Head Coaches of Women's Collegiate Teams

A Report on Seven Select NCAA Division-I Conferences 2017-2018

www.TuckerCenter.org
Twitter: @TuckerCenter
facebook.com/TuckerCenter

www.GoCoaches.org
Twitter: @GoCoaches
facebook.com/AllianceofWomenCoaches

Head Coaches of Women's Collegiate Teams

A REPORT ON SEVEN SELECT NCAA DIVISION-I CONFERENCES

2017-18

This longitudinal research series, now in its sixth year (2012-18), 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 and retaining the number of women in the coaching profession. In this longitudinal research series, we assign a grade to each institution, sport, and conference based on the percentage of women head coaches of women's teams.

Purpose

The purpose of this research series is multifaceted: 1) to document and benchmark the percentage of women coaches of women's teams in college athletics; 2) to provide evidence that will help recruit and retain women coaches and thereby increase the percentage of women who are in the coaching profession; 3) to track the effectiveness of initiatives aimed at increasing the percentage of women in coaching; and 4) to bring awareness while providing an evidence-based starting point for a national discussion on this important issue. In this report we answer the following research questions: 1) *What percentage of women occupy head coach positions for women's sport teams in 86 select "big time" NCAA D-I athletics programs during the 2017-18 academic year? 2) Is the data changing over time, and if so, how is it changing?*

Methodology

DATA COLLECTION

Documenting and adhering to a rigorous methodology is important for transparency, replication, comparison to other data, and consistency in tracking and reporting over time. Data for this report was collected from November 1 through November 20, 2017, by visiting each institution's athletics website and reviewing the coaching roster/staff for the 2017-18 academic year for each women's NCAA-sponsored and NCAA-emerging sport team listed. Coaches hired or fired near or around November 20, 2017, (e.g., soccer, volleyball) will be recorded in the following year's report. 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 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.

CALCULATION OF GRADE CRITERIA AND GRADE SCALE

Developing a report card grading scale to accurately reflect the percentage of female coaches for women's teams is a difficult—and potentially controversial—assignment given the context of female under-representation at many institutions. With careful thought we developed a defensible system.

First, we wanted a grading criterion that would help reverse the trend in the stagnation of women coaches and not reward schools undeservedly. Second, we considered using the standard criterion-based grading scale (e.g., A = 90-100, B = 80-89, C = 70-79, D = 60-69, F ≤ 59); however, if we applied this scale to our current (or past) data set, where ≤59% is an F, all but a handful of the 86 institutions *would receive a failing grade.* In contrast, if the same standard grading scale were applied to the percentage of male head coaches of men's teams for the same 86 schools then none would get an F, and *all* would receive not only a passing grade, but an A, since 96-98% of male athletes are coached by men (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). Ultimately, we wanted a grading scale that would be taken seriously, be credible, reflect the dire reality of the under-representation of women coaches, celebrate successes, and hold entities and decision makers accountable.

Since the distribution of grades using a standard grading scale was greatly skewed, a new, modified criterion-based grading scale was developed to reflect a closer-to-normal distribution. This system allows us to assign a grade that reflects a level of achievement or standing, while also holding each institution/conference/sport to an absolute standard of excellence. Therefore, performance is assessed in comparison to peer institutions. The mean percentage of female head coaches for all schools is 40%—the midpoint of the data—which represents average achievement (i.e., a C grade). This mean was used to construct the grading system.

The scale used to assign grades is as follows: **A = 70-100%, B = 55-69%, C = 40-54%, D = 25-39%, F = 0-24% 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.

SAMPLE

The 2017-18 dataset included all head coaches of women's teams ($N = 970$) at 86 institutions of higher education in all geographic regions of the United States that were current members of seven select NCAA Division-I conferences: American Athletic Conference (AAC), Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), Big 12, Big East, B1G Ten, Pacific-12 (Pac-12), and Southeastern Conference (SEC). Appendix A summarizes the distribution of schools by conference for 2017-18.

NEW AND ELIMINATED PROGRAMS

In 2017-18 four new coaching positions were added and teams began competing, reflecting expansion of women's teams: Arizona State (triathlon, male hired), Duke (softball, female hired), East Carolina (lacrosse, female hired), and Utah (beach volleyball, male hired). Half of the institutions capitalized on this target of opportunity to hire a female. One program, Clemson diving, was eliminated; however, Clemson added softball and will begin play during 2019-20 season, at which time the coach on record will be included in the report.

Results

TOTAL HEAD COACHES

A total of 970 head coaches of women's teams from 86 institutions comprised this sample. The percentage of women head coaches improved slightly (0.3%) from 2016-17 (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
2016-17 Head Coaches	86	41.2	397	58.8	567	964
2017-18 Head Coaches	86	41.5	403	58.5	567	970

HEAD COACH TURNOVER

Coach turnover is a **target of opportunity** to hire a woman. In the 2017-18 academic year, 91 out of 970 (9.4%) head coach positions turned over (20 more than in 2016-17). 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 (55 of 91; 60.4%) a male was hired. Over half (51 of 86; 59.3%) of the institutions in the sample experienced coach turnover: 27 institutions had one coach change; 14 institutions had two; seven institutions (Arizona State, Ohio State, Oregon State, Seton Hall, UCLA, Virginia, SMU) had three changes, one school (USC) had four, and two schools (Illinois,

Stanford) had five head coach changes in one academic year. Many insititutions failed to utilize coach turnover as a target of opportunity. Attribution of failure is varied (LaVoi, 2018).

TABLE 2. GENDER COMPOSITION OF HEAD COACH VACANCY HIRES FROM 2016-17 TO 2017-18

Former Coach-New Coach Gender Dyad	Frequency	Percentage
Male-Male	42	46.1
Female-Female	18	19.8
Male-Female	18	19.8
Female-Male	13	14.3
TOTAL	91	100

BY SPORT

The percentage of women head coaches in 23 NCAA-sponsored sports varied greatly (see Table 3). Field hockey, lacrosse, and golf continued to have a large majority of female head coaches. Alpine skiing sustained all male coaches for the fifth year in a row, and was joined by triathlon as a sport with all male coaches. Nearly twice as many sports received failing grades of Ds or Fs ($n = 13$) as received As or Bs ($n = 7$). Twelve sports had no change in percentage of female head coaches. Seven sports increased in percentage. Rowing was the only sport to move up a grade level from a D to a C. Four sports—field hockey, softball, basketball and beach volleyball—(compared to seven in 2016-17) decreased in percentage. Beach volleyball dropped a grade level for the second year in row, this year from a D to an F.

For the first time since we started collecting data sports that traditionally anchored each end of the grade scale—field hockey (100%) and water polo (0%)—moved off the endpoints. Ohio State became the first school in our sample to hire a male field hockey coach, and Cal was the first school to hire a female water polo coach. Table 4 contains the breakdown of coach hires by gender dyad and sport. In soccer, all six vacant positions were filled by men. Gymnastics (26.5%), rowing (15.4%) and cross country (14%) had the Top 3 highest coach turnover percentages based on how many institutions offer that sport in the sample.

TABLE 3. GRADE BY SPORT FOR PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE HEAD COACHES FOR 2017-18

Grade	%	Sport
A	70-100	field hockey (-95.7%), lacrosse (+86.7%), golf (81.3%), equestrian (75%), softball (-71.8%)
B	55-69	basketball (-59.3%), gymnastics (55.9%)
C	40-54	nordic skiing (50%), tennis (+45.3%), rowing (↑ 43.6%)
D	25-39	rifle (37.5%), volleyball (+38.1%), bowling (33.3%), fencing (27.3%), soccer (26.2%), ice hockey (25%)
F	0-24	beach volleyball (↓ 20%), cross country (+19.8%), swimming (17.2%), water polo (+12.5%), track & field (12%), diving (+8.6%), alpine skiing (0%), triathlon (0%)

↓ Sport decreased percentage of women head coaches and moved down a grade from 2015-16 to 2016-17
- 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

↑ 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 2017-18

| Sport | Head Coaches | | | | | Former Coach-New Coach Gender Dyad Hires | | | | |
| | Female | | Male | | | | | | | |
	%	n	%	n	N	male-male	male-female	female-female	female-male	TOTAL HIRES
Basketball	59.3	51	40.7	35	86	1	2		4	7
Beach Volleyball	20	3	80	12	15				2	2
Bowling	33.3	1	66.7	2	3					
Cross Country	19.8	17	80.2	69	86	9	2		1	12
Diving	8.6	5	91.4	53	58	4	2	1		7
Equestrian	75	6	25	2	8					
Fencing	27.3	3	72.7	8	11					
Field Hockey	95.7	22	4.3	1	23				1	1
Golf	81.3	61	18.7	14	75			2		2
Gymnastics	55.9	19	44.1	15	34		2	5	2	9
Ice Hockey	25	2	75	6	8	1				1
Lacrosse	86.7	26	13.3	4	30			1		1
Rifle	37.5	3	62.5	5	8	1				1
Rowing	43.6	17	56.4	22	39	2	3	1		6
Skiing-Alpine	0	0	100	3	3					
Skiing-Nordic	50	1	50	1	2					
Soccer	26.2	22	73.8	62	84	6				6
Softball	71.8	51	28.2	20	71	1		4	1	6
Swimming	17.2	11	82.8	53	64	6				6
Tennis	45.3	39	54.7	47	86	2	3	1	1	7
Triathlon	0	0	100	1	1					
Track & Field	12	10	88	73	83	3	0			3
Volleyball	38.1	32	61.9	52	84	5	3	2	1	11
Water Polo	12.5	1	87.5	7	8	1	1			2
TOTAL	**41.5**	**403**	**58.5**	**567**	**970**	**42**	**18**	**18**	**13**	**91**

BY INSTITUTION

The range for percentage of women head coaches by institution again varied dramatically from the highest (80% at Cincinnati) to the lowest (9.1% at Syracuse and West Virginia) (see Table 5), unchanged from the previous two years. 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 institutions as the previous five years: Central Florida (UCF) and Cincinnati. Cincinnati is the *only* institution to have earned an A all six years of this report card. We chose to honor Cincinnati again by putting Jamelle Elliott, Cincinnati Head Women's Basketball Coach and Alliance of Women Coaches member, on the cover of this report. Yet, to be fair, UCF entered our sample in year three (2014-15) due to conference realignment, and has earned an A each year it has been evaluated.

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

School	A-F	Δ	Female %	n	Male %	n	School	A-F	Δ	Female %	n	Male %	n
Cincinnati	A		80	8	20	2	Colorado	C		40	4	60	6
Central Florida	A		77.8	7	22.2	2	North Carolina	C		40	6	60	9
Minnesota	B	+	64.3	9	35.7	5	Oregon	C	-	40	4	60	6
SMU	B		63.6	7	36.4	4	Pittsburgh	C	+	40	4	60	6
Washington	B	+	63.6	7	36.4	4	Tulane	C		40	4	60	6
South Florida	B		62.5	5	37.5	3	Indiana	D		38.5	5	61.5	8
UC Berkeley	B	+	62.5	10	37.5	6	Notre Dame	D		38.5	5	61.5	8
Miami	B		60	6	40	4	USC	D		38.5	5	61.5	8
Oklahoma	B		60	6	40	4	Boston College	D		37.5	6	62.5	10
Northwestern	B		58.3	7	41.7	5	Texas Tech	D		37.5	3	62.5	5
Tennessee	B		58.3	7	41.7	5	East Carolina	D	+	36.4	4	63.6	7
UCLA	B		57.1	8	42.9	6	Texas	D		36.4	4	63.6	7
Seton Hall	B		55.6	5	44.4	4	Texas A&M	D		36.4	4	63.6	7
Stanford	B	↑	55.6	10	44.4	8	Nebraska	D		35.7	5	64.3	9
Washington State	B		55.6	5	44.4	4	Utah	D	-	35.7	5	64.3	9
Florida State	B*		54.5	6	45.5	5	Arizona	D		33.3	4	66.7	8
Illinois	B*	↑	54.5	6	45.5	5	Auburn	D		33.3	4	66.7	8
Maryland	B*		54.5	6	45.5	5	Georgia	D	↓	33.3	4	66.7	8
Temple	B*		54.5	6	45.5	5	Mississippi	D		33.3	3	66.7	6
Clemson	C	+	50	4	50	4	NC State	D	+	33.3	4	66.7	8
Duke	C	+	50	7	50	7	Wisconsin	D		33.3	4	66.7	8
Georgia Tech	C		50	4	50	4	Connecticut	D		30.8	4	69.2	9
Oregon State	C		50	5	50	5	Houston	D		30	3	70	7
South Carolina	C	+	50	6	50	6	Purdue	D		30	3	70	7
Wake Forest	C	↑	50	4	50	4	DePaul	D		28.6	2	71.4	5
Ohio State	C	↓	47.1	8	52.9	9	Butler	D		27.3	3	72.7	8
Michigan	C		46.7	7	53.3	8	Iowa State	D	-	27.3	3	72.7	8
Penn State	C	+	46.7	7	53.3	8	Kansas	D	↑	27.3	3	72.7	8
Georgetown	C	-	46.2	6	53.8	7	Providence	D	-	27.3	3	72.7	8
Iowa	C		46.2	6	53.8	7	Virginia Tech	D	↑	27.3	3	72.7	8
Louisville	C		46.2	6	53.8	7	Alabama	D		25	3	75	9
LSU	C	↓	46.2	6	53.8	7	Creighton	D		25	2	75	6
Michigan State	C	-	46.2	6	53.8	7	Mississippi State	D		25	2	75	6
Villanova	C		46.2	6	53.8	7	Xavier	D		25	2	75	6
Virginia	C	↑	46.2	6	53.8	7	Baylor	F		22.2	2	77.8	7
Memphis	C		44.4	4	55.6	5	Tulsa	F		22.2	2	77.8	7
St. John's	C		44.4	4	55.6	5	Vanderbilt	F		22.2	2	77.8	7
Kansas State	C		42.9	3	57.1	4	Arkansas	F		18.2	2	81.8	9
Marquette	C		42.9	3	57.1	4	Missouri	F		18.2	2	81.8	9
Rutgers	C		42.9	6	57.1	8	Kentucky	F		16.7	2	83.3	10
Florida	C	-	41.7	5	58.3	7	Oklahoma State	F		12.5	1	87.5	7
TCU	C		41.7	5	58.3	7	Syracuse	F		9.1	1	90.9	10
Arizona State	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
↓   Institution decreased percentage of women head coaches and moved down a grade from 2016-17 to 2017-18
-    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
↑   Institution increased percentage of women head coaches and moved up a grade from 2016-17 to 2017-18

Table 5 contains the grade assigned to each institution, including which institutions moved up or down a grade level, which institutions increased or decreased in percentage of head female coaches, and how many female and male head coaches are employed at each institution. From 2016-17 to 2017-18, 16 of 86 institutions (18.6%) increased their percentage of female head coaches and realized their target of opporunity. Of those 16 institutions, six moved up a grade level: Stanford and Illinois moved up from a C to a B, Virginia and Wake Forest moved from D to C, and Kansas and Virginia Tech moved up from an F to a D. Eleven institutions (12.8%) registered a *decrease* in their percentage of women head coaches. Of those 11, three institutions recevied a lower grade: Ohio State and LSU moved down from a B to a C and Georgia moved down from a C to a D.

A majority of the institutions (59 of 86, 68.6%) maintained their percentage of women head coaches and remained in the same grade category. The lack of institutional change can be attributed to three reasons: 1) no coach turnover occurred; 2) a same-sex individual replaced 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 third year in a row, more institutions received As and Bs (22.1%) as received a failing grade of F (10.4%)(see Table 6), indicating a continued, slight trend of improvement. The same number of institutions have received As ($n = 2$) four years in a row. Two-thirds of institutions remained within the C and D grade levels, but two fewer schools were awarded F grades compared to 2016-17.

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

GRADE	A	B	C	D	F	
Grade Criteria %	70-100	55-69	40-54	25-39	0-24	Total
YEAR	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 (10.5%)	33 (38.4%)	31 (36%)	11 (12.9%)	86 (100%)
2015-16	2 (2.3%)	13 (15.1%)	31 (36%)	30 (34.9%)	10 (11.6%)	86 (100%)
2016-17	2 (2.3%)	17 (19.8%)	27 (31.4%)	29 (33.7%)	11 (12.8%)	86 (100%)
2017-18	2 (2.3%)	17 (19.8%)	29 (33.7%)	29 (33.7%)	9 (10.4%)	86 (100%)

Note: n (%): n = number of institutions receiving a grade, % = percent of institutions in sample receiving grade

BY CONFERENCE

The American Athletic Conference (AAC) had the highest, while the Big 12 had the lowest percentage of women head coaches (see Table 7) again this year. Given that the only two institutions that earned As are members of the AAC, it not surprising it ranks highest. Using the grading criteria, all conferences earned a C or D. Two conferences (Big East, SEC) decreased and three (ACC, American, Pac-12) increased the percentage of female head coaches. The ACC moved up a grade from a D to a C. The percentage of women head coaches in "The Power

Five" conferences (ACC, Big 12, B1G Ten, Pac-12, SEC) was slightly lower (41%) than the total sample of seven conferences (41.5%); however, the Power Five percentage increased slightly (.06%) from its mark in 2016-17 (40.4%). The number of coaches in each conference by gender can be found in Table 8. The ACC added six female head coaches from the previous year, which reflects the improvement of their grade from a D to a C.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR WOMEN COACHES

For the time in this report we recognized the 16 schools with **Alliance of Women Coaches** (AWC) institutional memberships with the for the 2017 calendar year, one marker of an institutional commitment to supporting and valuing women coaches. Table 8 indicates the B1G Ten boasts the highest percentage of institutional memberships (35.7%), while the AAC had zero. See Appendix A, for the 16 **bolded institutions** which denotes AWC members.

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

Grade	Criteria %	Conference
A	70-100	
B	55-69	
C	40-54	American (+48.6%), Pac-12 (+48%), B1G Ten (46.2%), ,ACC (↑ 41.6%)
D	25-39	Big East (-37.5%), SEC (-33.3%), Big 12 (31.6%)
F	0-24	

Note: Conference decreased (-) or increased (+) percentage of women head coaches; moved down ↓ or up ↑ a grade from 2016-17 to 2017-18.

TABLE 8. GRADE, PERCENTAGE, AND NUMBER OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES BY CONFERENCE AND ALLIANCE OF WOMEN COACHES INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP 2017-18

Conference	Alliance Members		Grade	Female Head Coaches		Male Head Coaches		Total Coaches
	n/N	%		%	n	%	n	N
American	0/11	0	C	48.6%	54	50.5	57	111
Pac-12	3/12	25	C	48.0%	73	53%	79	152
B1G Ten	5/14	35.7	C	46.2%	85	53.8	99	184
ACC	5/15	33.3	C	41.6%	72	58.4%	101	173
Big East	1/10	10	D	37.5%	36	62.5%	60	96
SEC	1/14	7.1	D	33.3%	52	66.7%	104	156
Big 12	1/10	10	D	31.6%	31	68.4%	67	98

Note: Alliance Members (Alliance of Women Coaches members) = number of institutional memberships (n)/total institutions in conference (N). % indicates % of AWC institutional members within conference

Summary

The goal of this research series is to document the percentage of women collegiate head coaches and data trends over time and add complementary results to the excellent work in this area conducted by our colleagues. Data matters. The numerous and complex barriers women coaches experience are illuminated in the academic literature (for a full review

see *Women in Sports Coaching*, edited by LaVoi, 2016) as well as in many other scholarly works and research reports. High-profile legal cases of college coaches, such as Tracey Greisbaum and Shannon Miller, are often highlighted in mainstream news coverage. The occupational landscape for women coaches is currently a hot topic!

Data in this sixth report for 86 big-time select NCAA Division-I athletic programs—including "The Power 5"—documented a *small* increase (.3%) of women head coaches of women's teams over one academic year. While gains or losses by institutions, sports or conferences were small, the data is headed in the right direction—UP! The good news is that the percentage of women head coaches in this sample over the last five years has been going up, and from last year the gain tripled (from .01 to .03)! The bad news is that the percentage of women coaches is not increasing in any *statistically significant* way, and remains stagnant. Change within any major social institution happens slowly and over time, and sport is no exception. This data provides a benchmark and documentation to hold decision makers accountable, creates dialogue and awareness, focuses collective and collaborative efforts, and provides a roadmap for where to dedicate resources. Efforts must continue.

HOW THE REPORT CARD IS MAKING A DIFFERENCE

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 start and continue discussion and educate and motivate decision makers to think differently about how they recruit, hire, and retain women coaches. Over the last five years, we have had numerous and ongoing discussions about this topic with a variety of stakeholders at every level of sport. We feel these discussions help shift the focus to decision makers and organizational change, and away from the continual blaming of women for the lack of women coaches (e.g., women don't apply, women lack experience, women aren't interested in coaching, women "opt out") which has dominated women in coaching narratives (LaVoi, 2016). How decision makers discuss the stagnation of women in coaching matters because the way something is framed influences how people process that information and what action is taken (or not) to address the issue. For example, based on recent data we found male ADs attributed the lack of women coaches to women (e.g., lack of qualified female coaches, women aren't interested in coaching), while female ADs & SWAs attributed the phenomena to structural factors (success of the old boys' club, conscious/unconscious discrimination in the hiring process) (Kane & LaVoi, 2018). That research is an example of how Tucker Center scholars are using data to educate and challenge these common blaming narratives, and this report card is another such effort.

In discussions with colleagues across the US we have learned about ways in which our reports are being used for social change, ways we could have never anticipated at its inception. Athletic administrators at institutions with A and B *Report Card* grades tell us that they showcase their grade as a "bragging right" to peers, colleagues, donors,

trustees and college presidents. ADs also use it, along with institutional Alliance of Women Coaches memberships, to recruit and retain the most talented women, as an above average *Report Card* grade can be proof of a workplace climate that values inclusion and diversity and supports women. Women coaches tell us they use *Report Card* grades as one tool to help them assess workplace climate and goodness of fit when on the job market or making a career move.

In the past year, LaVoi (2018) interviewed ADs with above average institutional grades (As and Bs) which is one indicator of a track record of recruiting, hiring and retaining women coaches. She found that, in short, these ADs valued women and explicitly tried to create a workplace culture where women felt valued, supported, appreciated, and cared about "on and off the court." Some caveats about *Report Card* grades are warranted. First, the institutional grade is reflective of one piece of the workplace; an above-average grade may not accurately reflect or guarantee a positive or healthy workplace climate for women, but it is a good general indicator. Additionally, ADs inherit a grade and it is neither fair nor productive to "blame" that person for a below average grade; conversely, some ADs inherit an above average grade. With the data, we can see over an AD's leadership tenure if the grade improves, is sustained, or if it declines. The *Report Card* data provides a visible mechanism of accountability.

TARGETS OF OPPORTUNITY FOR CHANGE

In assessing six years of data it is clear that a coaching position vacancy provides the biggest target of opportunity to hire women. There are a <u>four ways </u>to realize the opportunity to increase the percentage of women coaches and to move up a grade level:

- Impact is greatest when a female is hired in a position previously occupied by a male.
- Hire a female head coach when an institution adds a new sport. Unfortunately in 2017-18, the majority of new coach hires (see Table 2) remained men.
- Replace an outgoing female coach with another female.
- Change in Athletic Director leadership. The institutions with the greatest rate of coach turnover from year-to-year are often institutions with a new Athletic Director.

ADDRESSING SYSTEMIC CHANGE

However, simply "adding more women" is only part of the solution. The greatest target of opportunity to create positive and sustainable social change is to confront the systemic bias that permeates collegiate athletics. Women coaches—no matter the sport, institution or level of competition—face a complex and multi-level (individual, interpersonal, organizational, societal) set of barriers and bias (Hollomon, 2016; LaVoi, 2016; Sabo et al., 2016). Systemic inequalities and gender and racial bias within the context of sport are prevalent. Bias, whether it is conscious or unconscious/implicit, results in unequal treatment, evaluation, perception, and interpretation that can result in overt, gross, or micro-aggressions due to attitudes based on the sex of an employee or group of employees—in the case of this report, women coaches. The social construction of what it

means "to coach," and the stereotypical behaviors and ideologies linked with coaching, are associated with men and masculinity (assertive, tough, confident, powerful). Unfortunately, when women coaches "coach" they are often unfairly and negatively evaluated, perceived and interpreted compared to their male counterparts—by athletic directors, media, peers, parents, and athletes. Based on the data, female coaches perceive gender bias very differently and feel it is more pervasive than do their male counterparts; foremost, women coaches perceive it exists, while a majority of their male colleagues do not (Sabo et al., 2016). The prevalent and systemic bias in college athletics creates an unpleasant workplace climate for many women and is one reason why women do not enter the coaching profession, are often silenced for speaking out against it, or are driven out by those in power when they call attention to injustice or discrimination. The failure to address bias as well as structural and systemic inequalities are likely reasons why dramatic and statistically significant upward change in the percentage of women head coaches fails to occur. It is simply not possible that as each new generation of females becomes increasingly involved in and shaped by their sport experience, they simultaneously become less interested, less passionate, and less qualified to enter the coaching profession. *We can do better.*

CONCLUSION

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 increase the percentage of women college coaches, generate awareness, continue a national dialogue, and recruit, support and retain women in the coaching profession. Our vision is that 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™."

To view and download this report and others go to *www.TuckerCenter.org.*

References

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2014). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal, national study, thirty-five year update.* Retrieved from http://www.acostacarpenter.org

Hollomon, N. (2016). Perceived barriers for ethnic minority females in collegiate athletics careers. Retrieved from https://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/2015RES_BarriersReport2015_20160506.pdf

Kane, M. J., & LaVoi, N. M. (2018). An examination of athletic administrators' perceptions regarding the absence of female head coaches in women's intercollegiate sports. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal.*

LaVoi, N. M. (Ed.) (2016). *Women in Sports Coaching.* London, UK: Routledge.

LaVoi, N. M. (2018). Athletics administration best practices of recruitment, hiring and retention of head women collegiate coaches. Minneapolis, MN: The Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport.

Sabo, D., Veliz, P., & Staurowsky, E. J. (2016). Beyond X's & O's: Gender bias and coaches of women's college sports. East Meadow, NY: Women's Sports Foundation.

Appendix A

CONFERENCE COMPOSITION 2017–18

American Athletic Conference (AAC)	Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC)	Big 12	Big East	Big Ten	Pacific-12 (Pac-12)	Southeastern Conference (SEC)
University of Central Florida	Boston College	Baylor University	Butler University	University of Illinois	University of Arizona	University of Alabama
University of Cincinnati	**Clemson University**	**Iowa State University**	Creighton University	**Indiana University**	Arizona State University	University of Arkansas
University of Connecticut	Duke University	University of Kansas	DePaul University	**University of Iowa**	University of California	Auburn University
East Carolina University	**Florida State University**	Kansas State University	**Georgetown University**	University of Maryland	University of California – Los Angeles	**University of Florida**
University of Houston	Georgia Institute of Technology	University of Oklahoma	Marquette University	University of Michigan	University of Colorado	University of Georgia
University of Memphis	University of Louisville	Oklahoma State University	Providence College	Michigan State University	**University of Oregon**	University of Kentucky
University of South Florida	University of Miami	University of Texas	Seton Hall University	**University of Minnesota**	**Oregon State University**	Louisiana State University
Southern Methodist University	University of North Carolina	Texas Christian University	St. John's University	University of Nebraska	University of Southern California	University of Mississippi
Temple University	North Carolina State University	Texas Tech University	Villanova University	Northwestern University	**Stanford University**	Mississippi State University
Tulane University	**University of Notre Dame**	West Virginia University	Xavier University	**Ohio State University**	University of Utah	University of Missouri
University of Tulsa	University of Pittsburgh			**Penn State University**	University of Washington	University of South Carolina
	Syracuse University			Purdue University	Washington State University	University of Tennessee
	University of Virginia			Rutgers University		Texas A&M University
	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University			University of Wisconsin		Vanderbilt University
	Wake Forest University					

bold= institutional membership Alliance Women Coaches

Women College Coaches Report Card
Grades for Institutions in Seven Select NCAA D-I Conferences 2017-18

Every year, the Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport along with the Alliance for Women Coaches releases this report card and assigns grades based on the percentage of women head coaches of women's teams. Below are grades for institutions in the following conferences: AAC, ACC, Big East, B1G Ten, Big 12, PAC-12, SEC. View the full report card at www.tuckercenter.org.

Grade	School
A	
B	
C	
D	
F	

Grading Criteria: A = 70 - 100%; B = 55 - 69%; C = 40 - 54%; D = 25 - 39%; F = 0 - 24% for percentage of women's head coaches of women's teams. Institutions are listed in order from highest to lowest percentage.

A report designed to
make a difference in the
lives of girls and women
in sport and to increase
the number of women in
the coaching profession

TC
TuckerCenter
for Research on Girls & Women in Sport

Alliance of Women Coaches

School of Kinesiology

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
+ HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA