

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

**Driven to Discover<sup>SM</sup>**



# The Decline of Women Coaches in Collegiate Athletics

---

**A REPORT ON SELECT NCAA  
DIVISION-I FBS INSTITUTIONS  
2012-2013**



**[www.TuckerCenter.org](http://www.TuckerCenter.org)**  
**@TuckerCenter**  
**[facebook.com/tuckercenter](https://facebook.com/tuckercenter)**

**[www.GoCoaches.org](http://www.GoCoaches.org)**  
**@GoCoaches**  
**[facebook.com/AllianceofWomenCoaches](https://facebook.com/AllianceofWomenCoaches)**

This report was prepared by Nicole M. LaVoi, Ph.D., associate director, the Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport, and Board of Directors member, the Alliance of Women Coaches.  
Please direct all inquiries to [nmlavoi@umn.edu](mailto:nmlavoi@umn.edu).

### **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to the following individuals for their role in producing and preparing this report: Sam Albrecht, Austin Calhoun, Julia Dutove, Marta Fahrenz, Gopher Athletics, Torrie Hazelwood, Holly Hesse, Megan Kahn, Mary Jo Kane, Elora Koepke, Julie Roe Lach, Nicole Lee, Emma Hawkins-Leyden, Ann Salerno, Celia Slater, Robin Sparks, Jonathan Sweet, Judy Sweet, Emily Timmerman, Stephanie VanderPloeg, and Chris Werle.

Design by Nance Longley, photos courtesy of the University of Minnesota Gopher Athletics and the Alliance of Women Coaches. Cover photo: Stefanie Golan, Head Soccer Coach at the University of Minnesota

LaVoi, N. M. (2013, December). *The decline of women coaches in collegiate athletics: A report on select NCAA Division-I FBS institutions, 2012-13*. Minneapolis: the Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport.

The report can be downloaded free of charge at [z.umn.edu/womencoachesreport](http://z.umn.edu/womencoachesreport)

© 2013 Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved.

The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

Opinions expressed herein belong entirely to the authors and do not necessarily represent viewpoints of the Regents of the University of Minnesota.

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION  
+ HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**

---

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**  
**Driven to Discover<sup>SM</sup>**

# The Decline of Women Coaches in Collegiate Athletics

---

## A REPORT ON SELECT NCAA DIVISION-I FBS INSTITUTIONS

2012-2013

The purpose of this project is to document the percentage of women coaches of women's teams in "big time" college athletics by sport, conference, and institution in order to track the effectiveness of initiatives aimed at reversing the decline of women in coaching. This project 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. To commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Tucker Center, this report launches the beginning of a meaningful longitudinal research project, expands the interdisciplinary collaborative research the Tucker Center has conducted over the last 20 years, and honors our mission of making a difference in the lives of girls and women in sport.

### Why this report matters

Sport is inextricably linked to the American ideal of meritocracy—that if you are good enough, work hard enough, and make sacrifices, you will have the opportunity to achieve and succeed. This has been a prevailing ideology for athletes, but does this same ideal of meritocracy apply to the coaching profession? Does it apply to all coaches both male and female? Based on the data in our report, as well as the work of others, the answer is a resounding "NO!"

Opportunities for girls and women to participate in sports after the passage of Title IX in 1972 is at an all-time high, but the percentage of women coached by women has declined to an all-time low. In 1974, 90+% of college female athletes were coached by women, but today the number is around 43% (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Women coaches in the 40 years following Title IX less frequently occupy coaching positions within women's athletics and are rarely, if ever, given opportunities to coach men. Conversely, men who desire to coach collegiate athletes enjoy dual career tracks, meaning that they have legitimate opportunity to coach both men and women. So, while Title IX dramatically opened up participation opportunities for females, it also opened up twice as many coaching opportunities for men. Currently, men occupy a majority (80%) of the

coaching positions in both men's and women's college sport (Acosta & Carpenter). Nearly all college male athletes are coached by men (96-98%), and more than half of college female athletes are coached by men (~60%) (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). At the NCAA Division I level women occupy only 38.6% of all head coaching positions of women's teams (Lapchick et al., 2013). This is not to suggest that men should not ever coach women. All athletes regardless of gender can benefit from being coached by qualified men and women, but given the current minority of women coaches, this benefit often remains unrealized. Women who desire to coach should have equal access and opportunity to pursue dual career tracks to coach both male and female athletes.

### Why women coaches matter

Women coaches matter in many ways. First, if societal stereotypes about gender and leadership—that privilege male coaches—are to change, male and female athletes need to be coached by women. Exposure to female role models and leaders in a context that matters to young people (e.g., sport) may help to change values and beliefs about women in positions of power and leadership. Second, if girls and young women see females in coaching roles they will more likely think about coaching as a legitimate and viable career, and so may aspire to become a coach. Same-sex role models inspire others to pursue and emulate similar achievements, and data indicate female athletes who were coached by women are more likely to pursue a career in coaching (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998). Third, same-sex role models can provide advice and insight to female athletes and to female colleagues on how to navigate the workplace. Lastly, having more females in the workplace reduces the likelihood of a negative workplace experience and environment for women. In many workplace environments female coaches are the statistical minority or “tokens” ( $\leq 15\%$  of the population; Kanter, 1977). Those with minority status are at the highest risk for many possible negative outcomes including increased risk of sexual harassment, wage inequality, limited opportunity for advancement, attribution of failure to group (e.g., if one female coach has a losing season, all female coaches are losers and incompetent), pressure to conform, feeling scrutinized, pressure to over-perform to gain credibility, potential harm to mental and physical health, and increased risk for burnout and quitting (Kanter, 1977).

Today the number of collegiate coaching jobs is at an all-time high and a record number of female athletes exist in the market who possess the knowledge and skills to coach. Furthermore, females comprise over 50% of the student body on college campuses, girls and young women state they value and need female role models, the number of women leaders in nearly all occupations is rising, and women are interested in coaching. Scholars have well documented the complex and numerous barriers faced by women coaches that have contributed to the decline in the 40 years after Title IX (see LaVoi & Dutove, 2012 for review). Now the question we must answer is: **What can be done to retain and increase the percentage of women who are in the coaching profession?**

## Purpose of project

The purpose of this project is twofold: 1) to retain and increase the percentage of women who are in the coaching profession, and 2) bring awareness to the decline of women coaches and provide an evidence-based starting point for a national discussion on this important topic. The first step in achieving our purpose is to educate and increase awareness by documenting and tracking the percentage of women coaches of women's teams in big time college athletics by sport, conference, and institution. Big time athletics programs are the most visible, powerful entity in college sport; therefore it is critical these trend-setting, flagship programs strive for a gender-balanced coaching staff. When women are seen in coaching positions—especially as head coaches in the programs that matter most in college sport—change may be more likely. This report complements and expands existing reports produced by the NCAA, The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES), and the longitudinal work of Vivian Acosta and Linda Carpenter over the last 35+ years, by including data by school and conference, as well as for a wider range of coaching staff positions. This data can be used by schools, conferences, and sport coaching associations to advocate for women coaches, to track progress or decline, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions or strategies to reverse the decline of women coaches. The data can also be used to motivate stakeholders and decision-makers who hire coaches to recruit, hire, and retain women coaches.

The following research question informed the current report: What percentage of women occupy coaching positions for women's sport teams that compete in six select "big time" Football Bowl Series (FBS) conferences?

- by sport
- by conference
- by institution

## Methodology

Documenting and adhering to a rigorous methodology is important for transparency, comparison to other data, and consistency in tracking and reporting over time.

### PHASE I: DATA COLLECTION

A coding key was developed by the primary researcher to collect information that would answer the previously stated research question. Data collected included position, first and last name, sport, conference, institution, and gender of individual. If unclear, gender was determined by examination of photograph and gender markers in accompanying biographical text. A research team trained by the primary researcher at the Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport collected the data for this study from January 2013 through April 2013 by visiting each institution's athletic Web site and reviewing the coaching roster/staff for each women's team listed. The report data covers individuals employed in athletics positions for the 2012-13 academic year. All individuals listed on the coaching roster were recorded, from head coach to volunteer coach ( $N = 3104$ ).

Data was collected from schools ( $N = 76$ ) in all geographic regions of the U.S. that were current members of six select “big time” conferences in the Football Bowl Series: Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), Big 12, Big East, BIG Ten, Pacific 12 (PAC 12), and Southeastern Conference (SEC). Due to conference realignment and the continuous shifting of schools, Appendix A summarizes the distribution of schools by conference observed in this study as of the 2012-13 academic school year. To streamline the data, some coaching positions were recoded, resulting in seven total positions which were used in the data analysis (see Table A below).

**TABLE A. CODING KEY FOR COACH POSITIONS**

Position in Sport	Incorporated positions
Head Coach	Co-Head Coach, Director of Sport (Cross Country, Golf, Tennis, T & F, Swimming)
Associate Head Coach	Senior Associate Head Coach
Assistant Coach	All Assistant Coaches listed, Specialty/Position Coach, Director of Player Development, Goalkeeper Coach, Western or Hunt Seat Coach (equestrian), Novice, Rigger or Boatmen Coach (rowing)
Director of Operations	None recoded
Graduate Assistant	All Graduate Assistants listed
Volunteer Coach	All Volunteer Coaches listed

Data was collected for all women’s sports listed on the athletic Web site which included several non-sponsored (sailing) or emerging (equestrian, squash, synchronized swimming, sand volleyball) NCAA sports. Diving coaches were coded as head coaches. An individual who occupied the head coach position for two sports (e.g., head coach of track & field and cross country) was coded as two separate coaches. A director of sport was included if he/she was different from the head coach. In some cases the number of head coaches is greater (due to co-head coaches, and inclusion of diving and director of sport positions) or less (due to open or unfilled positions at the time of data collection) than the number of sports offered at a particular institution. As with any data, the numbers reported herein have a  $\pm 1-2\%$  margin of error. Many efforts were undertaken to ensure accurate and reliable data.

**PHASE II: VERIFICATION AND RELIABILITY OF DATA**

To ensure coding accuracy, the primary researcher trained two independent research assistants to review the data gathered in Phase I. Approximately 10% of the data ( $n = 317$ ) was randomly selected and verified. Inter-coder reliability was measured by calculating a Krippendorff’s alpha coefficient which met an acceptable reliability level (98.8%). The primary researcher verified all head coach data independently (K-alpha 98.0%), and all errors were corrected to achieve 100% accuracy. The complete verified data set was transferred into SPSS and data analysis ensued.

**PHASE III: DATA ANALYSIS**

Frequency distributions and crosstabs were run for institution, sport, and conference for each coaching position. Data was compiled into tables and verified by a second researcher.

## CALCULATION OF GRADES

In this report we wanted a mechanism to hold institutions, conferences, and sport governing bodies accountable or reward them for the employed percent of females on staff for women's teams—particularly at the head coach position. All teams have a head coach, while not all teams have other coaching staff positions. Therefore head coaches allow an “apples to apples” comparison for grading. A report card method is a commonly used and effective way to achieve this goal. Developing a report card grading scale to accurately reflect the percentage of female coaches for women's teams was a difficult—and potentially controversial—assignment given the context of female under-representation in many schools. However, with careful thought we developed a defensible system.

We examined criteria in the *Racial and Gender Report Cards* issued by TIDES, where having 40% of women on staff earned an A. We felt assigning an A using this criteria would do little to reverse the trend in the decline of women coaches and may reward schools undeservedly. 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 data, where ≤59% is an F, all but five of the 76 schools (93%) would have received a failing grade! This negatively skewed grade distribution is even more shocking when compared to the pre-Title IX era in 1972 when the percentage of women coaching women was high (90+%). In contrast, if the same standard grading scale were applied to the percentage of male head coaches of men's teams for the same 76 schools then none (0%) would fail, and all would receive not only a passing grade but an A, since 96-98% of male athletes are coached by men (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick et al., 2013; Wilson, 2012). Ultimately, we wanted a grading scale that would reflect the dire reality of the scarcity of women coaches and hold entities accountable.

Since the distribution of grades using a standard grading scale was so skewed, a new, modified criterion-based grading scale was developed so that grades would reflect a closer-to-normal distribution. This system allowed us to assign a grade that would reflect level of achievement or standing within this sample group, 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 76 schools was 40%—the midpoint of the data—which represents average achievement (i.e., a C grade). This mean was used to construct the grading system. If rounding up the decimal resulted in a grade change, the school/sport/conference was placed in the higher grade bracket.

The modified grading scale was as follows:

**A=70-100, B=55-69, C=40-54, D=25-39, F=0-24.**

## Results

### TOTAL SAMPLE

Based on the data collected for all 76 FBS Division-I schools, women occupied less than half (45.8%) of all head, associate, and assistant coaching positions (see Table B). As the position became more powerful and visible women less frequently occupied the position—

from assistant coach (49.6%), to associate coach (44%), to head coach (40.2%). Females (42.2%) were also less likely than males (57.8%) to be unpaid volunteer coaches. While over two-thirds of director of operations (69.8%) and graduate assistants (67.8%) were female—arguably two potentially viable career pathways into coaching—very few programs have the resources to support these important gateway positions. In fact, across all sport teams ( $N = 886$ ), only 59 teams (6.7%) had graduate assistants and only 222 (25%) had a director of operations.

**TABLE B. PERCENT OF WOMEN BY POSITION FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS IN SIX FBS CONFERENCES**

Position	Female		Male		Total
	%	N	%	N	N
Head Coach	40.2	356	59.8	530	886
Associate Head Coach	44.0	95	56.0	121	216
Assistant Coach	49.6	699	50.4	709	1,408
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>45.8</b>	<b>1150</b>	<b>54.2</b>	<b>1360</b>	<b>2510</b>
Director of Operations	69.8	155	30.2	67	222
Graduate Assistant	67.8	40	32.2	19	59
Volunteer Coach	42.2	132	57.8	181	313
<b>ALL POSITION TOTAL</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>1477</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>1627</b>	<b>3104</b>

**BY SPORT**

The percentage of female head coaches across 25 sports varied greatly (see Table C). Some NCAA sponsored sports—including field hockey (100%), lacrosse (92.6%), golf (78.8%) and softball (71.9%)—had a large majority of female head coaches, as did emerging NCAA sports such as synchronized swimming (100%) and equestrian (71.4%). Some sports had few, if any, head female coaches. Five sports had zero female head coaches. Sport teams with a large number of co-ed athletes were typically run by a head coach/director who oversaw both the men's and women's programs. In this sample, women rarely occupied this head coach/director position for track & field (10.4%), cross country (12.8%), and swimming & diving (13.8%). Based on the percentage of female head coaches, each sport was assigned a grade (see Table C below) using the previously defined grading criteria. Twice as many sports received failing grades of D's or F's ( $n = 14$ ) as received above average grades of A's or B's ( $n = 7$ ).

**TABLE C. GRADE BY SPORT FOR PERCENT OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES**

Grade	Sport
<b>A</b>	field hockey (100%), synchronized swimming (100%), lacrosse 92.5%, golf (78.8%), softball (71.9%), equestrian (71.4%)
<b>B</b>	basketball (60.5%)
<b>C</b>	gymnastics (50%), tennis (42.9%), rowing (40.5%), volleyball (40%)
<b>D</b>	rifle (37.5%), sand volleyball (33.3%), fencing (27.3%), soccer (25.3%), ice hockey (25%)
<b>F</b>	swimming (13.8%), cross country (12.8%), track & field (10.4%), diving (9.1%), water polo (0%), bowling (0%), sailing (0%), skiing (0%), squash (0%)

Data for all coaching and staff positions in both NCAA sponsored and non-sponsored sports can be found in the Appendix, Table 1. According to the NCAA (2011), the top five sports with the most women’s teams were basketball, volleyball, cross country, soccer, and softball. The percentage of female head coaches for these five most frequently offered college sports in this FBS sample were basketball 60.5%, volleyball 40.0%, cross country 12.8%, soccer 25.3%, and softball 71.9% respectively. Graduate assistants and director of operations positions were most frequently part of the coaching staff in these five sports, and most common in basketball.

**BY CONFERENCE**

The Big East (51.2%) and BIG Ten (51.0%) had the highest overall percentage of females on staff and the SEC had the lowest (41.0%, see Table 2 for full data). None of the six conferences employed a majority of female head coaches. The BIG Ten Conference had the most female head coaches (46.1%), while the SEC had the fewest (33.1%). Data was also collected for the athletic director (AD). Only three of 76 schools had a female athletic director (Cal, DePaul, & NC State), and three conferences (BIG Ten, Big East, SEC) had no female AD. Tables 4-9 contain data for all coaching positions by gender for each institution organized by conference affiliation. Using the grading criteria, no conference (see Table D) received an above average grade of an A or B, and none got F's, for percent of women head coaches of women's teams.

**TABLE D. GRADE BY CONFERENCE FOR PERCENT OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES**

Grade	Conference
A	
B	
C	BIG Ten (46.1%), ACC (42%), Big East (41.4%), PAC 12 (40%)
D	Big 12 (37.4%), SEC (33.3%)
F	

**BY INSTITUTION**

Based on the percentage of female head coaches, only three of 76 institutions (4%)—Cincinnati (80%), Texas (72.7%) and University of Miami (70%)—received A’s for being above average compared to peer institutions (see Table E). Compared to A-grade institutions, over twice as many institutions (10.5%) received failing grades, including the bottom three—Oklahoma State (0%), Alabama (15.4%), Kentucky and Arkansas (16.7%). Notably, Oklahoma State did not have any women head coaches for women’s teams. Table 3 contains grades given to each of the 76 institutions.

**TABLE E. DISTRIBUTION OF GRADES BY INSTITUTION FOR PERCENT OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES**

Grade	Number of institutions (N = 76)	Percent institutions receiving grade
A	3 of 76	4.0%
B	6	7.9%
C	29	38.2%
D	30	39.5%
F	8	10.5%

## Conclusion

This report added to existing data by providing institutional, conference and sport-specific information on who is coaching women's teams in big time collegiate athletics. Women are under-represented in big time college coaching—a fact which is true for women coaching women's teams and incredibly so for women coaching men's teams. Based on this data, only nine of 76 schools (11.8%) received an A or B grade, while 38 (50%) received D's or F's—grades either barely worthy of merit or failing outright. In all six FBS conferences, women comprised half or fewer of the workforce. In some sports, female coaches were tokens ( $\leq 15\%$ ), but in other sports female coaches were well represented. The fact that over two-thirds of graduate assistants (GA) and director of operations (DOO) positions are filled by females is good news, but few teams support and fund these important gateway positions. This scarcity of paid entry level positions (that often include graduate tuition, a stipend/salary, and health care) may turn many women away from coaching and decrease the likelihood of them entering coaching as a profession. For example, the highest number of GA and DOO positions are in basketball, and perhaps not coincidentally, this sport has one of the highest percentages of female head coaches.

A key point is reiterated by this data, and supported by other researchers such as Vivian Acosta and Linda Carpenter, Amy Wilson, and Richard Lapchick and colleagues—women head coaches remain under-represented in women's sports 40+ years after the passage of Title IX. This report provides a “by the numbers” analysis of gender and coaching in big time college sport which is much needed and provides a good starting point, but it does not address the complex reasons why women coaches are leaving the profession, or why women are not applying—or not being hired for—coaching positions.

A number of researchers have addressed the barriers women coaches face and the reasons why they may leave the coaching profession (LaVoi & Dutove, 2012), but additional data is needed to aid in the development of strategies and to answer remaining key questions. These questions include: (a) What process (if any) is used to identify and recruit qualified women into big time (and all) coaching positions; (b) What institutional and organizational support is being provided to help women survive and thrive in coaching positions; (c) What are the values and beliefs of the athletic director around gender and leadership that drive job searches and subsequent hires; (d) What is the composition of the candidate pool for head coaches, and who is interviewed and hired (and who is not); (e) What reasons do female coaches give for accepting or rejecting a job; (f) What criteria are salient for women coaches who want to stay in coaching and are considering a job change or career move; (g) Is coaching men a viable career path: How many women apply to coach men's teams, in what sports, and what percentage of women that do apply are hired; (h) What reasons do women coaches give for not pursuing or applying to coach men's teams; and (i) Is it still true today that female athletes who are coached by women are more likely to pursue coaching as a profession? In addition, data is needed to help dispel and challenge the frequently iterated, damaging and untrue myth that “women aren't interested” in coaching! Evidence-based talking points and strategies

must be developed and enacted as there is much we don't know in order to stop the decline of women in the profession of college coaching.

One point about the grading criteria not included in this report is worth considering for future report cards. Based on Rosabeth Moss Kanter's (1977) theory of tokenism in the workplace, the goal should not be to have a large majority (e.g., 85-100%) of athletes, regardless of gender, coached by a same-sex coach. As outlined above, tokens experience a host of negative workplace outcomes and some likely face an environment that is less than positive, inclusive, or friendly. Striving toward or maintaining a skewed (i.e., one gender is  $\leq 15\%$ ) occupational workplace is incongruous with the goal of having a healthy and diverse workplace climate. We feel the ultimate long-term goal should be to have a gender-balanced coaching staff for both men's and women's teams, through implementing a plan that maximizes benefits for both coaches and athletes and provides a legitimate dual career track for women coaches. While this report only looked at employment patterns of coaches for women's teams, if the entire coaching staff of men's and women's teams were considered together, women would be an even greater minority due to the fact that nearly all men's teams are coached by men. Given this, it is of even greater importance to strive for a gender balanced workplace in college coaching. To this end, athletic directors should be educated about the potential negative impact and consequences that a gender-skewed workforce can have on all coaches and athletes and work to identify, recruit, consider and hire female coaches for both men's and women's teams. This report is one mechanism to hold institutions and decision makers accountable in hiring coaches for women's teams.

Together, the Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport at the University of Minnesota and the Alliance of Women Coaches, among others, are striving to reverse the trend of the declining percentage of women college coaches, generate awareness, and start a national dialogue this issue. Women who desire 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 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™."

## References

- Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L.J. (2012). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal, national study thirty five year update*. Retrieved from <http://www.acostacarpenter.org>
- Everhart, C.B., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Gender differences in preferences for coaching as an occupation: The role of self-efficacy, valence, and perceived barriers. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69, 188-200.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 965-990.
- Lapchick, R., Agusta, R., Kinkopf, N., & McPhee, F. (2013, July). *2012 race and gender report card: College sport*. Retrieved from [http://www.tidesport.org/RGRC/2012/2012\\_College\\_RGRC.pdf](http://www.tidesport.org/RGRC/2012/2012_College_RGRC.pdf)
- LaVoi, N. M., & Dutove, J. K. (2012). Barriers and supports for female coaches: An ecological model. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1(1), 17-37.
- NCAA (2011). *NCAA Sports sponsorship and student athlete participation rates report: 1981-1982 – 2010-2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/PR2012.pdf>
- Wilson, A. (2012, June). *The status of women in intercollegiate athletics as Title IX turns 40*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/TITLEIX.pdf>

## Appendix A

### CONFERENCE COMPOSITION 2012-2013

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

TABLE 1. COACH POSITION BY GENDER BY SPORT

Sport	Position																												
	Head Coach			Associate Head Coach			Assistant Coach			Director of Operations			Volunteer Coach			Graduate Assistant			Total										
	%	N	%	%	N	%	%	N	%	%	N	%	%	N	%	%	N	%	%	N	%								
Basketball	60.5	46	39.5	30	61.1	22	38.9	14	66.0	132	34.0	68	73.7	56	26.3	20	100	1	0	0	42.9	6	57.1	8	65.3	263	34.7	140	
Bowling	0	0	100	2	----	----	----	----	50.0	1	50.0	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	25.0	1	75.0	3	
Crew/Rowing	40.5	15	59.5	22	66.7	2	33.3	1	71.6	53	28.4	21	----	----	----	----	75.0	6	25.0	2	100	12	0	0	65.9	88	34.1	46	
Cross Country	12.8	10	87.2	68	12.5	1	87.5	7	31.8	28	68.2	60	53.8	7	46.2	6	30.0	9	70.0	21	50.0	4	50.0	4	26.2	59	73.8	166	
Diving	9.1	5	90.9	50	----	----	----	----	0	0	100	2	100	2	0	0	50.0	2	50.0	2	----	----	----	----	14.3	9	85.7	54	
Equestrian #	71.4	5	28.6	2	100	5	0	0	100	10	0	0	100	2	0	0	----	----	----	----	100	3	0	0	93.1	27	6.9	2	
Fencing	27.3	3	72.7	8	0	0	100	2	12.5	2	87.5	14	----	----	----	----	50.0	2	50.0	2	----	----	----	----	21.2	7	78.8	26	
Field Hockey	100	23	0	0	62.5	5	37.5	3	68.4	26	31.6	12	0	0	100	1	80.0	4	20.0	1	----	----	----	77.3	58	22.7	17		
Golf	78.8	52	21.2	14	33.3	1	66.7	2	63.9	39	36.1	22	66.7	2	33.3	1	45.5	5	54.5	6	100	1	0	0	69.0	100	31.0	45	
Gymnastics	50.0	18	50.0	18	33.3	3	66.7	6	39.2	20	60.8	31	66.7	4	33.3	2	57.1	4	42.9	3	----	----	----	----	45.0	49	55.0	60	
Ice Hockey	25.0	2	75.0	6	50.0	1	50.0	1	69.2	9	30.8	4	0	0	100	3	0	0	100	2	----	----	----	----	42.9	12	57.1	16	
Lacrosse	92.6	25	7.4	2	75.0	3	25.0	1	90.4	47	9.6	5	100	5	0	0	80.0	8	20.0	2	----	----	----	89.8	88	10.2	10		
Rifle	37.5	3	62.5	5	----	----	----	----	100	4	0	0	----	----	----	----	0	0	100	1	0	0	0	100	1	50.0	7	50.0	7
Sailing*	0	0	100	3	----	----	----	----	100	2	0	0	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	33.3	2	66.7	4	
Sand Vball #	33.3	2	66.7	4	100	1	0	0	0	0	100	3	0	0	100	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	----	----	----	30.8	4	69.2	9		
Skiing	0	0	100	4	----	----	----	----	60.0	3	30.0	2	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	33.3	3	66.7	6	
Soccer	25.3	19	74.7	56	31.8	7	68.2	15	41.8	51	58.2	71	63.2	12	36.8	7	41.2	14	58.8	20	100	1	0	0	38.0	104	61.7	169	
Softball	71.9	46	28.1	18	72.0	18	28.0	7	69.6	71	30.4	31	90.5	19	9.5	2	64.7	22	35.3	12	85.7	6	14.3	1	71.9	182	28.1	71	
Squash #	0	0	100	1	----	----	----	----	0	0	100	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0	0	100	2	
Swimming	13.8	9	86.2	50	20.8	5	79.2	19	40.4	44	59.6	65	70.0	7	30.0	3	26.7	4	73.3	11	33.3	1	66.7	2	31.5	69	68.5	150	
Synch Swim #	100	2	0	0	----	----	----	----	100	2	0	0	----	----	----	----	100	1	0	0	----	----	----	----	100	5	0	0	
Tennis	42.9	33	57.1	44	42.9	6	57.1	8	47.5	28	52.5	31	100	1	0	0	59.1	13	40.9	9	50.0	1	50.0	1	46.9	82	53.1	93	
Track & Field	10.4	8	89.6	69	17.9	5	82.1	23	25.8	68	74.2	196	52.2	12	47.8	11	29.3	24	70.7	58	66.7	4	33.3	2	25.0	120	75.0	360	
Volleyball	40.0	30	60.0	45	50.0	11	50.0	11	46.3	56	53.7	65	72.2	26	27.8	10	33.3	12	66.7	24	100	1	0	0	46.7	136	53.3	155	
Water Polo	0	0	100	8	50.0	1	50.0	1	42.9	3	57.1	4	----	----	----	----	0	0	100	4	----	----	----	----	19.0	4	81.0	17	
Total	40.2	356	59.8	530	44.0	95	56.0	121	49.6	699	50.4	709	69.8	155	30.2	67	42.2	132	57.8	181	67.8	40	32.2	19	47.6	1477	52.4	1627	

\*= not NCAA sponsored, # = emerging NCAA sport

TABLE 2. POSITIONS BY GENDER AND CONFERENCE FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

Conference	Position															
	Athletic Director				Head Coach				Associate Head Coach				Assistant Coach			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
ACC	8.3	1	91.7	11	42.0	58	58.0	80	38.2	13	61.8	21	45.5	105	54.5	126
Big 12	0	0	100	10	37.4	37	62.6	62	44.4	12	55.6	15	47.4	74	52.6	82
Big East	6.2	1	93.8	15	41.4	72	58.6	102	46.9	15	53.1	17	60.5	167	39.5	109
Big 10	0	0	100	12	46.1	76	53.9	89	51.2	22	48.8	21	53.7	132	46.3	114
PAC-12	8.3	1	91.7	11	40.0	60	60.0	90	39.5	17	60.5	26	48.9	113	51.1	118
SEC	0	0	100	14	33.1	53	66.9	107	43.2	16	56.8	21	40.3	108	59.7	160
Total	3.9	3	96.1	73	40.1	356	59.8	530	44.0	95	56.0	121	49.6	699	50.4	709

POSITIONS BY GENDER AND CONFERENCE

Conference	Position															
	Director of Operations				Volunteer Coach				Graduate Assistant				Total			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
ACC	64.7	22	35.3	12	40.4	23	59.6	34	66.7	6	33.3	3	43.9	226	56.1	289
Big 12	65.6	21	34.4	11	38.7	12	61.3	19	72.2	13	27.8	5	45.3	169	54.7	204
Big East	73.1	19	26.9	7	42.9	21	57.1	28	37.5	3	62.5	5	51.2	298	48.8	283
Big 10	66.7	26	33.3	13	50.8	33	49.2	32	75.0	6	25.0	2	51.0	295	49.0	283
PAC-12	73.2	30	26.8	11	40.0	26	60.0	39	66.7	2	33.3	1	45.7	249	54.3	296
SEC	74.0	37	26.0	13	37.0	17	63.0	29	76.9	10	23.1	3	41.0	241	59.0	347
Total	69.8	155	30.2	67	42.2	132	57.8	181	67.8	40	32.2	19	46.5	1,480	53.5	1,700

**TABLE 3. 2012-2013 GRADES BY INSTITUTION FOR PERCENT OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES OF WOMEN'S TEAMS**

<b>A (70-100%)</b>	<b>B (55-69%)</b>	<b>C (40-54%)</b>	<b>D (25-39%)</b>	<b>F (0-24%)</b>
Cincinnati (80%)	Illinois (63.6%)	Connecticut (53.8%)	Duke (38.5%)	USC (23.1%)
Texas (72.7%)	Penn State (60%)	Iowa (53.8%)	Notre Dame (38.5%)	Vanderbilt (22.2%)
Miami (70%)	UCLA (57.1%)	Michigan State (53.8%)	South Carolina (38.5%)	Virginia Tech (20%)
	Washington St (55.6%)	Colorado (50%)	Tennessee (38.5%)	Syracuse (18.2%)
	Florida State (54.5%)*	Florida (50%)	Villanova (38.5%)	Arkansas (16.7%)
	LSU (54.5%)*	Georgia Tech (50%)	Virginia (38.5%)	Kentucky (16.7%)
		Kansas State (50%)	Wake Forest (37.5%)	Alabama (15.4%)
		Northwestern (50%)	Iowa State (36.4%)	Oklahoma State (0%)
		Oklahoma (50%)	Kansas (36.4%)	
		South Florida (50%)	Providence (36.4%)	
		Washington (50%)	Texas A & M (36.4%)	
		California (46.7%)	Georgetown (35.7%)	
		Michigan (46.7%)	Nebraska (35.7%)	
		Minnesota (46.7%)	Wisconsin (35.7%)	
		North Carolina (46.7%)	Arizona State (33.3%)	
		Louisville (46.2%)	Georgia (33.3%)	
		Maryland (45.5%)	Mississippi (33.3%)	
		Ohio State (45%)	Mississippi St. (33.3%)	
		Seton Hall (44.4%)	Missouri (33.3%)	
		St. John's (44.4%)	Oregon (33.3%)	
		Marquette (42.9%)	Indiana (30.8%)	
		Auburn (41.7%)	Purdue (30%)	
		Temple (41.7%)	DePaul (28.6%)	
		Boston College (41.2%)	Rutgers (28.6%)	
		Stanford (40.9%)	Utah (28.6%)	
		Clemson (40%)	Baylor (27.3%)	
		Oregon State (40%)	West Virginia (27.3%)	
		Pittsburgh (40%)	Arizona (25%)	
		TCU (40%)	NC State (25%)	
			Texas Tech (25%)	

\* Decimal rounded up causing institution to be placed in higher grade.

TABLE 4. ACC POSITIONS BY GENDER AND SCHOOL FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

School	Position												Total													
	Head Coach			Associate Head			Assistant Coach			Director of Operations			Volunteer Coach			Graduate Assistant			Total							
	Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male						
%	N	%	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N				
Boston College	41.2	7	58.8	10	100	3	0	0	75.0	18	25.0	6	0	0	100	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	62.2	28	37.8	17
Clemson	40.0	4	60.0	6	33.3	1	66.7	2	41.2	7	58.8	10	100	1	0	0	--	--	100	3	0	0	47.1	16	52.9	18
Duke	38.5	5	61.5	8	0	0	100	4	52.0	13	48.0	12	100	2	0	0	27.3	3	--	--	--	--	41.9	23	58.1	32
Florida State	54.5	6	45.5	5	20.0	1	80.0	4	25.0	4	75.0	12	40.0	2	60.0	3	71.4	5	50.0	1	50.0	1	41.4	19	58.6	27
Georgia Tech	50.0	4	50.0	4	100	2	0	0	40.0	6	60.0	9	100	2	0	0	66.7	2	--	--	--	--	51.7	15	48.3	14
Maryland	45.5	5	54.5	6	100	2	0	0	50.0	10	50.0	10	50.0	2	50.0	2	75.0	3	--	--	--	--	53.7	22	46.3	19
Miami	70.0	7	30.0	3	0	0	100	1	23.5	4	76.5	13	100	4	0	0	100	2	--	--	--	--	44.1	15	55.9	19
North Carolina	46.7	7	53.3	8	25.0	1	75.0	3	50.0	13	50.0	13	33.3	1	66.7	2	50.0	1	--	--	--	--	46.0	23	54.0	27
NC State	25.0	3	75.0	9	0	0	100	2	42.9	9	57.1	12	100	4	0	0	18.2	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	37.0	20	63.0	34
Virginia	38.5	5	61.5	8	40.0	2	60.0	3	42.1	8	57.9	11	60.0	3	40.0	2	44.4	4	--	--	--	--	43.1	22	56.9	29
Virginia Tech	20.0	2	80.0	8	33.3	1	66.7	2	50.0	8	50.0	8	50.0	1	50.0	1	33.3	1	--	--	--	--	38.2	13	61.8	21
Wake Forest	37.5	3	62.5	5	100	1	0	0	33.3	5	66.7	10	0	0	100	1	0	0	--	--	--	--	30.0	9	70.0	21
Total	42.0	58	58.0	80	38.2	13	61.8	21	45.5	105	54.5	126	64.7	22	35.3	12	40.4	23	66.7	6	33.3	3	45.1	227	54.9	276

TABLE 5. BIG 12 POSITIONS BY GENDER AND SCHOOL FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

School	Position												Total													
	Head Coach			Associate Head			Assistant Coach			Director of Operations			Volunteer Coach			Graduate Assistant			Total							
	Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male			
%	N	%	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N		
Baylor	27.3	3	72.7	8	33.3	2	66.7	4	50.0	5	50.0	5	20.0	1	80.0	4	25.0	1	100	1	0	0	35.1	13	64.9	24
Iowa State	36.4	4	63.6	7	66.7	2	33.3	1	42.1	8	57.9	11	75.0	3	25.0	1	50.0	2	0	0	100	1	45.2	19	54.8	23
Kansas	36.4	4	63.6	7	--	--	--	--	44.0	11	56.0	14	100	3	0	0	33.3	1	100	1	0	0	46.5	20	53.5	23
Kansas State	50.0	4	50.0	4	50.0	1	50.0	1	60.0	6	40.0	4	100	3	0	0	100	2	0	0	0	0	67.9	19	32.1	9
Oklahoma	50.0	5	50.0	5	100	2	0	0	33.3	7	66.7	14	40.0	2	60.0	3	33.3	2	33.3	1	66.7	2	40.4	19	59.6	28
Oklahoma State	0	0	100	8	50.0	2	50.0	2	47.1	8	52.9	9	100	3	0	0	0	0	100	1	0	0	41.2	14	58.8	20
Texas	72.7	8	27.3	3	50.0	1	50.0	1	71.4	10	28.6	4	100	1	0	0	--	--	100	1	0	0	72.4	21	27.6	8
Texas Tech	25.0	2	75.0	6	33.3	1	66.7	2	38.5	5	61.5	8	75.0	3	25.0	1	40.0	2	100	3	0	0	44.4	16	55.6	20
TCU	40.0	4	60.0	6	0	0	100	3	46.2	6	53.8	7	33.3	1	66.7	2	--	--	50.0	1	50.0	1	42.4	14	57.6	19
West Virginia	27.3	3	72.7	8	50.0	1	50.0	1	57.1	8	42.9	6	100	1	0	0	33.3	2	50.0	1	50.0	1	44.4	16	55.6	20
Total	37.4	37	62.6	62	44.4	12	55.6	15	47.4	74	52.6	82	65.6	21	34.4	11	38.7	12	72.2	13	27.8	5	46.8	171	53.2	194

TABLE 6. BIG EAST POSITIONS BY GENDER AND SCHOOL FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

School	Position																									
	Head Coach			Associate Head			Assistant Coach			Director of Operations			Volunteer Coach			Graduate Assistant			Total							
	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N					
Cincinnati	80.0	8	20.0	2	--	--	58.3	7	41.7	5	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	0	100	1	68.0	17	32.0	8	
Connecticut	53.8	7	46.2	6	50.0	1	70.0	14	30.0	6	--	--	--	66.7	2	33.3	1	100	1	0	0	64.1	25	35.9	14	
DePaul	28.6	2	71.4	5	--	--	68.8	11	31.2	5	--	--	--	0	0	100	1	--	--	--	--	54.2	13	45.8	11	
Georgetown	35.7	5	64.3	9	100	1	52.4	11	47.6	10	100	1	0	0	100	6	0	--	--	--	--	55.8	24	44.2	19	
Louisville	46.2	6	53.8	7	50.0	2	59.1	13	40.9	9	83.3	5	16.7	1	100	1	0	--	--	--	--	58.7	27	41.3	19	
Marquette	42.9	3	57.1	4	33.3	1	66.7	2	33.3	1	--	--	--	12.5	1	87.5	7	0	0	100	2	35.5	11	64.5	20	
Notre Dame	38.5	5	61.5	8	57.1	4	42.9	3	60.0	6	50.0	2	50.0	2	75.0	3	25.0	1	--	--	--	53.5	23	46.5	20	
Pittsburgh	40.0	4	60.0	6	100	1	0	0	45.0	9	55.0	11	50.0	2	100	1	0	0	--	--	--	47.2	17	52.8	19	
Providence	36.4	4	63.6	7	--	--	46.7	7	53.3	8	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	50.0	2	50.0	2	46.9	15	53.1	17
Rutgers	28.6	4	71.4	10	50.0	1	69.2	18	30.8	8	50.0	1	50.0	1	25.0	1	75.0	3	--	--	--	52.1	25	47.9	23	
Seton Hall	44.4	4	55.6	5	--	--	80.0	8	20.0	2	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	2	--	--	--	54.5	12	45.5	10	
South Florida	50.0	4	50.0	4	33.3	1	66.7	2	61.5	8	100	1	0	0	0	0	100	3	--	--	--	50.0	14	50.0	14	
St. John's	44.4	4	55.6	5	0	0	100	1	52.9	9	47.1	8	100	1	0	0	100	4	--	--	--	43.7	14	56.3	18	
Syracuse	18.2	2	81.8	9	25.0	1	75.0	3	44.4	8	100	2	0	0	0	0	100	1	--	--	--	36.1	13	63.9	23	
Temple	41.7	5	58.3	7	100	1	0	0	75.0	15	100	1	0	0	50.0	3	50.0	3	--	--	--	62.5	25	37.5	15	
Villanova	38.5	5	61.5	8	33.3	1	66.7	2	70.0	14	100	1	0	0	33.3	1	66.7	2	--	--	--	55.0	22	45.0	18	
Total	41.4	72	58.6	102	46.9	15	53.1	17	60.5	167	39.5	109	73.1	19	26.9	7	42.9	21	37.5	3	62.5	5	52.7	297	47.3	267

TABLE 7. BIG 10 POSITIONS BY GENDER AND SCHOOL FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

School	Position																									
	Head Coach			Associate Head			Assistant Coach			Director of Operations			Volunteer Coach			Graduate Assistant			Total							
	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N	Female	Male	N					
Illinois	63.6	7	36.4	4	25.0	1	75.0	3	46.7	7	53.3	8	100	2	0	0	66.7	6	33.3	3	--	--	56.1	23	43.9	18
Indiana	30.8	4	69.2	9	0	0	100	4	54.5	12	45.5	10	50.0	1	50.0	1	75.0	3	25.0	1	0	0	100	1	43.5	20
Iowa	53.8	7	46.2	6	100	3	0	0	54.5	12	45.5	10	33.3	1	66.7	2	50.0	1	50.0	1	100	1	0	0	56.8	25
Michigan	46.7	7	53.3	8	42.9	3	57.1	4	73.7	14	26.3	5	100	2	0	0	33.3	2	66.7	4	100	1	0	0	63.0	29
Michigan State	53.8	7	46.2	6	66.7	2	33.3	1	47.8	11	52.2	12	50.0	1	50.0	1	100	4	0	0	50.0	1	50.0	1	55.3	26
Minnesota	46.7	7	53.3	8	66.7	2	33.3	1	50.0	10	50.0	10	66.7	2	33.3	1	66.7	6	33.3	3	100	1	0	0	54.9	28
Nebraska	35.7	5	64.3	9	66.7	2	33.3	1	40.0	8	60.0	12	50.0	2	50.0	2	22.2	2	77.8	7	--	--	38.0	19	62.0	31
Northwestern	50.0	6	50.0	6	80.0	4	20.0	1	76.9	10	23.1	3	50.0	1	50.0	1	28.6	2	71.4	5	--	--	60.5	23	39.5	16
Ohio State	45.0	9	55.0	11	50.0	1	50.0	1	51.9	14	48.1	13	66.7	2	33.3	1	42.9	3	57.1	4	100	1	0	0	50.0	30
Penn State	60.0	9	40.0	6	57.1	4	42.9	3	36.0	9	64.0	16	57.1	4	42.9	3	100	1	0	0	--	--	49.1	27	50.9	28
Purdue	30.0	3	70.0	7	0	0	100	1	61.1	11	38.9	7	100	6	0	0	66.7	2	33.3	1	--	--	57.9	22	42.1	16
Wisconsin	35.7	5	64.3	9	0	0	100	1	63.6	14	36.4	8	66.7	2	33.3	1	25.0	1	75.0	3	100	1	0	0	51.1	23
Total	46.1	76	53.9	89	51.2	22	48.8	21	53.7	132	46.3	114	66.7	26	33.3	13	50.8	33	49.2	32	75.0	6	25.0	2	52.1	295

TABLE 8. PAC 12 POSITIONS BY GENDER AND SCHOOL FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

School	Position																											
	Head Coach		Associate Head		Assistant Coach		Director of Operations		Volunteer Coach		Graduate Assistant		Total															
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male														
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N														
Arizona	25.0	3	75.0	9	20.0	1	80.0	4	62.5	10	37.5	6	100	4	0	0	20.0	1	80.0	4	--	--	--	--	44.2	19	55.8	24
Arizona State	33.3	4	66.7	8	75.0	3	25.0	1	35.0	7	65.0	13	100	2	0	0	0	0	100	4	--	--	--	--	37.2	16	62.8	27
California	46.7	7	53.3	8	42.9	3	57.1	4	60.0	12	40.0	8	66.7	2	33.3	1	42.9	6	57.1	8	--	--	--	--	53.2	31	46.8	29
Colorado	50.0	5	50.0	5	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	9	50.0	9	100	5	0	0	42.9	3	57.1	4	--	--	--	--	53.5	23	46.5	20
Oregon	33.3	3	66.7	6	0	0	100	2	37.9	11	42.1	8	100	2	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	0	100	1	47.1	16	52.9	18
Oregon State	40.0	4	60.0	6	0	0	100	3	50.0	10	50.0	10	75.0	3	25.0	1	50.0	3	50.0	3	--	--	--	--	45.5	20	54.5	24
Stanford	40.9	9	59.1	13	85.7	6	14.3	1	60.7	17	39.3	11	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	50.0	4	--	--	--	--	54.3	38	45.7	32
UCLA	57.1	8	42.9	6	0	0	100	3	50.0	9	50.0	9	100	4	0	0	50.0	3	50.0	3	--	--	--	--	52.2	24	47.8	22
USC	23.1	3	76.9	10	0	0	100	3	45.5	10	54.5	12	66.7	2	33.3	1	33.3	2	66.7	4	--	--	--	--	35.4	17	64.6	31
Utah	28.6	4	71.4	10	0	0	100	1	37.5	6	62.5	10	0	0	100	4	50.0	3	50.0	3	100	2	0	0	34.1	15	65.9	29
Washington	50.0	5	50.0	5	50.0	2	50.0	2	26.3	5	73.7	14	50.0	2	50.0	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	36.8	14	63.2	24
Washington State	55.6	5	44.4	4	50.0	1	50.0	1	46.7	7	53.3	8	100	2	0	0	33.3	1	66.7	2	--	--	--	--	50.0	16	50.0	16
Total	40.0	60	60.9	90	39.5	17	60.5	26	48.9	113	51.1	118	73.2	30	26.8	11	40.0	26	60.0	39	66.7	2	33.3	1	45.7	249	54.3	296

TABLE 9. SEC POSITIONS BY GENDER AND SCHOOL FOR WOMEN'S TEAMS

School	Position																											
	Head Coach		Associate Head		Assistant Coach		Director of Operations		Volunteer Coach		Graduate Assistant		Total															
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male														
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N														
Alabama	15.4	2	84.6	11	100	1	0	0	24.1	7	75.9	22	100	1	0	0	10.0	1	90.0	9	100	2	0	0	25.0	14	75.0	42
Arkansas	16.7	2	83.3	10	0	0	100	1	53.8	7	46.2	6	62.5	5	37.5	3	100	3	0	0	100	1	0	0	47.4	18	52.6	20
Auburn	41.7	5	58.3	7	50.0	1	50.0	1	25.9	7	74.1	20	100	5	0	0	100	3	0	0	100	1	0	0	44.0	22	56.0	28
Florida	50.0	6	50.0	6	0	0	100	3	40.0	6	60.0	9	100	4	0	0	20.0	1	80.0	4	--	--	--	--	43.6	17	56.4	22
Georgia	33.3	4	66.7	8	16.7	1	83.3	5	41.2	7	58.8	10	100	1	0	0	0	0	100	2	50.0	1	50.0	1	35.0	14	65.0	26
Kentucky	16.7	2	83.3	10	66.7	2	33.3	1	38.1	8	61.9	13	100	3	0	0	75.0	3	25.0	1	100	2	0	0	44.4	20	55.6	25
LSU	54.5	6	45.5	5	50.0	1	50.0	1	33.3	8	66.7	16	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	50.0	2	--	--	--	--	41.9	18	58.1	25
Mississippi	33.3	3	66.7	6	100	1	0	0	50.0	10	50.0	10	25.0	1	75.0	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	44.1	15	55.9	19
Mississippi State	33.3	3	66.7	6	100	1	0	0	57.1	8	42.9	6	100	1	0	0	0	0	100	1	--	--	--	--	50.0	13	50.0	13
Missouri	33.3	4	66.7	8	0	0	100	3	47.6	10	52.4	11	80.0	4	20.0	1	0	0	100	3	0	0	100	1	40.0	18	60.0	27
South Carolina	38.5	5	61.5	8	66.7	4	33.3	2	37.5	6	62.5	10	100	4	0	0	50.0	1	50.0	1	100	2	0	0	51.2	22	48.8	21
Tennessee	38.5	5	61.5	8	0	0	100	2	44.4	8	55.6	10	66.7	4	33.3	2	20.0	1	80.0	4	50.0	1	50.0	1	41.3	19	58.7	27
Texas A&M	36.4	4	63.6	7	66.7	4	33.3	2	27.8	5	72.2	13	40.0	2	60.0	3	33.3	1	66.7	2	--	--	--	--	37.2	16	62.8	27
Vanderbilt	22.2	2	77.8	7	--	--	--	--	73.3	11	26.7	4	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	--	--	--	--	57.7	15	42.3	11
Total	33.1	53	66.9	107	43.2	16	56.8	21	40.3	108	59.7	160	74.0	37	26.0	13	37.0	17	63.0	29	76.9	10	23.1	3	42.0	241	58.0	333



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**  
**Tucker Center**  
for Research on Girls & Women in Sport

**Alliance of Women Coaches**  
[www.GoCoaches.org](http://www.GoCoaches.org)

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION  
+ HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
**Driven to Discover**<sup>SM</sup>

