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The Women in College Coaching Report Card (WCCRC) is a longitudinal research series (2012-2023). Data in this report extends and complements the important research and contributions of Drs. R. Vivian Acosta and Linda Jean Carpenter who historically documented the percentage of women in intercollegiate sport leadership positions from 1977 to 2014 (acostacarpenter.org). In this report we highlight an exemplar NCAA D-III conference, the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (MIAC), for reasons we specify in the conclusion. In short, we feel it is important to celebrate the success and exceptionality in the recruitment and hiring of women coaches. As in previous reports, we assigned a grade to each institution and sport based on the percentage of women head coaches of women’s teams. We also analyzed race of head coaches, and turnover patterns.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What percentage of women occupy head coach positions for women’s sport teams in 12 select Division-III athletics programs in one conference during the 2022-23 academic year?

2. Over time, which institutions have increased their percentage of women head coaches?

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of the WCCRC 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 retain and increase the percentage of women in the coaching profession;
3) to track the effectiveness of initiatives aimed at reversing the decline, and current stagnation, of 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.
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 at www.TuckerCenter.org.

For this report, data for 2022-23 coaching rosters were collected during June 2022, by visiting each institution’s athletics website and reviewing the coaching roster/staff for the 2022-23 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 margin of error. Data for the 2020-21, 2018-19, 2017-18, 2016-17, and 2013-14 coaching rosters within the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (MIAC) were gathered in the fall of each academic year (the full reports are available at www.TuckerCenter.org), which we used to document coach turnover rates.

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. 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.

SAMPLE

The 2022-23 dataset included all head coaches of women’s teams from 12 institutions of higher education in the state of Minnesota that were current members of the MIAC. No positions remained unfilled at the time of data collection (N = 124). The current dataset reflects the addition of the University of St. Scholastica following the departure of the University of St. Thomas to the NCAA Division I level.

GRADING CRITERIA

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.**
SEX vs. GENDER

In past reports we have used the term ‘sex’ when identifying women and men coaches. The terms ‘sex’ and ‘gender’ are often used interchangeably both in literature and popular culture. Feminist scholars have argued for decades for a differentiation between the two constructs to better acknowledge the intersectionality and unique sociocultural experiences that intersex, transgender, and non-binary individuals face (Schellenberg & Kaiser, 2018; Ansara & Hegarty, 2014). For example in 1979, Unger argued that ‘gender’ refers to more than a person’s sex and involves sociocultural traits and human experiences, while the term ‘sex’ refers to biological mechanisms. In a study examining brain function differences between male and female coaches, using the term ‘sex’ would be appropriate, while within the scope of the WCCRC we do not examine biological mechanisms or variables. Our research is based on the understanding that human experience is intersectional and is influenced by both biological traits (nature) and sociocultural factors (nurture). Therefore, we adjusted our language to reflect our research philosophy, and align with sociocultural shifts.

We believe in inclusivity and fostering a supportive environment in women’s sport, and although the phrase ‘women’s sport’ appears to reinforce a gender binary, the culture does not have to follow.

The fight for trans and non-binary gender identity rights and inclusion is a controversial and prevalent issue. Continued use of the term ‘sex’ to reflect male or female identity, erased the full range possible identities and reinforced discriminatory language and behavior that we strive to eliminate and combat (Ansara & Hegarty, 2014). We believe in inclusivity and fostering a supportive environment in women’s sport, and although the phrase ‘women’s sport’ appears to reinforce a gender binary, the culture does not have to follow. To date in our data collection, we have not noted any use of non-binary pronouns within online coaching biographies, such as they/them or explicit mentions of transgender, non-binary, or genderqueer coaches in our sample. In this report and into the future, use of ‘gender’ instead of ‘sex’ will be used as we strive to be more inclusive, and open up the space and possibility to capture all coach identities.
The current Women in College Coaching Report Card includes analysis of the race of head coaches of women’s teams. Our research team had many nuanced discussions about adding race to the WCCRC over the years and we no longer found it helpful or appropriate to exclude this aspect of women coaches' identity. Our work complements and extends the work of Dr. Richard Lapchick and The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES) team as well as data collected by the NCAA. Adding race to the WCCRC will help document the percentage and number of coaches of color so we can track hiring and retention trends over time and hold decision makers accountable.

Our methodology for coding race is consistent with how we code gender. When coding gender, we rely on personal pronouns as well as photos within the coach's online biography on the institutional website to accurately assess this variable. When coding race, we also used the coach headshot photo to visually assess how a coach presented. Each coach was coded as either white, Black or African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, American Indian or Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander based on coding instructions from the US Department of Labor. This is the second year we have collected race data, we felt it important to align our beliefs about the importance and complexity of identity with practice. Therefore we will not capitalize white, but we will capitalize Black and other racial and ethnic identifiers, such as Asian, Hispanic, and Native American in racial, ethnic, and cultural contexts. This decision aligns with our goal to use language that is inclusive, respectful, and consistent with industry standards. For a coach whose race our team was uncomfortable or uncertain coding, the coach was e-mailed and provided an opportunity to self-identify.

Visual assessment of race is unarguably an imperfect and problematic methodology. However, in our right for gender equity, we believe in and strive to be inclusive of intersectional identities in our approach to ensure that ALL women were counted and represented in sport leadership positions and in our research. Including race in the WCCRC and the MIAC WCCRC is a step in the right direction. It is well documented that women of color face multiple oppressions in society and the workplace, and are under-represented in coaching positions, which is disproportionate to the racial composition of their student-athletes. We can do better. In order to hold decision makers accountable, hiring and retention data specific to racial demographics over time must be documented and shared.
RESULTS

A total of 124 head coach positions of women’s teams from 12 institutions compromised this sample. Women held 59 of the 124 (47.6%) head coaching positions within the MIAC for 2022-23. The variation in total coaches is attributed to the elimination and adding of sports over time. The percentage of MIAC head women coaches increased from 38.1% in 2013-14 to 47.6% in 2022-23, a 9.5% increase. This percentage is a 0.4% increase from 47.2% in 2020-21.

**KEY NUMBERS**

- 47.6% of coaches within the MIAC were women in 2022-23
- 9.5% increase in women coaches in the MIAC since 2013-14
- 0.4% increase in women coaches in the MIAC since 2021-22

Compared to the 2.3% increase in our D-I Select 7 sample (40.2% in 2012-13 to 42.5% in 2020-21) over the same period, this increase is notable.
COACH TURNOVER

In the two years since we last collected turnover data, 16 of 124 (12.9%) MIAC head coach positions for women’s teams turned over. The yearly turnover rate for head coaches in NCAA Division-I Select 7 is 5.6%. Data indicates there are opportunities for women to “get in the game” in D-III athletics, compared to less available, higher paying, and higher profile jobs in NCAA D-I.

In 2022, a female head coach was hired in half of the vacant positions (8 of 16, 50%), similar to the hiring percentage of female head coaches as collected in 2020-21 (24 of 48, 50%). Carleton College and St. Mary’s each had three, while Macalester College, St. Catherine, St. Olaf, Augsburg and Concordia College each had two head coach changes between 2020-21 and 2022-23. Since 2013, a majority (54.8%) of all head coach hires were men but recently women are being hired at equal rates.

HEAD COACH TURNOVER PAIR BY GENDER OVER TIME

HEAD COACHES HIRED BY GENDER IN THE MIAC OVER TIME
The percentage of women head coaches in 17 sports varied greatly. Seven of the 17 sports teams had 50% or more women head coaches (Lacrosse received an A, and gymnastics and Nordic skiing received C’s, but each only represented 1 position). Diving, tennis, wrestling, and alpine skiing all earned F grades.

**NOTABLE CHANGES**
*FROM 2020-21 TO 2022-23*

**ICE HOCKEY**
C → B (+10%)

**VOLLEYBALL**
+15.9%

**NORDIC SKIING**
F → C (+50%)

**SWIMMING**
D → C (+14.4%)

**SOCCER**
B → C (-8.3%)

**ALPINE SKIING**
A → F (-100%)
RACE

At the time of data collection, only 4 of 124 (3.2%) head coaching positions were held by coaches of color. Of the 12 MIAC institutions, two schools (Augsburg, St. Kate's) had one BIPOC head coach on staff, and one school (Carleton College) had two BIPOC head coaches. These coaches of color are: Augsburg head volleyball coach Abby Monson, St. Catherine head soccer coach Jesse Campos, and Carleton College head softball coach Amy Erickson and head volleyball coach Jacki Smith.

Based on the data, women coaches of color are underrepresented (2.4%) as head coaches of women teams. Although the MIAC has proven that they prioritize hiring women coaches, the data shows the priority has greatly improved opportunities for white women only. The MIAC needs to use its resources and passion for equity to recruit, hire and retain more women coaches of color.
INSTITUTIONS

At the time of data collection, only two MIAC institutions (Augsburg and Concordia) received an A with 72.7% and 70% women head coaches respectively. Two institutions (St. Olaf and Carleton) received a B, four institutions (Saint Benedict, Gustavus Adolphus, Hamline and St. Scholastica) received a C, and two institutions (Macalester and St. Catherine) received a D. Saint Mary's and Bethel University received F grades, each with only 2 of their head coach positions held by women (25% and 22.2%, respectively). 2022-23 data includes the addition of St. Scholastica to the MIAC, while St. Thomas transitioned to the NCAA Division I Summit Conference. Based on the institution grades and the calculated average, the MIAC conference’s overall grade is a C (47.6%). See page 13 for a full list of grades by institution for percentage of women head coaches.

Most institutions (58.3%, n = 7) had 50% or less women head coaches. Augsburg, Bethel, and Hamline recorded the biggest gains over time, while Macalester College recorded some of the biggest losses over time dropping from an A to a D in 2017-18. See below for a complete longitudinal graph of the percentage of MIAC women head coaches of women’s teams by institution. Pages 11 and 12 show the current percentage of women coaches of women’s teams at each institution and a longitudinal graph to display how these percentages have changed over time.
### INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUGSBURG (72.7%)</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETHEL (22.2%)</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON (60.0%)</td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCORDIA (70.0%)</td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image21.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image22.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image23.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image24.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSTAVUS (45.5%)</td>
<td><img src="image25.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image26.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image27.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image28.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image29.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image30.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMLINE (45.5%)</td>
<td><img src="image31.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image32.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image33.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image34.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image35.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image36.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUGSBURG UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETHEL UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARELTON COLLEGE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCORDIA COLLEGE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMLINE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACALESTER COLLEGE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ST. BENEDICT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. CATHERINE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAINT MARY’S UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. OLAF COLLEGE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ST. SCHOLASTICA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

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 Tucker Center Director Nicole M. LaVoi, 2016) as well as in many other scholarly works and research reports.

Data in this report for 12 NCAA Division-III athletic programs within the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (MIAC) documented a small increase (+0.4%) of women head coaches of women’s teams over two academic years. Four of the 12 institutions had significant decreases in women head coaches of women’s teams, six had no change, and the final three had significant increases in women head coaches of women’s teams. For example, Concordia College saw a dramatic increase going from an F (10%) in 2017-2018 to a C (50%) in 2018-2019 to an A (70%), because their new athletic director (AD), Rachel Bergeson, capitalized on opportunities to hire women. St. Kate’s experienced a 22.7% decrease and St. Mary’s experienced a 12.5% decrease from 2020-21.

In this special report we chose to highlight and celebrate the MIAC. Out of all the conferences in our Women in College Coaching Report Cards (WCCRC) series over the last ten years, the MIAC stands alone as exemplar. The MIAC has increased the percentage of women head coaches 9.5% over 10 years, averaging 1% a year. Compare that to the slight increases (0.1%-0.3%) made by Division I conference counterparts over the same time period. Due to the leadership of MIAC commissioner Dan McKane who pointedly, unapologetically, and consistently champions hiring women for coaching positions, along with many MIAC ADs and SWAs, the MIAC shines. Each year McKane attends the Women Coaches Symposium (WCS) as a male ally, promotes and encourages coaches in the MIAC to attend the WCS, and sends the WCCRC to MIAC Athletic Directors and college Presidents. In addition, on the MIAC website a special tab exists for administrators looking for potential female candidates for open positions, making it easy for ADs who “can’t find women” to recruit applicants. The MIAC website [www.miacathletics.com/members/women_asst_coaches] states:

“The MIAC is committed to the promotion of women in athletics. Below is a list of female assistant coaches in the MIAC. This page is intended to be a resource for athletic department administration throughout college athletics as they seek qualified candidates for administrative and coaching vacancies.”
CONCLUSION

McKane is a true gender ally that supports and values women coaches and he, his staff, and the MIAC serve as an example that it is possible, with targeted effort, to recruit, hire and retain women coaches. Additional resources are warranted for equity to recruit, hire and retain more women coaches of color. Representation and role modeling matters, and the student athletes of color in the MIAC deserve to be represented. Thus far, the improvements within the MIAC have only benefitted white women.

There are ~190,000 student-athletes (79,000 females) competing for more than 450 colleges and universities throughout the US at the Division-III level, making it the NCAA’s largest membership division. Division-III also provides the largest number of coaching opportunities, therefore women – including current and former female student-athletes – should consider this level of collegiate coaching as a viable career pathway. Given the turnover rate of head coaches in the MIAC over the last ten years, the data also demonstrates that opportunity to “get in” exists! However, to realize opportunity it requires athletic directors who value and support women and make a commitment to recruit and hire women to coach their women’s teams, and we would argue to also coach the men’s teams. We have written a report Athletic administration best practices of recruitment, hiring and retention of female collegiate coaches (LaVoi & Wasend, 2018) which contains information to help the process.

The WCCRC 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 and other conferences would be well advised to look to the MIAC for best practices. 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.

To view and download this report or any report in the Women in College Coaching Report Card series, go to the Tucker Center website at www.TuckerCenter.org, click on the “Current Research” tab and go to the Women in Sports Coaching page.


