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

Tucker Center
for Research on Girls & Women in Sport

Alliance of Women Coaches

School of Kinesiology

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION + HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Driven to Discover℠

Head Coaches of Women's Collegiate Teams

A Report on Select NCAA Division-I Institutions 2016-2017

Tucker Center
for Research on Girls & Women in Sport

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

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

LaVoi, N. M. (2017, February). Head coaches of women's collegiate teams: A report on select NCAA Division-I institutions, 2016-17. Minneapolis: The Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport.

The report can be downloaded free of charge at www.TuckerCenter.org [Research tab}

School of Kinesiology
CEHD | College of Education + Human Development

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Driven to Discover℠

Head Coaches of Women's Collegiate Teams

....

A REPORT ON SELECT NCAA DIVISION-I INSTITUTIONS

2016-17

This longitudinal research series, now in its fifth year (2012-17), 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 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 question: *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 2016-17 academic year?*

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, 2016 by visiting each institution's athletics website and reviewing the coaching roster/staff for the 2016-17 academic year for each women's NCAA-sponsored and NCAA-emerging sport team listed. Coach turnover after November 20, 2016 will be recorded in the following year's (2017-18) 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 women 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 grading system.

We first examined criteria used in the invaluable and longstanding *Racial and Gender Report Cards* issued by our colleagues at The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES) where an A is awarded if 40% of the staff is comprised of women. We felt assigning an A using this criterion would do little to reverse the trend in the decline of women coaches and may 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 (six to be exact!) 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, 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 2016-17 dataset included all head coaches of women's teams ($N = 966$) 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 2016-17.

For 2016-17 one program, the Kansas State equestrian team (-1 female head coach) was eliminated, and two programs with a co-head coach structure (Arizona State softball, Tennesee tennis) went to a single head coach structure. At both institutions the co-head coaches were comprised of a male and a female (Tennessee was a husband-wife pair), and the new individuals hired for the single head coach positions were female. Two institutions (Arizona State, Butler) added lacrosse in 2016-17. Two positions were unfilled at the time of data collection (Boston College diving, Cal Berkeley water polo).

Results

TOTAL HEAD COACHES

A total of 966 head coaches of women's teams from 86 institutions comprised this sample. Two positions were unfilled and not included in anlaysis. The total sample used for analysis was $N = 964*$. The percentage of women head coaches improved negligibly (0.1%)(see Table 1). The increase is primarily due to the elimination of positions occupied by men (i.e., co-head), rather than solely hiring women. There was no net gain of the number of women coaches this year from 2015-16.

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*

HEAD COACH TURNOVER

In the 2016-17 academic year, 73 out of 966 (7.6%) head coach positions turned over, a rate consistent with past years (this number includes the 2 unfilled positions). 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 (38 of 71, 53.5%) a male was hired.

Over half (47 of 86, 54.7%) of the institutions in the sample experienced coach turnover: 31 institutions had one coach change; eight institutions had two coach changes; six institutions (Arkansas, Iowa, Georgetown, Oregon State, Wake Forest, Washington) had three changes, and one school (Arizona State) had five head coach changes in one academic year.

TABLE 2. GENDER COMPOSITION OF HEAD COACH VACANCY HIRES FROM 2015-16 TO 2016-17

Former Coach-New Coach Gender Dyad	Frequency	Percentage
Male-Male	28	39.4
Female-Female	21	29.6
Male-Female	12	16.9
Female-Male	10	14.1
TOTAL	71	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. Two sports—water polo and alpine skiing—sustained all male coaches for the fourth year in a row. More than twice as many sports received failing grades of Ds or Fs ($n = 14$) as received As or Bs ($n = 6$). Ten sports had no change in percentage of female head coaches; six sports increased in percentage but no sports moved up a grade level; seven sports decreased in percentage and one sport (beach volleyball) dropped a grade level. Table 4 contains the breakdown of coach hires by gender dyad and sport. A new sport with growing pains, beach volleyball, had the greatest turnover rate of coaches 4 of 14 (29%), while most sports had small rates (<10%) of turnover, and others had none.

TABLE 3. GRADE BY SPORT FOR PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE HEAD COACHES FOR 2016-17

Grade	%	Sport
A	70-100	field hockey (100%), lacrosse (-86.2%), golf (+81.3%), equestrian (-75%), softball (+72.9%)
B	55-69	basketball (-61.6%), gymnastics (-55.9%),
C	40-54	nordic skiing (50%), tennis (+43.5%)
D	25-39	rifle (37.5%), rowing (35.9%), beach volleyball (↓ 35.7%), volleyball (+35.7%), bowling (33.3%), fencing (27.3%), soccer (-26.2%), ice hockey (25%)
F	0-24	cross country (+18.6%), swimming (+17.2%), track & field (12%), diving (-6.9%), water polo (0%), alpine skiing (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

| 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	61.6	53	38.4	33	86	1		5	2	8
Beach Volleyball	35.7	5	64.3	9	14	3			1	4
Bowling	33.3	1	66.7	2	3					
Cross Country	18.6	16	81.4	70	86	2	2	1	1	6
Diving	6.9	4	93.1	54	59*	5				5
Equestrian	75	6	25	2	8					
Fencing	27.3	3	72.7	8	11	1				1
Field Hockey	100	23	0	0	23			3		3
Golf	81.3	61	18.7	14	75		1	3		4
Gymnastics	55.9	19	44.1	15	34			1	1	2
Ice Hockey	25	2	75	6	8			1		1
Lacrosse	86.2	25	13.8	4	29			1	1	2
Rifle	37.5	3	62.5	5	8			1		1
Rowing	35.9	14	64.1	25	39		1		1	2
Skiing-Alpine	0	0	100	3	3					
Skiing-Nordic	50	1	50	1	2					
Soccer	26.2	22	73.8	62	84	1				1
Softball	72.9	51	27.1	19	70		1	4		5
Swimming	17.2	11	82.8	53	64	5	1			6
Tennis	43.5	37	56.5	48	86		3	4	2	9
Track & Field	12	10	88	73	83	2	1			3
Volleyball	35.7	30	64.3	54	84	6	2		1	9
Water Polo	0	0	100	8	8*					
TOTAL	**41.2**	**397**	**58.8**	**567**	**964***	**28**	**12**	**21**	**10**	**71**

* denotes unfilled position in that sport

BY INSTITUTION

The range for percentage of women head coaches by institution varied dramatically from the highest (80% at Cincinnati) to the lowest (9.1% at Syracuse and 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 institutions as the previous three years: Central Florida (UCF) and Cincinnati. Cincinnati is the *only* institution to have earned an A all five years of this report card. We chose to honor Cincinnati by putting Janet Carl, Cincinnati head women's golf 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 of the three years it has been evaluated.

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

School	A–F	Δ	Female %	Female n	Male %	Male n	School	A–F	Δ	Female %	Female n	Male %	Male n
Cincinnati	A		80	8	20	2	North Carolina	C		40	6	60	9
Central Florida	A	-	77.8	7	22.2	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		62.5	5	37.5	3	Indiana	D		38.5	5	61.5	8
Miami	B		60	6	40	4	Notre Dame	D		38.5	5	61.5	8
Oklahoma	B	↑	60	6	40	4	USC	D		38.5	5	61.5	8
Ohio State	B		58.8	10	41.2	7	Utah	D		38.5	5	61.5	8
LSU	B		58.3	7	41.7	5	Virginia	D	+	38.5	5	61.5	8
Northwestern	B		58.3	7	41.7	5	Boston College ‡	D	↓	37.5	6	56.3	9
Tennessee	B	↑	58.3	7	41.7	5	Texas Tech	D		37.5	3	62.5	5
Minnesota	B		57.1	8	42.9	6	Wake Forest	D		37.5	3	62.5	5
UCLA	B		57.1	8	42.9	6	Iowa State	D		36.4	4	63.6	7
UC Berkeley ‡	B	↑	56.3	9	37.5	6	Providence	D	↓	36.4	4	63.6	7
Seton Hall	B	↑	55.6	5	44.4	4	Texas	D		36.4	4	63.6	7
Washington State	B		55.6	5	44.4	4	Texas A&M	D		36.4	4	63.6	7
Florida State	B*		54.5	6	45.5	5	Nebraska	D		35.7	5	64.3	9
Maryland	B*		54.5	6	45.5	5	Arizona	D		33.3	4	66.7	8
Temple	B*		54.5	6	45.5	5	Auburn	D		33.3	4	66.7	8
Washington	B*	↑	54.5	6	45.5	5	Mississippi	D	↓	33.3	3	66.7	6
Georgetown	C	↑	53.8	7	46.2	6	Wisconsin	D	↓	33.3	4	66.7	8
Michigan State	C		53.8	7	46.2	6	Connecticut	D		30.8	4	69.2	9
Florida	C		50	6	50	6	East Carolina	D		30	3	70	7
Georgia Tech	C		50	4	50	4	Houston	D		30	3	70	7
Oregon	C		50	5	50	5	Pittsburgh	D		30	3	70	7
Oregon State	C	+	50	5	50	5	Purdue	D		30	3	70	7
Michigan	C		46.7	7	53.3	8	DePaul	D		28.6	2	71.4	5
Duke	C		46.2	6	53.8	7	Butler	D	-	27.3	3	72.7	8
Iowa	C		46.2	6	53.8	7	Alabama	D		25	3	75	9
Louisville	C		46.2	6	53.8	7	Creighton	D		25	2	75	6
Villanova	C		46.2	6	53.8	7	Mississippi State	D		25	2	75	6
Illinois	C		45.5	5	54.5	6	NC State	D	↑	25	3	75	9
Clemson	C	↑	44.4	4	55.6	5	Xavier	D		25	2	75	6
Memphis	C		44.4	4	55.6	5	Baylor	F		22.2	2	77.8	7
St. John's	C		44.4	4	55.6	5	Tulsa	F		22.2	2	77.8	7
Stanford	C	↓	44.4	8	55.6	10	Vanderbilt	F		22.2	2	77.8	7
Arizona State	C	↑	42.9	6	57.1	8	Arkansas	F		18.2	2	81.8	9
Kansas State	C	-	42.9	3	57.1	4	Kansas	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	Virginia Tech	F	↓	18.2	2	81.8	9
Georgia	C		41.7	5	58.3	7	Kentucky	F		16.7	2	83.3	10
South Carolina	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
Colorado	C	-	40	4	60	6	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 2015-16 to 2016-17
-     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 2015-16 to 2016-17
‡   One unfilled position which once filled will effect % and possibly the grade

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 2015-16 to 2016-17, 12 of 86 institutions (13.9%) increased their percentage of female head coaches. Of those 12 institutions, eight moved up a grade level: five moved up from C to B (UC Berkeley‡, Oklahoma, Seton Hall, Tennessee, Washington), four moved from D to C (ASU, Clemson, Georgetown, Rutgers), and one moved up from F to D (NC State). Eleven institutions (11 of 86, 12.8%) registered a *decrease* in their percentage of women head coaches. Of those 11, seven institutions recevied a lower grade: one moved down from B to C (Stanford), four moved down from C to D (Boston College, Mississippi, Providence, Wisconsin), and two moved down from D to F (Missouri, Virginia Tech).

Nearly three-fourths of the institutions (63 of 86, 73.3%) 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 occured; 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%) than received a failing grade of F (12.9%)(see Table 6), indicating a slight trend of improvement. While the same number of institutions received As ($n = 2$) as the previous two years, the most significant gain again occurred in the B grade. Institutions earning a B increased in number from 13 to 17 institutions in one year. Nearly two-thirds of institutions (65.1%) remained within the C and D grade levels, slightly less than the previous four years.

TABLE 6. 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 (10.6%)	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%)
2016-17	2 (2.3%)	17 (19.8%)	27 (31.4%)	29 (33.7%)	11 (12.9%)	86 (100%)

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

BY CONFERENCE

The AAC had the highest percentage of women head coaches, while the Big 12 had the lowest (see Table 7). Given that the only two institutions that earned As are members of the AAC, it is not surprising that the AAC ranks highest. Using the grading criteria, all conferences earned a C or D. Two conferences (AAC, SEC) decreased and four (ACC, Pac-12, Big East, Big 12)

increased the percentage of female head coaches, although the changes in either direction were small. The percentage of women head coaches in "The Power Five" conferences (ACC, Big 12, Big Ten, Pac-12, SEC) was slightly lower (40.4%) than the total sample of seven conferences (41.2%). The number of coaches in each conference by gender is in Table 8.

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

Grade	Criteria %	Conference
A	70-100	
B	55-69	
C	40-54	AAC (-48.2%), Big Ten (46.2%), Pac-12 (+47%)
D	25-39	Big East (+39.6%), ACC (+38.4%), SEC (-34.2%), Big 12 (+31.6%)
F	0-24	

Note: Conference decreased (-) or increased (+) percentage of women head coaches; moved down ↓ or up ↑ a grade from 2015-16 to 2016-17.

TABLE 8. GRADE, PERCENTAGE, AND NUMBER OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES BY CONFERENCE

Conference	Grade	Female Head Coaches		Male Head Coaches		Total Coaches
		%	n	%	n	N
AAC	C	48.2%	53	51.8	57	110
BIG Ten	C	46.2%	85	53.8	99	184
Pac-12	C	47%	70	53%	53%	149
Big East	D	39.6%	38	60.4%	58	96
ACC	D	38.4%	66	61.6%	106	172
SEC	D	34.2%	53	65.8%	102	155
Big 12	D	31.6%	31	68.4%	67	98
TOTAL		41.2%	397	58.8%	567	964

Summary

The goal of this research series is to document the percentage of women collegiate head coaches over time and complement and add 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 LaVoi, 2016). Data in this fifth report for 86 big-time select NCAA Division-I athletic programs—including "The Power 5"—documented a *negligible* increase (.1%) of women head coaches of women's teams over one academic year. The most marked improvement was made in the number of institutions receiving Bs. Gains or losses by institution, sport or conference were also very slight. Based on this data, as well as data from the last decade pertaining to women collegiate coaches, it is most accurate to move away from the popular and pervasive "decline narrative" and declare a new era—***stagnation.*** It is true that a major decline in the percentage of women coaches of women's teams occured after the passage of Title IX in 1972 from 90+% (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014) to the current level which hovers around 40 (±2)% (LaVoi, 2016). The good news is that the decline seems to have stopped. The bad news is that the percentage of women coaches is not increasing in any statistically significant way despite the efforts

of many individuals and groups. This is not to say these efforts are not working. Without data documentation to hold decision makers accountable, dialogue, a collective effort, and dedicated resources, the decline would certainly persist. 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 "opt out") which has dominated women in coaching narratives (LaVoi, 2016).

In our discussions we have learned about ways in which our reports over time are being used for social change, ways we could have never anticipated at inception. Athletic administrators at institutions with A and B Report Card grades tell us they use and showcase their grade as a "bragging right" to peers, colleagues, donors, faculty athletic representatives (FARs), trustees and college chancellors and presidents. Conference commissioners are using it to assist them in developing programming at the conference level to support and increase the percentage of women coaches. National college coaching associations use it to bring awareness to their membership and provide evidence that initiatives and policies aimed at recruiting and retaining women coaches are needed. ADs also use it to recruit and retain the most talented women, as an above average Report Card grade indicates, in part, a workplace climate that values inclusion and diversity and supports women. Educators use it in their classrooms to illuminate the under-representation of women in the context of sport. The Alliance of Women Coaches use it to provide evidence of the need for women-focused programming, networking, and need for change at the organizational level that supports women in the coaching profession, and to educate and empower their membership. Women coaches tell us they use Report Card grades as one tool to help them assess goodness of fit when on the job market or making a career move as women want, and deserve, a supportive, inclusive workplace where they can simultaneously develop young people and strive for performance excellence. The Report Card gives women a piece of tangible information in which to assess a potential (or current) workplace. One coach told us her immigration lawyer used our research and Report Card data to make a case for shortage-based immigration, which resulted in her attainment of a green card. In short, the Women in College Coaching Report Card is being utlized in a variety of ways!

Currently we are interviewing ADs with above average institutional grades and a track record of recruiting, hiring and retaining women coaches so that we can all learn best practices from these exemplars. Stay tuned! However, a caveat about Report Card grades is warranted: The institutional grade is reflective of one piece of the workplace, and 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. It is also true that a below average or failing grade does not necessarily reflect a hostile or unpleasant workplace climate for women.

TARGETS OF OPPORTUNITY FOR CHANGE

In assessing five years of data it is clear that a coaching position vacancy provides the biggest target of opportunity to hire women. The most impactful strategy to move up a grade or increase the percentage of women head coaches is to hire a female in a position previously occupied by a male. Another way is to hire a female head coach when an institution adds a new sport, as we've seen with lacrosse and beach volleyball. Unfortunately, the majority of coach hires (as evidenced by the data in Table 2) are men. Another target of opportunity to hire women occurs under new athletic administration leadership. The institutions with the greatest rate of coach turnover from year-to-year are institutions with a new AD.

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 (LaVoi, 2016). As recently documented in *Women in Sports Coaching* (LaVoi, 2016), the Women's Sport Foundation report *Beyond X's & O's: Gender Bias and Coaches of Women's College Sports* (Sabo, Veliz, & Staurowsky, 2016) and in the NCAA report *Perceived Barriers for Ethnic Minority Females in Collegiate Athletics Careers* (Hollomon, 2016) as well as in a plethora of scholarship over decades, systemic inequalities and gender and racial bias within the context of sport are prevalent. Bias, whether it is conscious or unconscious, 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), and when women coaches "coach" they are often unfairly and negatively evaluated, perceived and interpreted compared to their male counterparts—by ADs, 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. This failure to address bias, and structural and systemic inqualities are likely reasons that 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 support and retain women in the coaching profession. Our goal is that more young women (and men) have female coaches as role models and that 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 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 go to the Tucker Center website at *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

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

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.

ERRATA from 2015-16, discovered in 2016-17: These errors may have effected an institution's grade. 1. Rob Alman was added into database as co-head coach of Butler soccer; 2.We removed Larry Penley, Clemson Director of Golf, from the database as Kelley Hester is the head coach per our stated methodology.

Appendix A

CONFERENCE COMPOSITION 2016-17

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	University of Indiana	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					