) remained within the C and D grade levels, a statistic which has remained consistent over four years.

TABLE 6. DISTRIBUTION OF GRADES BY INSTITUTION FOR PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES BY YEAR

| GRADE | A | B | C | D | F |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Criteria | $100-70$ | $\mathbf{6 9 - 5 5}$ | $54-40$ | $39-25$ | $\mathbf{2 4 - 0}$ | Total |
| YEAR | $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2012-13$ | $3(4.0 \%)$ | $6(7.9 \%)$ | $29(38.2 \%)$ | $30(39.5 \%)$ | $8(10.5 \%)$ | $76(100 \%)$ |
| $2013-14$ | $1(1.3 \%)$ | $8(10.5 \%)$ | $27(35.5 \%)$ | $31(40.8 \%)$ | $9(11.8 \%)$ | $76(100 \%)$ |
| $2014-15$ | $2(2.3 \%)$ | $9(10.6 \%)$ | $33(38.8 \%)$ | $31(36.5 \%)$ | $11(12.9 \%)$ | $86(100 \%)$ |
| $2015-16$ | $2(2.3 \%)$ | $13(15.1 \%)$ | $31(36.5 \%)$ | $30(34.9 \%)$ | $10(11.6 \%)$ | $86(100 \%)$ |

Note: $\mathrm{n}(\%)$ : $\mathrm{n}=$ number of institutions receiving a grade, $\%=$ percent of institutions in sample receiving grade

## BY CONFERENCE

The AAC (49.1\%) and Big Ten (46.2\%) had the highest, while the SEC (35.9\%) and Big 12 ( $31.3 \%$ ) had the lowest percentage of female head coaches (see Table 7). Given that the only two institutions that earned As are members of the AAC, it not surprising the AAC ranks highest. Using the grading criteria, all conferences earned a C or D. Two conferences decreased (ACC, Big 12) and five (AAC, Big Ten, Pac-12, Big East, SEC) increased their percentage of female head coaches. No conference moved up or down a grade. The Big 12 decreased the
most ( $35 \%$ to $31.3 \%$ ) from last year. The percentage of women head coaches in "The Power Five" conferences (ACC, Big 12, Big Ten, Pac-12, SEC) was $40.2 \%$, slightly lower than the total sample of seven conferences ( $41.1 \%$ ).

TABLE 7. GRADE BY CONFERENCE FOR PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES

| Grade | Criteria | Conference |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 7 0}$ |  |
| B | $\mathbf{6 9 - 5 5}$ |  |
| C | $\mathbf{5 4 - 4 0}$ | AAC ( $+49.1 \%)$, Big Ten $(+46.2 \%)$, Pac-12 (+46\%) |
| D | $\mathbf{3 9 - 2 5}$ | Big East $(+38.3 \%)$, ACC $(-37.9 \%)$, SEC $(+35.9 \%)$, Big $12(-31.3 \%)$ |
| F | $\mathbf{2 4 - 0}$ |  |

Note: Conference decreased (-) or increased ( + ) percentage of women head coaches; moved down $\downarrow$ or up $\uparrow$ a grade from $2014-15$ to 2015-16.

## Conclusion

The goal of this research series is to document the percentage of women collegiate head coaches over time and add to the excellent work in this area conducted by our colleagues (Acosta \& Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick et al., 2015; Wilson, 2012). The numerous, complex barriers and limits to coaching opportunities that women coaches experience is evidenced not only in the academic literature (see LaVoi \& Dutove, 2012) but is reflected in stories of women coaches that appear regularly in the popular press. Data in this report of 86 big-time select NCAA Division-I athletic programs, including "The Power 5," documented a slight increase (.9\%) and net gain (+7) of women head coaches of women's teams over one academic year. This year marked the third year in a row the number and percentage of institutions receiving As and Bs increased, also marking a slight trend of improvement of women head coaches of women's teams.

When a head coaching position turned over, in a little over half of all vacancies (53.9\%) a male was hired, an improvement from the previous year when a larger majority of hires were male ( $61 \%$ ). This also is another indication of a slight trend of improvement. Consistent with past years, a select few institutions are above average compared to peer institutions, which means opportunity for improvement is evident. In all seven conferences, men continued to retain the majority of head coach positions. Consistent with the previous three years, field hockey maintained all women head coaches, while water polo and sailing still had zero female head coaches. Based on the data, it appears that a three-year trend of slight improvement is evident. Figure 1 illustrates the historic decline in the percentage of women college coaches (Acosta \& Carpenter, 2014). Rather than referring to a "decline" in the percentage of women coaches, perhaps leveling off may be a more accurate representation of the current data. The data in this report card series, Acosta and Carpenter (2014) and The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES; Lapchick et al., 2015), despite differing methods for data collection, similarly indicate the decline has leveled off in the last decade from 2005 to 2015 (See Figure 2). Therefore, additional data is necessary to determine if the slight upward trend will continue.

Figure 1. The Decline of Female Coaches of Women's Collegiate Teams in the United States from 1971 to 2014


Figure 2. Leveling Off of Female Head Coaches of Women's Teams in NCAA D-I Teams from 2005 to 2015


The data in this report can be used by institutions, athletics administrators, and sport coaching associations to advocate for women coaches, track progress or decline in comparison to peer institutions, evaluate the effectiveness of strategies aimed at increasing the percentage of women coaches, and hold institutions and decision makers accountable in creating a gender-balanced workforce-especially for women's teams. It can also be used to educate and motivate stakeholders and decision makers to recruit, hire, and retain women coaches. Together, the Tucker Center for Research on Girls \& Women in Sport at the University of Minnesota and the Alliance of Women Coaches-along with other organizations, groups and individuals-are striving to reverse the trend and increase the percentage of women college coaches, generate awareness and start a national dialogue on this issue, support and retain women coaches, and recruit more women to join the coaching profession. This
report card series has indeed generated dialogue. Athletics directors, many of whom do not like to be graded (i.e., "judged"), are asking for help and tools to facilitate the hiring and retention of women coaches. We feel these discussions are steps in the right direction and shifts the focus to decision makers and organizational change, and away from continuing to blame women for the lack of women coaches (e.g., women don't apply, women lack experience, women "opt out") which has dominanted women in coaching narratives (LaVoi, 2016). This shift may help to ensure more young women (and men) have female coaches as role models and coaching becomes a more gender-balanced profession.

Women who aspire to coach should have legitimate opportunities to enter the workforce, experience a supportive, inclusive and positive work climate when they do, and be paid accordingly and fairly for their expertise. Our efforts aspire to the tagline from the Wellesley Centers for Women: "A world that is good for women is good for everyone ${ }^{\mathrm{mx}}$."

To view and download the accompanying infographic for this report, The Status of Women in Collegiate Coaching: A Report Card, go to the Tucker Center website at www.TuckerCenter.org
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ERRATA for 2014-15: We erroneously coded both the director of golf and the head coach at Clemson (resulting in - 1 male coach for 2015-16), and coded Puggy Buckmon (male) at South Carolina as the head coach of golf, when the head coach was Kalen Anderson (female)(resulting in -1 male and +1 female coach for 2015-16).
Appendix A
CONFERENCE COMPOSITION 2015-2016

| American Athletic <br> Conference (AAC) | Atlantic Coast <br> Conference (ACC) | Big $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Big East | Pig Ten | Pacific-12 (Pac-12) | Southeastern |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conference (SEC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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