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## A REPORT ON SELECT NCAA DIVISION-I MID-MAJOR INSTITUTIONS 2014-15

This longitudinal research series, now in its third year, 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 coaching positions 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 multifacted: 1) to document and benchmark the percentage of women coaches of women's teams; 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 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 52 select NCAA Division I mid-major athletics programs during the 2014-15 academic year?

## Methodology

Documenting and adhering to a rigorous methodology is important for transparency, 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 http://www.TuckerCenter.org.

Data for this report was collected from November 2014 through April 2015 by visiting each institution's athletics website and reviewing the coaching roster/staff for the 2014-15 academic year for each NCAA-sponsored and NCAA-emerging sport women's team listed. All individuals listed on the coaching roster were recorded. 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 2014-15 dataset included all head coaches of women's teams ( $N=472$ ) at 52 institutions of higher education in all geographic regions of the United States that were current members of four select NCAA Division-I mid-major conferences: Mid-American, Mountain West, Conference USA, and Sun Belt. Appendix A summarizes the distribution of schools by conference recorded for 2014-15.

## GRADE CRITERIA

The scale used to assign grades is as follows: $\mathrm{A}=\mathbf{7 0 - 1 0 0 \%}, \mathrm{B}=\mathbf{5 5 - 6 9 \%}, \mathrm{C}=\mathbf{4 0 - 5 4 \%}$, D $=\mathbf{2 5 - 3 9} \%, \mathrm{~F}=\mathbf{0 - 2 4 \%}$. 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

## By Coaching Position

In the 2014-15 academic year, women coaches comprised less than half (45.6\%) of all coaching positions. A smaller percentage of women coaches occupied head coaching positions ( $40.3 \%$ ) compared to assistant ( $48.9 \%$ ) and associate ( $50.0 \%$; see Table 1) coaching positions. However, in a few of the less visible, entry-level positions-such as director of operations ( $75.0 \%$ ) and graduate assistant ( $73.9 \%$ )-women occupied the majority of the positions. The only two exceptions to this trend were the positions of video coordinator ( $41.7 \%$ ) and volunteer coaches (43.2\%), in which men occupied the majority. Nonetheless, women were more likely to fill positions that were more "behind the scenes" than highly visible positions, such as athletic director. In fact, men (67.3\%) were about twice as likely to be athletic directors than women ( $32.7 \%$ ) at institutions in these four mid-major conferences.

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN COACHES AND ATHLETIC STAFF FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

| Position | Female |  | Male |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | $\%$ | n | $\%$ | n | N |
| Head Coach | 40.3 | 190 | 59.7 | 282 | 472 |
| (Senior) Associate Coach | 50.0 | 36 | 50.0 | 36 | 72 |
| Assistant Coach | 48.9 | 323 | 51.1 | 337 | 660 |
| SUBTOTAL | 45.6 | 549 | 54.4 | 655 | 1204 |
| Athletic Director | 32.7 | 17 | 67.3 | 35 | 52 |
| Director of Operations | 75.0 | 57 | 25.0 | 19 | 76 |
| Volunteer Coach | 43.2 | 48 | 56.8 | 63 | 111 |
| Graduate Assistant | 73.9 | 51 | 26.1 | 18 | 69 |
| Video Coordinator | 41.7 | 5 | 58.3 | 7 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 47.7 | 727 | 52.3 | 797 | 1524 |

## BY SPORT

There was great variance across 22 NCAA sports in terms of percentage of female head coaches (see Tables $2 \& 3$ ). Table 2 contains grades by percentage, while Table 3 contains breakdown by sport and gender of coach. Some of the sports-such as lacrosse (100.0\%), softball ( $76.7 \%$ ), and golf ( $75.6 \%$ ) -all of which earned an A grade, had a predominance of women head coaches, while other sports had few (if any) women head coaches. Three sports (alpine skiing, fencing, and sailing) had no female head coaches. Women were much less likely than men to hold head coaching positions in sports with co-ed teams such as swimming (32.1\%), track \& field (19.1\%), and cross country (10.9\%). More sports ( $\mathrm{n}=7$ ) earned an F, than sports ( $\mathrm{n}=6$ ) that earned an A or B grade.

TABLE 2. GRADE BY SPORT FOR PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE HEAD COACHES FOR 2014-15

| Grade | Criteria | Sport |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 7 0}$ | Lacrosse (100\%), Softball (76.7\%), Golf (75.6\%) |
| B | $\mathbf{6 9 - 5 5}$ | Water Polo (66.7\%), Field Hockey (57.1\%), Basketball (56.3\%) |
| C | $\mathbf{5 4 - 4 0}$ | Equestrian (50.0\%), Sand Volleyball (50.0\%), Volleyball (44.2\%), Tennis (43.5\%), Gymnastics <br> (40.0\%) |
| D | $\mathbf{3 9 - 2 5}$ | Bowling (33.3\%), Crew/Rowing (33.3\%), Rifle (33.3\%), Swimming (32.1\%) |
| F | $\mathbf{2 4 - 0}$ | Track (19.1\%), Soccer (18.0\%), Diving (17.9\%), Cross Country Run (10.9\%), Alpine Skiing <br> (0.0\%), Fencing (0.0\%), Sailing (0.0\%) |

TABLE 3. HEAD COACH NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE ALPHABETICALLY BY SPORT AND GENDER FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

|  | Head Coaches |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female |  | Male |  |  |
| Sport | $\%$ | n | $\%$ | n | N |
| Alpine skiing | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 2 | 2 |
| Basketball | 56.3 | 27 | 43.8 | 21 | 48 |
| Bowling | 33.3 | 1 | 66.7 | 2 | 3 |
| Crew/Rowing | 33.3 | 1 | 66.7 | 2 | 3 |
| Cross Country | 10.9 | 5 | 89.1 | 41 | 46 |
| Diving | 17.9 | 5 | 82.1 | 23 | 28 |
| Equestrian | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 2 |
| Fencing | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 1 | 1 |
| Field Hockey | 57.1 | 4 | 42.9 | 3 | 7 |
| Golf | 75.6 | 31 | 24.4 | 10 | 41 |
| Gymnastics | 40.0 | 4 | 60.0 | 6 | 10 |
| Lacrosse | 100.0 | 4 | 0.0 | 0 | 4 |
| Rifle | 33.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 4 | 6 |
| Sailing | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 3 | 3 |
| Sand VB | 50.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 4 | 8 |
| Soccer | 18.0 | 9 | 82.0 | 41 | 50 |
| Softball | 76.7 | 33 | 23.3 | 10 | 43 |
| Swimming | 32.1 | 9 | 67.9 | 19 | 28 |
| Tennis | 43.5 | 20 | 56.5 | 26 | 46 |
| Track \& Field | 19.1 | 9 | 80.9 | 38 | 47 |
| Volleyball | 44.2 | 19 | 55.8 | 24 | 43 |
| Water Polo | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 3 |
| TotAL | 40.3 | 190 | 59.7 | 282 | 472 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## BY INSTITUTION

Based on the percentage of women head coaches, only 2 of the 52 institutions (3.8\%)-Texas State ( $80.0 \%$ ) and Bowling Green ( $71.4 \%$ ) -received As compared to peer institutions (see Tables $4,6, \& 7$ ). Nearly one-third of the 52 mid-major institutions (32.7\%) fell within the C-grade range. Compared to the A-grade schools, more than three times as many institutions received failing grades ( $17.3 \%$ ) and more than six times as many institutions received Ds ( $25.0 \%$ ) for percentage of women head coaches. Colorado College and Louisiana Tech University tied for the lowest percentage of women head coaches ( $0.0 \%$ ), followed by UL Monroe and University of Wyoming (11.1\%). However, it is worth noting that Colorado College only had one D-1 women's team (women's hockey), and thus an F-grade might not be a fair representation of their coaching staff for women's teams.

TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF GRADES BY INSTITUTION FOR PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES

|  |  | 2014-2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Grade <br> Criteria | Institutions | Institutions <br> Receiving <br> Grade |
| A | $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 7 0}$ | 2 | $3.8 \%$ |
| B | $\mathbf{6 9 - 5 5}$ | 11 | $21.2 \%$ |
| C | $\mathbf{5 4 - 4 0}$ | 17 | $32.7 \%$ |
| D | $\mathbf{3 9 - 2 5}$ | 13 | $25.0 \%$ |
| F | $\mathbf{2 4 - 0}$ | 9 | $17.3 \%$ |
| TOTAL |  | 52 | $100 \%$ |

## BY CONFERENCE

Out of the four NCAA D-I mid-major conferences, the Mid-American Conference had the highest percentage of women head coaches (47.2\%), followed by Mountain West (40.0\%). Both earned C grades. Conference USA (37.8\%) and Sun Belt (36.5\%) had the lowest percentages of women head coaches, and both earned a D. None of the four conferences had a percentage of women head coaches greater than $50.0 \%$, and thus no conference earned an A or a B.

TABLE 5. GRADE BY CONFERENCE FOR PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES

| Grade | Criteria | Conference |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | $100-70$ |  |
| B | $69-55$ |  |
| C | $54-40$ | Mid-American (47.2\%), Mountain West (40.0\%) |
| D | $39-25$ | Conference USA (37.8\%), Sun Belt (36.5\%) |
| F | $24-0$ |  |

## Conclusion

The purpose of this report was to provide an analysis of the percentage of women in coaching and administrative positions at the collegiate level, by institution, conference, and sport. Similar to prior reports on women coaches in collegiate athletics (LaVoi, 2012, 2013, 2014), this report provides further evidence for the under-representation of women coaches in collegiate athletics at the NCAA D-I mid-major conference level. These data illustrate an underrepresentation of women in coaching and administrative positions. In 2014-15 in these four mid-major conferences, female coaches occupy less than half of all head coach, assistant coach, and associate coach positions. Male coaches are afforded more opportunities to coach both male and female athletes, and men occupy the majority of athletic administrative positions. As the data demonstrate, male coaches and administrators are well-represented in collegiate athletics, especially in positions in which they are afforded more money, power,

TABLE 6. 2014-15 GRADES BY INSTITUTION FOR PERCENT OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES OF WOMEN'S TEAMS

| A (70-100\%) | B (55-69\%) | C (40-54\%) | D (25-39\%) | F (0-24\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Texas State (80.0\%) | Buffalo (66.7\%) | Southern Mississippi University (50.0\%) | Troy (37.5\%) | Marshall University (20.0\%) |
| Bowling Green (71.4\%) | Western Michigan (66.7\%) | University of Texas at San Antonio (50.0\%) | Eastern Michigan (33.3\%) | University of North Texas (20.0\%) |
|  | Florida Atlantic University (63.6\%) | Miami (50.0\%) | Ohio (33.3\%) | South Alabama (20.0\%) |
|  | University of Nevada-Reno (63.6\%) | UT Arlington (50.0\%) | Boise State (30.8\%) | Colorado State (20.0\%) |
|  | Central Michigan (62.5\%) | UNLV (50.0\%) | Western Kentucky University (30.0\%) | UL Lafayette (14.3\%) |
|  | San Diego State (61.5\%) | Ball State (45.5\%) | Akron (30.0\%) | UL Monroe (11.1\%) |
|  | CSU-Fresno (58.3\%) | University of Texas at El Paso (44.4\%) | New Mexico State (27.3\%) | University of Wyoming (11.1\%) |
|  | Northern Illinois (55.6\%) | Toledo (44.4\%) | Air Force (27.3\%) | Louisiana Tech University (0.0\%) |
|  | Appalachian State (55.6\%) | Georgia State (44.4\%) | Middle Tennesse State University (25.0\%) | Colorado College (0.0\%) |
|  | University of Alabama at Birmingham (54.5\%) | University of North Caroline <br> - Charlotte (42.9\%) | Kent State (25.0\%) |  |
|  | University of New Mexico (54.5\%) | Rice University (42.9\%) | Arkansas State (25.0\%) |  |
|  |  | UALR (42.9\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { San Jose State University } \\ & (25.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | Hawaii (42.9\%) | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Utah State University } \\ \text { (25.0\%) } \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | Florida International University (40.0\%) |  |  |
|  |  | Old Dominion University (40.0\%) |  |  |
|  |  | Georgia Southern (40.0\%) |  |  |
|  |  | Idaho (40.0\%) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 7. HEAD COACH NUMBER AND PERCENT HIGH TO LOW BY INSTITUTION AND GENDER

|  | Head Coaches |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fem |  | Ma |  |
| School | \% | N | \% | N |
| Texas State | 80.0 | 4 | 20.0 | 1 |
| Bowling Green | 71.4 | 5 | 28.6 | 2 |
| Buffalo | 66.7 | 4 | 33.3 | 2 |
| Western Michigan | 66.7 | 6 | 33.3 | 3 |
| Florida Atlantic University | 63.6 | 7 | 36.4 | 4 |
| University of Nevada-Reno | 63.6 | 7 | 36.4 | 4 |
| Central Michigan | 62.5 | 5 | 37.5 | 3 |
| San Diego State | 61.5 | 8 | 38.5 | 5 |
| CSU-Fresno | 58.3 | 7 | 41.7 | 5 |
| Northern Illinois | 55.6 | 5 | 44.4 | 4 |
| Appalachian State | 55.6 | 5 | 44.4 | 4 |
| Alabama-Birmingham | 54.5 | 6 | 45.5 | 5 |
| University of New Mexico | 54.5 | 6 | 45.5 | 5 |
| Southern Mississippi | 50.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 4 |
| Texas-San Antonio | 50.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 4 |
| Miami | 50.0 | 5 | 50.0 | 5 |
| UT Arlington | 50.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 |
| UNLV | 50.0 | 5 | 50.0 | 5 |
| Ball State | 45.5 | 5 | 54.5 | 6 |
| Texas-El Paso | 44.4 | 4 | 55.6 | 5 |
| Toledo | 44.4 | 4 | 55.6 | 5 |
| Georgia State | 44.4 | 4 | 55.6 | 5 |
| North Carolina-Charlotte | 42.9 | 3 | 57.1 | 4 |
| Rice University | 42.9 | 3 | 57.1 | 4 |
| UALR | 42.9 | 3 | 57.1 | 4 |
| Hawaii | 42.9 | 6 | 57.1 | 8 |
| Florida International | 40.0 | 4 | 60.0 | 6 |


|  | Head Coaches |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female |  | Male |  |
| School | \% | N | \% | N |
| Old Dominion University | 40.0 | 4 | 60.0 | 6 |
| Georgia Southern | 40.0 | 4 | 60.0 | 6 |
| Idaho | 40.0 | 4 | 60.0 | 6 |
| Troy | 37.5 | 3 | 62.5 | 5 |
| Eastern Michigan | 33.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 4 |
| Ohio | 33.3 | 3 | 66.7 | 6 |
| Boise State | 30.8 | 4 | 69.2 | 9 |
| Western Kentucky | 30.0 | 3 | 70.0 | 7 |
| Akron | 30.0 | 3 | 70.0 | 7 |
| New Mexico State | 27.3 | 3 | 72.7 | 8 |
| Air Force | 27.3 | 3 | 72.5 | 8 |
| Middle Tennessee State | 25.0 | 2 | 75.0 | 6 |
| Kent State | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 9 |
| Arkansas State | 25.0 | 2 | 75.0 | 6 |
| San Jose State University | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 9 |
| Utah State University | 25.0 | 2 | 75.0 | 6 |
| Marshall University | 20.0 | 2 | 80.0 | 8 |
| University of North Texas | 20.0 | 2 | 80.0 | 8 |
| South Alabama | 20.0 | 1 | 80.0 | 4 |
| Colorado State | 20.0 | 2 | 80.0 | 8 |
| UL Lafayette | 14.3 | 1 | 85.7 | 6 |
| UL Monroe | 11.1 | 1 | 88.9 | 8 |
| University of Wyoming | 11.1 | 1 | 88.9 | 8 |
| Louisiana Tech University | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 8 |
| Colorado College | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 40.3 | 190 | 59.7 | 282 |

visibility and higher status. It is especially worth noting that men often occupy the "decisionmaking positions," in which they have the primary say in the hiring process. These trends in the representation of women coaches support additional research on barriers facing women coaches and athletic administrators (see LaVoi \& Dutove, 2012), with the aim of reducing these barriers.
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## Appendix A

## CONFERENCE COMPOSITION 2014-15

| Conference USA | Mid-American/MIAC | Mountain West | Sun Belt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| University of North Caroline -Charlotte | Akron | Air Force | Appalachian State |
| Florida International University | Ball State | Boise State | UALR |
| Florida Atlantic University | Bowling Green | Colorado College | Arkansas State |
| Louisiana Tech University | Buffalo | Colorado State | Georgia Southern |
| Marshall University | Central Michigan | CSU-Fresno | Georgia State |
| Middle Tennesse State University | Eastern Michigan | Hawaii | Idaho |
| University of North Texas | Kent State | University of Nevada-Reno | UL Lafayette |
| Old Dominion University | Miami | University of New Mexico | UL Monroe |
| Rice University | Northern Illinois | San Diego State | New Mexico State |
| Southern Mississippi University | Ohio | San Jose State University | South Alabama |
| University of Alabama at Birmingham | Toledo | UNLV | UT Arlington |
| University of Texas at El Paso | Western Michigan | Utah State University | Troy |
| University of Texas at San Antonio |  | University of Wyoming | Texas State |
| Western Kentucky University |  |  |  |
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