

A NEW ERA

THE WOMEN IN COLLEGE COACHING REPORT CARD: YEAR 11

SELECT SEVEN
NCAA D-I
CONFERENCES
2022-23



THE **TUCKER**
CENTER 
for Research on Girls & Women in Sport

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Driven to Discover®



This report was prepared by Johanna Glaaser, MS, a 2022 Tucker Center Summer Gender Equity Intern under the guidance of Nicole M. LaVoi, PhD, Courtney Boucher, PhD.

Please direct all inquiries to nmlavoi@umn.edu

Acknowledgements: Thank you to the many members of the Tucker Team for their role in producing this report.

Cover photo features Gina Thomas, Head Coach, University of Cincinnati Lacrosse. Photo provided courtesy of Maggie McKinley (Deputy AD/SWA, Cincinnati).

Preferred citation: Glaaser, J., Boucher, C. & LaVoi, N. M. (2023, August). A new era. The Women in College Coaching Report Card, Year 11: Select Seven NCAA Division-I institutions, 2022-23. Minneapolis, MN: The Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport.

The report can be downloaded free of charge at <http://www.TuckerCenter.org>

©2023 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.

A Decade of Impact: The Women in College Coaching Report Card

THE IMPACT: MULTIDIMENSIONAL AND FAR REACHING

Over the last 11 years, the *Women in College Coaching Report Card* has been used by institutions, athletics administrators, conference commissioners, NGBs, federations, non-profits, sport clubs, and sport coaching associations around the world to improve the occupational landscape for women sport coaches. *We let data tell the story.*


HOW IT IS MAKING A DIFFERENCE

- **Started** and created discussions to educate & increase awareness of the barriers & bias women coaches face, and why it is important to develop a workplace where women coaches feel safe valued and supported
- **Motivated** decision makers to think differently about how they recruit, hire, and retain women coaches
- **Spurred** a new era of slow & steady increase in the percentage of women coaches of women's teams
- **Used** & leveraged data to advocate for women coaches
- **Tracked** progress or decline in the percentage of women coaches of women's college teams
- **Helped** evaluate effectiveness of strategies aimed at increasing the percentage of women coaches
- **Held** institutions and decision makers accountable in creating a gender-balanced workforce
- **Shifted** the focus away from dominant 'blame the women' narratives (e.g., women don't apply) to data-informed narratives (e.g., getting an NCAA D-I job is about who you know, not who applies)
- **Accelerated** systems change by conducting and inspiring research for and about women sport coaches
- **Informed** conference-wide diversity and inclusion initiatives
- **Guided** women coaches in evaluating career opportunities and informed job-change decision making
- **Inspired** similar report cards & mechanisms of accountability around the world
- **Identified** that 26-33 is the age range of the 'critical zone of attrition' when women leave coaching
- **Illuminated** opportunities for program development to benefit & support women coaches
- **Challenged** men in positions of power to embrace allyship & interrogate gender biases
- **Invited** head coaches, Athletics Directors & coaching directors to provide women opportunities
- **Encouraged** the inclusion of LGBTQ+ family narratives in online coaching biographies
- **Buoyed** development of the *Game ON: Women Can Coach* documentary & toolkit
- **Empowered** women coaches to see and speak up about gender bias the workplace
- **Provided** hope that change is possible

...and counting!



It is *impossible* that as each new generation of women become increasingly involved in and shaped by sport, they simultaneously become less interested, less passionate, and less qualified to enter the coaching profession. #SHECANCOACH



Tucker Center for Research
on Girls & Women in Sport

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Driven to Discover®

A New Era

The Women in College Coaching Report Card, Year 11 SELECT SEVEN NCAA DIVISION-1 INSTITUTIONS 2022-23

Our longitudinal research for women collegiate sport coaches, now in its eleventh 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 WeCOACH, the premiere organization in the US dedicated to increasing and retaining the number of women in the coaching profession. In this longitudinal research, we assign a grade to each institution, sport, and conference based on the percentage of women head coaches of women's teams.

The first benchmark report of this longitudinal research series was *The Decline of Women Coaches in Collegiate Athletics: A Report on Select NCAA Division-I FBS Institutions, 2012–13* (LaVoi, 2013). For over a decade our data indicated the percentage of women head coaches of intercollegiate women increased in very small increments. We coined this era from 2010-2020 'stagnation' to more accurately demarcate this decade from the 'historical and sharp decline' era in the 1970s and early 1980s, and 'gradual decline' era evidenced between 1982 and 2010. Based on the last two years of data in this report we are cautiously optimistic we might be entering a new era: **slow & steady incline!**

Due to interest in the data, we consistently hear the same narratives and field the same battery of questions related to women sport coaches from a variety of stakeholders and media which include:

- Why do women coaches matter?
- Why should we care?
- Why should we hire women?
- What does gender have to do with coaching?
- Why did the decline of women coaches occur post Title IX?
- Why is there still an underrepresentation of women coaches?
- What is the biggest barrier to increasing the percentage of women?
- Who is responsible for the underrepresentation of women sport coaches?
- Why don't women apply? What is the end goal of this report card?
- What can we do to increase the percentage of women sport coaches?
- What can I/we do to help?

The answer to these questions is not simple. 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 that multiply based on women’s intersecting identities and is well documented in scholarly works and research reports (for a full review see *Women in Sports Coaching*, edited by LaVoi, 2016; Hollomon, 2016; Norman, 2021; Sabo et al., 2016). What we want to emphasize is the underrepresentation of women is not the problem, it is a symptom of the problem. The real problem is a culture, both societal and within sport, that does not value or support women.

Documenting the number and percentage of women in sport coaching positions is one strategy to help change the system. However, we realize counting individual women is limited, and as a standalone, problematic. An increase in the percentage of women coaches doesn’t mean the culture or social structure of sport is changing. Increases in the proportionality of women coaches, or even achieving numerical equality (i.e., 50/50) for women's team (let alone men's teams!) doesn’t mean the culture of sport is changing; nor does it indicate sport culture is changing equally for all women. Sport is a highly gendered context in what some argue is a gender regime—meaning it is gender segregated, highly masculinized, and encompasses male dominated processes and practices. Therefore, sport functions to discriminate against, segregate, marginalize, and exclude women from the most powerful and prestigious roles which limits women’s cultural importance, and social and economic advancement.

The greatest target of opportunity to create positive and sustainable social change is to confront the gendered structure and systemic biases that permeate intercollegiate athletics. Systemic inequalities and gender and racial bias within the context of sport are prevalent. Bias, whether it is conscious/explicit or unconscious/implicit, results in unequal treatment, evaluation, perception, and interpretation that can result in overt, gross, or micro-level aggressions due to attitudes based on the gender 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).

When women coaches “coach”, they are often unfairly and negatively evaluated, perceived, and interpreted by Athletic Directors, media, peers, parents, and athletes—compared to their male counterparts. One trend to watch is the increasing prevalence of student-athletes alleging coach mistreatment or abuse, which likely are layered with intersecting gender, race, and age biases that disadvantage women.

The gender regime and systemic bias in college athletics create an unpleasant workplace climate for many women and is one reason why women do not enter the coaching profession, are often silenced for speaking out against it, or are driven out by those in power when they call attention to injustice or discrimination. The failure to address bias, and structural and systemic inequalities are likely reasons that dramatic and statistically significant upward change in the percentage of women head coaches fails to occur.

It is simply not possible that as each new generation of girls and women become 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.**

To us, the ultimate endgame is to help change the culture of sport so that all women, with their various intersecting identities, feel safe, valued and supported, and the *Women in College Coaching Report Card™* is one piece of the solution puzzle.



Veronique Drouin-Luttrell, Head Women's Golf Coach, University of Oklahoma



Molly Alvey, Head Women's Volleyball Coach, University of Cincinnati



Sarah Trowbridge, Head Women's
Rowing Coach, University of Oklahoma

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT CARD

The purpose of the *Women in College Coaching Report Card™* (WCCRC) research series is multifaceted:

1. Document, benchmark and track the percentage of women coaches of women's teams in collegiate athletics (i.e. gender diversity)
2. Provide evidence that can help recruit, retain, and increase the percentage of women in the coaching profession
3. Track the effectiveness of initiatives aimed at moving the numbers (up!) for women in sport coaching
4. Bring awareness, while providing an evidence-based starting point, for a national discussion on this important issue
5. Extend and complement research on women in sport coaching
6. Hold decision makers accountable for who they hire
7. Provide women one data point to consider when making an institutional job change

This report has educated and informed thousands of women coaches and sport stakeholders, not only in the US but around the world. It has helped women realize they are not alone in feeling undervalued, unsupported, marginalized, and discriminated against. *We let the data tell the story.* When women learn the data, they begin to see the system in which they exist and how that system has failed to value and support them. In some cases, women realize how their positive experiences in coaching are privileged and not the norm. Women begin thinking about how they can effect change, advocate for themselves and each other, develop networks of support, upskill their resumes and make informed choices about their career trajectory. Data is power, and the goal of this report is to provide data that can be used in a variety of ways to ultimately change the structure and system of sport. Additional information about the impact of the WCCRC is in the front matter of this report (see p. ii).

In all eleven years of the *Women in College Coaching Report Card™*, we documented data in the seven NCAA Division-I conferences - arguably the most visible, lucrative and powerful intercollegiate athletic conferences. We arbitrarily call this grouping the 'select seven' which include: American Athletic Conference (AAC), Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), Big 12, Big East, Big Ten, Pacific-12 (Pac-12) and Southeastern Conference (SEC).

Women in College Coaching Grading Scale

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

Percentage of women head coaches of women's teams. If rounding resulted in moving up a grade level, the institution, sport, or conference was placed in the higher grade bracket. Institutions with the same percentage were ordered alphabetically. For how the grading criteria was developed see LaVoi (2013).

METHODOLOGY

Documenting and adhering to a rigorous methodology is important for transparency, replication, comparison to other data, and consistency in tracking and reporting over time. For a detailed account of our methodology, coding key, data collection, reliability processes, and how we determined and developed grading criteria, see (LaVoi, 2013) which can be downloaded at TuckerCenter.org. For this report, data was collected between September 27th and December 23rd, 2022 by visiting each institution's athletics website and reviewing the coaching roster/staff for the 2022-23 academic year for each women's NCAA-sponsored and NCAA-emerging sport team listed. Our goal was to achieve 100% accuracy and many efforts were undertaken to verify and ensure reliable data. As with any data, the numbers reported herein may have a small margin of error. To report an error, please contact nmlavoi@umn.edu

SAMPLE

The 2022-23 dataset included all head coaches of women's teams. There was a final total of 980 head coaching positions at 87 institutions of higher education in all geographic regions of the United States that were current members of the select seven NCAA Division-I conferences (American, ACC, Big East, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-12, SEC). Appendix A summarizes the distribution of schools by conference for 2022-23. Two coaching positions were either unfilled or not discernible at the time of data collection; resulting in the 980 head coaching positions used for data analyses


RESULTS

HEAD COACHES OF WOMEN'S TEAMS

This sample consists of 980 head coach positions of women's teams from 87 institutions (note: two coaching positions were unfilled at the time of data collection). **The overall percentage of women's teams with women head coaches went up for the ninth year in a row to 46%** (451 of 980!). Yet, women continued to hold less than half of the head coaching positions. This 46% marks a 2.3% increase from 43.7% in 2021-22 (see Table 1 in the Appendices and visual graphic below).

This year marked the greatest increase in the percentage of women head coaches in the history of the report!

LONGITUDINAL PERCENTAGE WOMEN HEAD COACHES OF WOMEN'S TEAMS IN THE SELECT SEVEN NCAA D-I CONFERENCES




HEAD COACH TURNOVER

Head coach turnover is a target of opportunity to increase the percentage of women head coaches. In the 2022-23 academic year, 12.7% (124 of 980) head coach positions turned over. The average yearly turnover rate for head coaches over eleven years is 9.3%. The high rate of coach turnover this year likely reflects COVID-related burnout and numerous retirements. To read more in depth analysis of coach occupational turnover within this dataset, see LaVoi and Silva-Breen (2022). See Table 2 in Appendices for the gender composition of the former coach-new coach dyad (i.e., if a male coach was replaced by a female, that was coded as male-female).

For the second time in ten years, a majority of positional vacancies (72 of 124, 58.1%) were filled by women! However, there were 52 missed opportunities to hire a woman. Since 2013, a majority (54.8%) of all head coach hires were men, but more recently, women are being hired at higher rates. To read more about the role of Athletic Directors in the hiring of head coaches and two additional research studies that have grown out of the WCCRC™, see Boucher and LaVoi (2023) and LaVoi and Wasend (2018).

HEAD COACH GENDER-DYAD TURNOVER BY YEAR

■ Male-Male ■ Female-Male ■ Male-Female
■ Female-Female



GRADE BY SPORT


The percentage of women head coaches in 27 sports varied greatly from wrestling (100%) to triathlon (0%) (See Table 3). Less than half (11 of 27, 40.1%) of NCAA sponsored sports had 50% or more women head coaches. Beach volleyball, swimming, cross country, track & field, fencing, diving, squash and triathlon received F grades. Many of these sports receiving F grades are notably 'co-ed'; meaning that the men's and women's teams commonly train together. The low percentage of women head coaches for these teams may reflect gender bias and reluctance of Athletics Directors to hire women to coach male athletes and/or men's teams.

Emerging NCAA sports of acrobatics & tumbling, wrestling, and equestrian received A grades and provided positive examples of hiring women at the outset of program building and development. Five sports improved their grade from 2021-22 with basketball (72.4%), golf (76.3%) and wrestling (100.0%) moving up to an A; rifle (62.5%) moving up to a B; and Nordic skiing (50.0%) and tennis (43.5%) up to C grades. Three sports, beach volleyball (20.0%), bowling (33.3%) and triathlon (0.0%) moved down letter grades from 2021-22. Table 4 indicates the number and percentage of head coaches by sport and gender for all NCAA sponsored and emerging D-I sports.

PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES OF WOMEN'S TEAMS BY SPORT

A	Acrobatics & Tumbling (100.0%), Wrestling (100.0%), Lacrosse (93.3%), Field Hockey (91.3%), Softball (76.4%), Golf (76.3%), Equestrian (75.0%), Basketball (72.4%)
B	Gymnastics (64.7%), Rifle (62.5%)
C	Nordic Skiing (50.0%), Rowing (48.7%), Volleyball (47.1%), Tennis (43.5%)
D	Ice Hockey (37.5%), Water Polo (37.5%), Soccer (35.3%), Alpine Skiing (33.3%), Bowling (33.3%)
F	Beach Volleyball (20.0%), Swimming (19.7%), Cross Country (19.3%), Track & Field (18.6%), Fencing (18.2%), Diving (8.8%), Squash (0.0%), Triathlon (0.0%)

PERCENTAGE OF SPORTS BY GRADE EARNED




GRADE BY INSTITUTION

Consistent with past WCCRCs, the range for the percentage of women head coaches of women's teams by institution also varied dramatically. The University of California and University of Cincinnati had the highest percentage of women head coaches of women's teams (both with 77.8%). See Appendix B for a full list of grades by institution for the percentage of women head coaches.

Based on the percentage of women head coaches of women's teams, 10 of 87 (11.5%) institutions received an A grade for being above average compared to peer institutions. **This is a dramatic & historic increase (the most ever!) in the number of institutions and that earned As!...and the fewest Fs!** Sixteen institutions (18.4%) received a B grade, 28 institutions (32.2%) received a C, and 30 institutions (34.5%) received a D. Three institutions (3.5%) received a failing grade of F (24% or less women head coaches). Over two-thirds of institutions (67.8%, n = 59) had 50% or fewer women head coaches, but the upward trend is noticeable in the more numerous A than F grades.

PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS BY GRADE EARNED



A	California (77.8%), Cincinnati (77.8%), Illinois (72.7%), Maryland (72.7%), Michigan State (72.7%), Mississippi (72.7%), Oklahoma (72.7%), Tennessee (70.6%), SMU (70.0%), UCF (70.0%)
B	Clemson (64.7%), Miami (FL) (64.3%), Michigan (63.6%), Minnesota (63.6%), Missouri (61.5%), Northwestern (60.0%), Ohio State (60.0%), Oregon State (58.3%), Penn State (57.1%), Rutgers (56.3%), Syracuse (55.6%), Vanderbilt (55.6%), Washington (55.6%), Washington State (55.6%), DePaul (54.5%), Temple (54.5%)
C	Alabama (53.8%), Arizona State (53.8%), Baylor (50.0%), Boston College (50.0%), Colorado (50.0%), Connecticut (50.0%), Duke (50.0%), Florida (50.0%), Florida State (50.0%), Georgia (50.0%), Georgia Tech (47.4%), Iowa (46.7%), North Carolina (46.2%), North Carolina State (45.5%), South Carolina (44.4%), South Florida (44.4%), Stanford (43.8%), UCLA (42.9%), Notre Dame (41.7%), Providence (41.7%), Virginia (41.7%), Wake Forest (41.7%), Wisconsin (41.7%), Houston (40.0%), Memphis (40.0%), St. John's (40.0%), Tulane (40.0%), Villanova (40.0%)
D	Arizona (38.5%), Arkansas (38.5%), Auburn (37.5%), Indiana (37.5%), Kansas (36.4%), Kansas State (36.4%), Kentucky (36.4%), Louisville (36.4%), LSU (35.7%), Mississippi State (33.3%), Nebraska (33.3%), Oregon (33.3%), Pittsburgh (33.3%), Purdue (33.3%), Texas A&M (33.3%), Texas Tech (33.3%), USC (30.8%), Virginia Tech (30.8%), West Virginia (28.6%), Utah (28.6%), TCU (28.6%), Georgetown (27.3%), Marquette (27.3%), Seton Hall (27.3%), Wichita State (27.3%), Butler (25.0%), Creighton (25.0%), E. Carolina (25.0%), Tulsa (25.0%), Xavier (25.0%)
F	Iowa State (18.2%), Oklahoma State (18.2%), Texas (12.5%)

INSTITUTIONAL GRADE EARNED BY PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES OF WOMEN'S TEAMS HIGHEST TO LOWEST 2022-2023

A



B



C



D



F



Institutions in select seven NCAA D-I conferences: American, ACC, Big East, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-12, SEC




GRADE BY CONFERENCE

The Big Ten once again earned the highest percentage (54.3%) while the Big 12 had the lowest percentage (30.0%) of women head coaches of women's teams (See Table 5). The Big East (+2.3%) was the only conference to improve their grade of D to C from 2021-22. Of note: **This year marked the first time ALL SEVEN conferences increased in percentage!** See Appendix A for institutional composition of each conference.

PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN HEAD COACHES OF WOMEN'S TEAMS IN SEVEN SELECT NCAA D-I CONFERENCES BY YEAR

2012-13
 2014-15
 2015-16
 2016-17
 2017-18
 2018-19
 2019-20
 2020-21
 2021-22
 2022-23




WOMEN COACHES OF COLOR

This is the third year we collected racial identity data because women coaches of color are dramatically and disproportionately under-represented, are given fewer opportunities, and face additive barriers due to the intersection of sexism and racism. Data helps tell the story and to accelerate systems change.


White coaches held a majority (826 of 980, 84.3%) of head coaching positions across seven select Division-I conferences, and women of color were dramatically under-represented (See Table 6). Compared to 2021-2022, an increase of head coaches of color was evidenced. Last year in this report, women of color held 55 (5.7%) head coach positions of women's teams, while this year that number increased to 61 (6.2%). Conversely, men of color lost ground as last year 100 (10.3%) men of color held head coaching positions for women's teams, and this year that number was 93 (9.5%).

HEAD COACH POSITION BY RACE



Based on the data, women coaches of color are underrepresented (6.2%) as head coaches of women's teams. The NCAA select seven Division-I conferences need to use their resources and passion for diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging efforts to recruit, hire and retain more women coaches of color.

HEAD COACH TURNOVER PERCENTAGE BY RACE-DYAD



Head coach occupational position turnover is a target of opportunity to increase the percentage of BIPOC head coaches. As previously mentioned, the greatest percentage of coach turnover occurred this year (12.7%), which provided a plethora of opportunities to hire women of color. See Tables 7 and 8 for the race and gender composition of the former coach-new coach dyad (e.g., if a white coach was replaced by a BIPOC coach, that was coded as White-BIPOC). A majority of positional vacancies (101 of 124, 81.5%) were filled by white coaches, leaving 101 missed opportunities to hire a coach of color and increase the percentage of BIPOC head coaches (men and women). Only 12.1% (15 of 124) of all head coaches hired in the last year were women of color. **However, of the 23 coaches of color hired, a majority (65%, 15 of 23) were women of color.**

COACHES OF COLOR BY SPORT

The percentage of BIPOC women head coaches in 27 sports varied from wrestling (100.0%), basketball (23%) and track & field (9.3%) to a few sports with low percentages. A majority of sports had zero women head coaches of color. Table 9 indicates the number and percentage of head coaches by gender, sport and race. Based on the NCAA participation data, female student-athletes in all sports do not see coaches who look like them, and this is particularly true for BIPOC women. Same-identity athletic role models increase the accrual of positive psychosocial, health, and developmental assets for girls and women – improvement is a necessity (LaVoi, 2016).




Gina Thomas, Head Coach, University of Cincinnati Lacrosse

COACHES OF COLOR BY INSTITUTION

Zero institutions at the time of data collection had 100% BIPOC head coaches. Alabama and Arizona had the highest percentage of BIPOC head coaches (50% each), and 16 institutions had 0% BIPOC head coaches. See Appendix C for a full list of the percentage of BIPOC head coaches by institution. Most institutions (83.9%, n = 73) had 25% or fewer BIPOC head coaches. University of Central Florida had the highest (n=4), Virginia and Notre Dame each had three, and while nine institutions had two women head coaches of color (California, Cincinnati, Georgia Tech, Iowa, Mississippi, Rutgers, Tennessee, UCLA, and Vanderbilt). Based on the data, **44 institutions employed ZERO female head coaches of color.**

Number of BIPOC Women Head Coaches for Women's Teams by Institution at Seven Select NCAA D-I Conferences



Number of BIPOC Women Head Coaches for Women's Teams by Institution at Seven Select NCAA D-I Conferences

4	University of Central Florida (UCF)
3	California, Notre Dame, Virginia
2	Cincinnati, Georgia Tech, Iowa, Mississippi, Rutgers, Tennessee, UCLA, Vanderbilt
1	Alabama, Arizona, Arizona State, Auburn, Butler, DePaul, Duke, East Carolina, Florida State, Georgia, Houston, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, LSU, Memphis, Miami (FL), Ohio State, Providence, SMU, South Carolina, South Florida, St. John's, Stanford, Syracuse, Temple, Texas A&M, Tulane, Virginia Tech, Washington State, Wisconsin
0	Arkansas, Baylor, Boston College, Clemson, Colorado, Connecticut, Creighton, Florida, Georgetown, Iowa State, Kansas, Kansas State, Louisville, Marquette, Maryland, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Mississippi State, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Carolina State, Northwestern, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State, Oregon, Oregon State, Penn State, Pittsburgh, Purdue, Seton Hall, Texas, Texas Christian University, Texas Tech, Tulsa, USC, Utah, Villanova, Wake Forest, Washington, West Virginia, Wichita State, Xavier

FEMALE BIPOC COACHES BY CONFERENCE

The American Conference evidenced the highest percentage of BIPOC women head coaches of women's teams (12.9%), while the Big 12 has the lowest percentage of BIPOC head coaches (0.0%). For a full breakdown of coaches by race, gender, and conference see Table 10.

Number of and Percentage of BIPOC Women Head Coaches for Women's Teams Employed within Seven Select NCAA D-I Conferences

Big 12	0.0% (n = 0)
Big East	3.6% (n = 4)
Big Ten	4.3% (n = 8)
Pac 12	6.5% (n = 10)
ACC	7.5% (n = 13)
SEC	8.4% (n = 13)
American	12.4% (n = 13)

THE DATA STORY

A summary

The goal of the *Women in College Coaching Report Card*[™] is to document the percentage of women collegiate head coaches of women's teams over time. Data matters! Based on the numbers this year, we are cautiously optimistic the era of stagnation is over. A **new era** for intercollegiate Division-I women sport coaches at the most visible, powerful institutions begins—**Slow and Steady Incline!**



Data in the 11th year of the WCCRC points to some 'firsts' and some good news!

- The percentage of women head coaches of NCAA D-I women's teams in seven select conferences is **up again for the ninth year in a row.**
- The percentage of women head coaches increased by the **largest margin** (2.3%) in the history of the Report Card, and 2022 marked the second greatest increase (1.2%)
- For the **first time** more institutions earned an A grade than a F grade! In fact, there were **3x more As than Fs!** For the last ten years, the number of F grades far outnumbered the As.
- This year recorded the **greatest number** (n = 10) of institutional A grades, 2021-22 recorded seven As.
- University of Cincinnati has earned an A grade *every year* of the report.
- For the **second time in ten years and for two years in a row**, a majority of positional vacancies (58.1%) were **filled by women.**
- For the **first time**, a majority (65%, 15 of 23) of BIPOC coaches hired were women of color.
- The percentage of women coaches of color **increased** from 5.7% in 2022 to 6.2% this year.
- This year marks the **first time** all select seven conferences increased in the percentage of women head coaches.
- Basketball the most lucrative, visible and popular women's intercollegiate sport moved up to an A grade for the **first time.**

SUMMARY

Despite the good news, women coaches of women's teams at the most visible and powerful institution in intercollegiate athletics remain in the minority. We must also point out women coaches of color remain dramatically underrepresented. A large number of institutions employed zero coaches of color, which does not reflect the racial composition of the student-athletes. Notably, the Big 12 conference had the lowest percentage of women *and* BIPOC coaches. Efforts to combat gender and racial bias in the occupational landscape of sport coaching must continue.

While a large body of literature exists about women in sport coaching, a small percentage of it is dedicated solely to women of color. The experiences of women of color and the scarcity of same identity role models and mentors in sport also likely influence the experience, development and performance of female student-athletes of color. Future research into the experiences of women coaches of color is needed and warranted so that support systems can be developed and implemented. Currently we are collaborating with WeCOACH within their WeAMPLIFY initiative (a connection, an action, and a promise to amplify the voices, visibility, experiences, and value of women coaches of color) to fill this gap.

As with prior reports and in other NCAA Divisions, the percentage of women head coaches by institution, sport and conference varied greatly. While some intercollegiate workplaces employ a majority of women head coaches for their women's teams and should be celebrated and recognized, room for improvement for institutions and sports with failing grades is evident.

The WCCRC complements and extends the excellent work by our colleagues and the tradition started by Drs. Vivian Acosta and Linda Carpenter in the 1970s through 2014 (see acostacarpenter.org) and Dr. Richard Lapchick at The Center for Diversity and Equity in Sport (TIDES).

The WCCRC is making a difference and an impact (see page ii), the data tells the story.



CONCLUSION

Together, the Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport at the University of Minnesota and WeCOACH—along with other organizations, groups and individuals—are striving to accelerate systems change, increase the percentage of women college coaches, generate awareness, lead a national dialogue about a gender-balanced workforce and the importance of women coaches, and socialize evidence-informed strategies to recruit, support and retain women in the coaching profession. We envision a world in which more young women (and men) have women coaches as role models and coaching becomes a more gender-balanced profession. Women who aspire to coach should have legitimate opportunities to enter the workforce, experience a supportive, inclusive and positive work climate when they do, and be paid accordingly and fairly for their expertise. Our efforts aspire to the tagline from the Wellesley Centers for Women: **“A world that is good for women is good for everyone™.”**

All reports, current and past, infographics and corollary materials are available at www.TuckerCenter.org.



REFERENCES

Boucher, C., & LaVoi, N. M. (2023). A longitudinal examination of homologous reproduction in athletic director's hiring of intercollegiate head coaches for women sports teams. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 10(2), 172-180. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2022-0002>

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, UK: Routledge.

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.

LaVoi, N. M., & Glassford, S. (2021). 'This is our family': LGBTQ family narratives in online coaching biographies. *Journal of Homosexuality*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2021.1921506>.

LaVoi, N. M., & Silva-Breen, H. (2022). Longitudinal Analysis of Head Coach Employee Turnover of Women's NCAA DI Teams. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v15i1.15738>

Norman, L. (Ed.). (2021). *Improving gender equity in sports coaching*. 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.

TABLES AND APPENDICES

Table 1. Percentage of Women Head Coaches of Women's Teams Within Select Seven NCAA Division-I Conferences

Year	Schools (N)	Female		Male		Total Coaches (N)
		%	n	%	n	
2022-23	87	46.0	451	53.9	528	980
2021-22	87	43.7	427	56.3	551	978
2020-21*	87	42.5	413	57.5	558	971
2019-20	86	42.3	410	57.7	560	970
2018-19	86	41.8	406	58.2	565	971
2017-18	86	41.6	404	58.4	567	971
2016-17	86	41.2	397	58.8	567	964
2015-16	86	41.1	397	58.9	570	967
2014-15*	86	40.2	390	59.8	579	969
2013-14	76	39.6	352	60.4	536	888
2012-13	76	40.2	356	59.8	530	886

* = Number of schools increased due to conference realignment

Table 2. Head Coach Turnover and Gender Pair of Outgoing and Incoming Coach by Number and Percentage of Select Seven Division-I Head Coaches Over Time

Year	Outgoing-Incoming Coach Gender Change								Total Coaches	Total Coach Turnover	
	Male-Male		Female-Male		Male-Female		Female-Female				
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%
2013-14	34	51.5	15	22.7	10	15.2	7	10.6	888	66	7.4
2014-15	42	50.0	9	10.7	15	17.9	18	21.4	969	85	8.8
2015-16	28	34.2	13	17.1	21	27.6	16	21.1	967	76	7.9
2016-17	28	39.4	10	14.1	12	16.9	21	29.6	966	71	7.3
2017-18	42	46.2	13	14.3	18	19.8	18	19.8	970	91	9.4
2018-19	43	34.4	24	19.2	28	22.4	30	24.0	971	125	12.9
2019-20	38	37.2	17	16.7	22	21.6	25	24.5	972	102	10.5
2020-21	18	33.3	11	20.4	14	25.9	11	20.4	969	54	5.6
2021-22	39	36.1	13	12.0	26	24.1	30	27.8	978	108	11.0
2022-23	47	37.9	5	4.0	31	25.0	41	33.3	980	124	12.7
TOTAL	359	40.0	130	15.1	197	21.6	217	23.2	9630	902	9.3

Table 3. Grade by Sport for Percentage of Select Seven D-I Women’s Teams Led by Women Head Coaches 2022-23

Grade	%	Sport
A	100-70	Acrobatics & Tumbling [100.0%]**, Wrestling [+100.0%] ↑ *, Lacrosse [+93.3%], Field Hockey [+91.3%], Softball [+76.4%], Golf [+76.3%] ↑ , Equestrian [-75.0%], Basketball [+72.4%] ↑
B	69-55	Gymnastics [+64.7%], Rifle [+62.5%] ↑
C	54-40	Nordic Skiing [+50.0%] ↑ **, Rowing [+48.7%], Volleyball [-47.1%], Tennis [+43.5%] ↑
D	39-25	Ice Hockey [+37.5%], Water Polo [+37.5%], Soccer [+35.3%], Alpine Skiing [+33.3%] ↑ ***, Bowling [-33.3%] ↓ ***
F	24-0	Beach Volleyball [-20.0%] ↓ , Swimming [-19.7%], Cross Country [-19.3%], Track & Field [-18.6%], Fencing [+18.2%], Diving [-8.8%], Squash [-0.0%]**, Triathlon [-0.0%] ↓ *
* Denotes a sport only offered at one institution (Triathlon - Arizona State, Wrestling - Iowa)		
** Denotes a sport only offered at two institutions (Acrobatics & Tumbling - Baylor, Oregon, Nordic Skiing - Colorado, Utah)		
*** Denotes a sport offered at three institutions (Bowling - Tulane, Nebraska, Vanderbilt, Alpine Skiing - Colorado, Boston College, Utah)		
[+/-] Denotes percentage increases or decreases from 2021-22		
[↑ / ↓] Denotes letter grade changes from 2021-22		

Table 4. Head Coach Number and Percentage Alphabetically by Sport and Gender for Select Seven Division-I Women's Teams 2022-23

Sport	Female		Male		N
	%	n	%	n	
Acrobatics & Tumbling	100.0	2	0.0	0	2
Alpine Skiing	33.3	1	66.7	2	3
Basketball	72.4	63	27.6	24	87
Beach Volleyball	20.0	3	80.0	12	15
Bowling	33.3	1	66.7	2	3
Crew/Rowing	48.7	19	51.3	20	39
Cross Country	19.3	17	80.7	71	88
Diving	8.8	5	91.2	52	57
Equestrian	75.0	6	25.0	2	8
Fencing	18.2	2	81.8	9	11
Field Hockey	91.3	21	8.7	2	23
Golf	76.3	58	23.7	18	76
Gymnastics	64.7	22	35.3	12	34
Ice Hockey	37.5	3	62.5	5	8
Lacrosse	93.3	28	6.7	2	30
Nordic Skiing	50.0	1	50.0	1	2
Rifle	62.5	5	37.5	3	8
Soccer	35.3	30	64.7	55	85
Softball	76.4	55	23.6	17	72

Squash	0.0	0	100.0	2	2
Swimming	19.7	12	80.3	49	61
Tennis	43.5	37	56.5	48	85
Track & Field	18.6	16	81.4	70	86
Triathlon	0.0	0	100.0	2	2
Volleyball	47.1	40	52.9	45	85
Water Polo	37.5	3	62.5	5	8
Wrestling	100.0	1	0.0	0	1

Table 5. Grade, Number, and Percentage of Select Seven NCAA Division-I Women Head Coaches by Conference 2022-23

Conference	Grade	Female		Male		N
		%	n	%	n	
Big Ten	B	54.3 [+]	100	45.7	84	184
American	B	51.4 [+]	54	48.6	51	105
ACC	C	47.4 [+]	82	52.6	91	173
Pac-12	C	47.1 [+]	72	52.3	80	152
SEC	C	43.5 [+]	67	56.5	87	154
Big East ↑	C	41.4 [+]	46	58.6	65	111
Big 12	D	30.0 [+]	30	70.0	70	100

[+/-] denote percentage increases or decreases from 2021-22
 [↑ / ↓] denote letter grade changes from 2021-22

Table 6. Percentage of Select Seven D-I Women’s Teams Led By BIPOC Coaches 2022-23

Race	Female		Male		Total Coaches	
	%	n	#	n	%	N
White/Caucasian	39.8 [+]	390	44.5	436	84.3	826
BIPOC	6.2	61	9.5	93	15.7	154
Black or African American	3.9 [+]	38	6.0	59	9.9	97
Asian	0.8 [+]	8	1.3	13	2.1	21
Hispanic or Latino/Latina	1.3 [-]	13	1.9	19	3.3	32
Native American or Alaskan Native	0.1	1	0.0	0	0.1	1
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.1 [+]	1	0.0	0	0.1	1

[+/-] Denotes percentage increases or decreases from 2021-22

Table 7. Head Coach Turnover of Outgoing and Incoming Coach by Race, Gender, Number and Percentage for Head Coaches 2022-23

Race Pair of Coach Change	Male to Male		Male to Female		Female to Female		Female to Male		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
White - White	29.0	36	18.5	23	21.0	26	4.0	5	72.6	90
BIPOC - White	2.4	3	4.0	5	2.4	3	0.0	0	8.9	11
White - BIPOC	2.4	3	1.6	2	7.3	9	0.0	0	11.3	14
BIPOC - BIPOC	4.0	5	0.8	1	2.4	3	0.0	0	7.3	9

Table 8. Head Coach Hiring Patterns by Gender and Race 2022-23

	Male		Female		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
Total White Coaches Hired	35.5	44	46.0	57	81.5	101
Total BIPOC Coaches Hired	6.5	8	12.1	15	18.5	23

Table 9. Percentage of Select Seven Division-I Head Coaches by Sport and Race 2022-23

Sport	Head Coaches						N
	BIPOC		White		Female BIPOC		
	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Acrobatics & Tumbling	0.0	0	100.0	2	0.0	0	2
Alpine Skiing	0.0	0	100.0	3	0.0	0	3
Basketball	27.6	24	72.4	63	23.0	20	87
Beach Volleyball	13.3	2	86.7	13	0.0	0	15
Bowling	0.0	0	100.0	3	0.0	0	3
Crew/Rowing	5.1	2	94.9	37	0.0	0	39
Cross Country	23.9	21	76.1	67	2.3	2	88
Diving	14.0	8	86.0	49	0.0	0	57
Equestrian	12.5	1	87.5	7	0.0	0	8
Fencing	9.1	1	90.9	10	0.0	0	11
Field Hockey	4.3	1	95.7	22	4.3	1	23
Golf	3.9	3	96.1	73	3.9	2	76

Gymnastics	14.7	5	85.3	29	8.8	3	34
Ice Hockey	0.0	0	100.0	8	0.0	0	8
Lacrosse	6.7	2	93.3	28	6.7	2	30
Nordic Skiing	0.0	0	100.0	2	0.0	0	2
Rifle	12.5	1	87.5	7	0.0	0	8
Soccer	11.8	10	88.2	75	2.4	2	85
Softball	8.3	6	91.7	66	6.9	5	72
Squash	0.0	0	100.0	2	0.0	0	2
Swimming	11.5	7	88.5	54	1.6	1	61
Tennis	18.8	16	81.2	69	8.2	7	85
Track & Field	36.0	31	64.0	55	9.3	8	86
Triathlon	0.0	0	100.0	1	0.0	0	1
Volleyball	12.9	11	87.1	74	7.1	6	85
Water Polo	0.0	0	100.0	8	0.0	0	8
Wrestling	100.0	1	0.0	0	100.0	1	1

Table 10. Percentage of Select Seven Division-I Head Coaches by Conference and Race 2022-23

Conference	BIPOC		White		Female BIPOC		N
	%	n	%	n	%	n	
ACC	16.8	29	83.2	144	7.5	13	173
American	21.9	23	78.1	82	12.4	13	105
Big 12	16.0	16	84.0	84	0.0	0	100
Big East	10.8	12	89.2	99	3.6	4	111
Big Ten	10.3	19	89.7	165	4.3	8	184
Pac 12	17.6	27	82.4	126	6.5	10	153
SEC	17.5	27	82.5	127	8.4	13	154

APPENDIX A

NCAA Division-I Select Seven Conference Composition

American Athletics Conference (American)

East Carolina University Florida Atlantic University Methodist University Rice University Southern Temple University	Tulane University United States Naval Academy University of Alabama at Birmingham University of Memphis University of North Carolina Charlotte	University of North Texas University of South Florida University of Texas San Antonio University of Tulsa Wichita State University
--	--	--

Athletic Coast Conference (ACC)

Boston College Clemson University Duke University Florida State University Georgia Institute of Tehcnology North Carolina State University	Syracuse University University of Louisville University of Miami University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill University of Notre Dame	University of Pittsburgh University of Virginia Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Wake Forest University
---	--	--

Big Ten Conference

Indiana University Michigan State University Northwestern University Ohio State University Penn State University	Purdue University Rutgers University-New Brunswick University of Illinois University of Iowa University of Maryland	University of Michigan University of Minnesota University of Nebraska-Lincoln University of Wisconsin- Madison
--	---	--

Big 12 Conference

Baylor University Iowa State University Kansas State University Oklahoma State University	Texas Christian University Texas Tech University University of Central Florida University of Cincinnati	University of Houston University of Kansas University of Oklahoma West Virginia University
--	--	---

Big East Conference

Butler University University of Connecticut Creighton University DePaul University	Georgetown University Marquette University Providence College St. John's University	Seton Hall University Villanova University Xavier University
---	--	--

Pacific-12 Conference (Pac 12)

Arizona State University Stanford University Oregon State University University of Arizona	University of California, Berkeley University of California University of Colorado University of Oregon	University of Southern California University of Washington University of Utah Washington State University
---	--	--

Southeastern Conference (SEC)

Auburn University Louisiana State University Mississippi State University Texas A&M University University of Alabama	University of Arkansas University of Florida University of Georgia University of Kentucky University of Mississippi	University of Missouri University of South Carolina University of Tennessee Vanderbilt University
--	---	--

APPENDIX B

Grade, Percentage, and Number of Women Head Coaches of Women's Teams by Institution 2022-23

School	Grade	Female		Male		N
		%	n	%	n	
California	A	77.8	12	22.2	5	17
Cincinnati	A	77.8	7	22.2	3	10
Illinois	A	72.7	8	27.3	3	11
Maryland	A	72.7	8	27.3	3	11
Michigan State	A	72.7	8	27.3	3	11
Mississippi	A	72.7	7	27.3	2	9
Oklahoma	A	72.7	7	27.3	3	10
Tennessee	A	70.6	8	29.4	3	11
SMU	A	70.6	8	30.0	3	11
UCF	A	70.0	7	30.0	2	9
Clemson	B	64.7	5	35.3	4	9
Miami (FL)	B	64.3	6	35.7	4	10
Michigan	B	63.6	9	36.4	7	16

Minnesota	B	63.6	8	36.4	3	11
Missouri	B	61.5	7	38.5	4	11
Northwestern	B	60.0	7	40.0	5	12
Ohio State	B	60.0	11	40.0	6	17
Oregon State	B	58.3	5	41.7	4	9
Penn State	B	57.1	9	42.9	6	15
Rutgers	B	56.3	9	43.7	5	14
Syracuse	B	55.6	6	44.4	5	11
Vanderbilt	B	55.6	5	44.4	4	9
Washington	B	55.6	7	44.4	4	11
Washington State	B	55.6	5	44.4	4	9
DePaul	B	54.5	4	45.5	3	7
Temple	B	54.5	6	45.5	5	11
Alabama	C	53.8	5	58.3	7	12
Arizona State	C	53.8	6	46.2	9	15

Baylor	C	50.0	4	50.0	6	10
Boston College	C	50.0	7	50.0	9	16
Colorado	C	50.0	4	50.0	6	10
Connecticut	C	50.0	4	50.0	6	10
Duke	C	50.0	7	50.0	7	14
Florida	C	50.0	6	50.0	6	12
Florida State	C	50.0	5	50.0	6	11
Georgia	C	50.0	5	50.0	7	12
Georgia Tech	C	47.4	4	52.6	4	8
Iowa	C	46.7	6	53.3	8	14
North Carolina	C	46.2	7	53.8	9	16
North Carolina State	C	45.5	6	54.5	6	12
South Carolina	C	44.4	5	55.6	7	12
South Florida	C	44.4	4	55.6	4	8
Stanford	C	43.8	9	56.2	10	19

UCLA	C	42.9	7	57.1	7	14
Virginia	C	41.7	7	58.3	6	13
Wake Forest	C	41.7	4	58.3	4	8
Wisconsin	C	41.7	5	58.3	7	12
Notre Dame	C	41.7	6	58.3	7	13
Providence	C	41.7	5	58.3	7	12
St. John's	C	40.0	4	60.0	5	9
Villanova	C	40.0	7	60.0	6	13
Memphis	C	40.0	4	60.0	5	9
Houston	C	40.0	4	60.0	6	10
Tulane	C	40.0	5	60.0	5	10
Arizona	D	38.5	4	61.5	8	12
Arkansas	D	38.5	3	61.5	8	11
Auburn	D	37.5	4	62.5	8	12
Indiana	D	37.5	4	62.5	9	13

Kansas	D	36.4	3	63.6	8	11
Kansas State	D	36.4	2	63.6	6	8
Kentucky	D	36.4	3	63.6	9	12
Louisville	D	36.4	5	63.6	8	13
LSU	D	35.7	4	64.3	8	12
Mississippi State	D	33.3	2	66.7	6	8
Nebraska	D	33.3	5	66.7	9	14
Oregon	D	33.3	4	66.7	7	11
Pittsburgh	D	33.3	3	66.7	6	9
Purdue	D	33.3	3	66.7	8	11
Texas A&M	D	33.3	3	66.7	8	11
Texas Tech	D	33.3	2	66.7	6	8
USC	D	30.8	5	69.2	8	13
Virginia Tech	D	30.8	4	69.2	7	11
West Virginia	D	28.6	3	71.4	8	11

Utah	D	28.6	4	71.4	9	13
TCU	D	28.6	4	71.4	8	12
Georgetown	D	27.3	4	72.7	10	14
Marquette	D	27.3	2	72.7	5	7
Seton Hall	D	27.3	3	72.7	6	9
Wichita State	D	27.3	2	72.7	5	7
Butler	D	27.3	4	72.7	7	11
Creighton	D	25.0	3	75.0	5	8
Xavier	D	25.0	3	75.0	5	8
E. Carolina	D	25.0	4	75.0	7	11
Tulsa	D	25.0	3	75.0	6	9
Iowa State	F	18.2	2	81.8	9	11
Oklahoma State	F	18.2	1	81.8	7	8
Texas	F	12.5	2	87.5	9	11

APPENDIX C

Percentage and Number of BIPOC Head Coaches of Women's Teams by Institution 2022-23

School	BIPOC		White		N
	%	n	%	n	
Alabama	50.0	1	50.0	11	12
Arizona	50.0	4	50.0	8	12
Arizona State	44.4	2	55.6	13	15
Auburn	42.9	2	57.1	10	12
Arkansas	37.5	1	62.5	10	11
Baylor	36.4	1	63.6	9	10
Boston College	36.4	1	63.6	15	16
California	33.3	3	66.7	14	17
Cincinnati	33.3	2	66.7	8	10
Clemson	33.3	1	66.7	8	9
Colorado	33.3	1	66.7	9	10
Connecticut	30.8	0	69.2	13	13
Duke	27.3	2	72.7	12	14

Florida	27.3	3	72.7	9	12
Florida State	25.0	1	75.0	10	11
Georgia	25.0	2	75.0	10	12
Georgia Tech	23.1	3	76.9	5	8
Illinois	23.1	1	76.9	10	11
Indiana	23.1	2	76.9	11	13
Iowa	22.2	2	77.8	12	14
Iowa State	22.2	0	77.8	11	11
Kansas	22.2	3	77.8	8	11
Kansas State	22.2	1	77.8	7	8
Kentucky	22.2	4	77.8	8	12
Louisville	21.4	2	78.6	11	13
LSU	20.0	1	80.0	11	12
Maryland	20.0	2	80.0	9	11
Miami (FL)	20.0	2	80.0	8	10
Michigan	18.2	0	81.8	16	16

Michigan State	18.2	1	81.8	10	11
Minnesota	18.2	1	81.8	12	13
Mississippi	18.2	2	81.8	7	9
Mississippi State	18.2	2	81.8	6	8
Missouri	18.2	0	81.8	11	11
Nebraska	18.2	1	81.8	13	14
North Carolina	18.2	1	81.8	14	15
North Carolina State	17.6	0	82.4	12	12
Northwestern	17.6	0	82.4	12	12
Ohio State	16.7	3	83.3	14	17
Oklahoma	16.7	2	83.3	10	12
Oklahoma State	16.7	1	83.3	7	8
Oregon	16.7	0	83.3	11	11
Oregon State	15.8	0	84.2	9	9
Penn State	15.4	0	84.6	15	15
Pittsburgh	15.4	2	84.6	7	9

Purdue	14.3	2	85.7	9	11
Rutgers	14.3	2	85.7	12	14
South Carolina	14.3	4	85.7	8	12
South Florida	14.3	4	85.7	4	8
Stanford	14.3	3	85.7	16	19
Syracuse	13.1	3	86.9	8	11
Tennessee	12.5	2	87.5	8	10
Texas	12.5	2	87.5	9	11
Texas A&M	11.1	1	88.9	10	11
Texas Tech	11.1	0	88.9	8	8
UCLA	11.1	6	88.9	8	14
USC	10.0	4	90.0	9	13
Vanderbilt	10.0	2	90.0	7	9
Virginia	9.1	3	90.9	10	13
Virginia Tech	9.1	4	90.9	7	11
Wake Forest	9.1	1	90.9	7	8

Washington	9.1	0	90.9	11	11
Washington State	9.1	1	90.9	8	9
West Virginia	9.1	2	90.9	9	11
Wisconsin	9.1	2	90.9	10	12
Utah	8.3	3	91.7	10	13
Notre Dame	8.3	3	91.7	10	13
TCU	7.7	4	92.3	8	12
DePaul	7.1	1	92.9	6	7
Georgetown	6.7	3	93.3	11	14
Marquette	6.2	1	93.8	6	7
Providence	0.0	2	100.0	10	12
Seton Hall	0.0	1	100.0	8	9
St. John's	0.0	2	100.0	7	9
Temple	0.0	2	100.0	9	11
Villanova	0.0	0	100.0	13	13
Wichita State	0.0	0	100.0	7	7

Butler	0.0	2	100.0	9	11
Creighton	0.0	0	100.0	8	8
Memphis	0.0	2	100.0	7	9
SMU	0.0	1	100.0	10	11
UCF	0.0	4	100.0	5	9
Houston	0.0	5	100.0	5	10
Xavier	0.0	0	100.0	8	8
E. Carolina	0.0	2	100.0	9	11
Tulane	0.0	1	100.0	9	10
Tulsa	0.0	0	100.0	9	9



Tucker Center for Research
on Girls & Women in Sport

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Driven to Discover®



THE TUCKER
CENTER



for Research on Girls & Women in Sport