Administrative Evaluation Practices and the effects they have on College Head Coaches.

A Synthesis Project

Presented to the

Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education

The College at Brockport

State University of New York

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Education

(Physical Education)

By

Nicholas A. Pontari

Spring 2018

THE COLLEGE AT BROCKPORT

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

BROCKPORT, NEW YORK

Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education

Title of Synthesis Project: Administrative Evaluation Practices and the effects they

have on College Head Coaches.

Cathy Houston-Wilson

Instructor Approval   Date   5/14/18

Accepted by the Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education, The College at Brockport, State University of New York, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science in Education (Physical Education).

Cathy Houston-Wilson

Chairperson Approval   Date   5/14/18

Table of Contents

Abstract

College Head Coaches are being replaced at an alarming rate over the past two decades. Turnover rates of 20% in certain sports are raising eyebrows on why college coaches are being fired or stepping down and changing positions. Studies show that there are many different components that go into selecting a head coach for a new hire. Also, studies talk about the different types of evaluations, depending on level of competition, and criteria used to evaluate those Head Coaches once they are in a program so it is clear to them how to keep from being fired or replaced.

Chapter 1- Introduction

There are numerous ways to perform an evaluation on College Head Coaches by an administrative department. An evaluation of a head coach at the college level can be intricate and sometimes complicated and depending on who is conducting the evaluation along with where the evaluation is taking place, can determine the type of evaluation that is performed. The evaluation format can depend on a number of different variables; private vs. state school, philosophy of the Director of Athletics and department, level of collegiate athletics (Division I, II, or III), etc.

With over 1,000 member schools participating in the NCAA containing just under 400,000 student-athletes spread over multiple divisions, evaluation and criteria can vary and have numerous factors on how a coach is evaluated (Sudano, 2017). Starting with the hiring process, the philosophy of the Athletic Director is the most important factor in determining the criteria in which the Head Coach is evaluated and how the evaluation is structured (Powers, Judge, & Makela, 2016). Next, the difference in philosophies and rules from the variety of Division I, II, III, or even NJCAA levels can play a huge part in criteria formed to hire and or evaluate a coach as well (Barber & Eckrich, 1998).

Recent studies show that in the NCAA Division 1 College Football bowl subdivision alone, nearly 20% of the 120 (24/120) Head Coaches are turned over at a yearly rate (Maxcy, 2013). With over half of those schools belonging to a "Power 5" conference, and the other half being labeled as "Small School" competitors, marketing for all programs increases revenue and profit for each school (Maxcy, 2013). With the combination of the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) football generating more revenue

than all other varsity sports combined (Marcy, 2013), and lucrative TV deals and contracts being provided for the "Power 5" schools (Ex: Big Ten Network), the ability to field not only a competitive, but successful team puts pressure on an Athletic Director as well as the coach to field the most successful team year in and year out, and win as much as possible. (Maxcy, 2013).

With this information, do Athletic Directors value a coach who is winning now over a coach who teaches morals and values first? Destructive leadership patterns, and misplaced values in intercollegiate athletics at the Division I level have led to violations, sanctions, and loss of scholarship to various high prestige programs (Powers, Judge & Makela, 2016). All of this information drives the question, "How are Administrators evaluating College Coaches, and does it have an effect on how they perform their job duties on a daily basis?"

Statement of the Problem

Evaluation of College Head Coaches remains somewhat arbitrary. Over the years, College Head Coaches have been hired and fired within small time frames. This creates inconsistency in the leadership of a team and makes it difficult to build a program over time. In addition, reasons for the firing of coaches does not always appear clear because the process is not always transparent. The need for a systematic and clearly articulated process of evaluation should be relayed during the hiring process. Such practices can aid in long-term commitments between coaches and athletic departments and create more stability for the teams being coached. With a mutual understanding of what is wanted between all parties (School President, Administrators, and Head Coach), the chances of

job security should increase, thus reducing the rate of turnover in College Coaching at each level.

Research Questions

1. What processes are used for evaluating college head coaches?

2. Is evaluation criteria relayed to coaches during the hiring process?

3. What effect does the frequent firing of head coaches have on the stability of teams?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this synthesis project is to review the literature on evaluation practices of College Head Coaches and its impact on athletic programs.

Operational Definitions

1. Summative Assessment: An evaluation performed at the end of the season, summing up the experience as a whole.

2. Formative Assessment: An assessment that can be done both formal or informal, but one that is conducted throughout the year to give feedback to the individual throughout the season.

Delimitations

1. All literature must pertain to College Coaching.

2. Athletic Administrators (n= 466) and College Coaches (n=838) are involved.

3. Evaluation of College Coaching is reviewed at all levels (Division I, II, III, and NJCAA.

Chapter 2- Methods

The purpose of this chapter was to review the methods used to review the literature on the evaluation processes of Head Coaches in Intercollegiate Athletics. The articles collected and reviewed for this synthesis were ascertained from The College at Brockport Drake Memorial Library. The data-base search was EBSCO. Within EBSCO , Sports Discus was the primary database used to find the articles for this synthesis review. In addition, all articles found were peer reviewed. In total, 10 articles met the criteria and were selected to review and synthesize for this review of literature. All articles were found from the time period of 2008-2018. Reviewing the peer-reviewed articles that have been written within the past ten years ensures high quality, recent up to date information on evaluation methods for coaching staffs in intercollegiate athletics. In addition to the EBSCO database, information was also pooled directly from the NCAA website to provide background information and additional data to complete the review of literature. All sources are cited in the reference section of this paper.

While conducting the search to find articles to synthesize for the review of literature, many different key phrases were searched. To start, the following terms were used; "Firing College Coaches", yielding five results and one article met the criteria for inclusion in the literature review. The second phrase searched was "How College Coaches are Evaluated", this time resulting in 26 to draw information from. Of the 26 articles, one was selected. The next phrase searched was "Criteria for Evaluating Head Coaches", this time resulting in one article which was selected from the four that were found. Directly following, "Evaluating Intercollegiate Coaches" was searched, seven articles were found and one article was selected for inclusion in the review. Following

that, the next phrase was "College Coaching Hiring", and out of the 20 articles found, two articles were selected. The next phrase was "Factors in Evaluating College Coaches", producing three articles to choose from, and one article was selected. The final key phrase searched was "Evaluating College Coaching", and of the 13 articles that were available, two of them were selected for use.

All articles researched for this synthesis have a base guideline and criteria that must be met. To start, all articles are peer-reviewed and are within the last ten years (2008-2018). All articles pertain to the hiring, firing, or evaluation of college coaches at any level of the NCAA (Division I, II, or III). Evaluation in the articles can come from Administration or from Student-Athletes.

In total, there were ten articles that have been chosen for the literature review. Of the articles found, a majority of the articles were qualitative based. The ten articles that were found were selected from numerous journals including; The International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, Journal of Sport Management, Sport Journal, Psychology of Sport and Exercise, and the Journal of Sports Economics. For this review, both male and female coaches were studied. Of the ten articles, Division 1 FBS College Football and Division 1 women's basketball were the main two sports covered, but throughout the ten articles, coaches from all sports (both Men and Women) were evaluated at each level (Division I, II, III). Over the span of the ten articles, 838 Head Coaches jobs were reviewed or evaluated, and questionnaires and surveys included a total of 466 Administrators. Articles also researched how Athletic Director's evaluated coaching staffs that spanned across all three divisions as well.

Chapter 3- Review of Literature

The purpose of this synthesis project is to review the literature on evaluation practices of College Head Coaches and its impact on athletic programs. The hiring and firing and turnover rate for College Head Coaches varies depending on the sport and the level of competition. Many different factors also go into hiring and firing a head coach. Criteria varies depending on sport and competition, but with alarming turnover rates such as 20% of 120 Head Coaches being fired or switching schools in the FBS football at the Division I level alone (Maxcy, 2013), the questions that arise are what are these College Head Coaches being assessed and evaluated on, and who is actually making these decisions on hiring and firing these coaches?

Chain of Command in a University

As previously stated, the perception from the outside looking in is that the Athletic Director makes all of the decisions on who will coach the athletic programs at the University, this is true to an extent. There is actually a formal chain of command in the decision process. Prior to 1997, management and control had been vested in a council of athletic administrators and faculty representatives (Turner, 2015). As of 1997, the NCAA has given the Presidents of the university full authority for the governance of intercollegiate programs nationally. What this means is that the President of the University or College is the person who is responsible for all hiring and firing, along with being responsible for the sanctions and infractions an Athletic Department may commit as well. The President of the University or College's role is not to micromanage and be

involved in the daily management of the Athletic Department, on the other hand they are responsible for putting the policies in place to provide a strong foundation of morals, ethics, and values for the Athletic Department (Turner, 2015).

Next, the Athletic Director and other administrative staff are responsible for making sure those morals, values, and ethics are upheld. The Administrative staff usually led by the Athletic Director, manage the daily operations of the department which include budgeting, home event planning, and the hiring, firing, and evaluation of the Head Coach of a certain program. The Athletic Director is responsible for reporting all sanctions and infractions to the NCAA to ensure honesty and fair play (Turner, 2015).

Finally, under the Athletic Director and other administrative personnel comes the Head Coaches of the programs. The Head Coach is also responsible for upholding the morals, values, and ethics of the Athletic Department. The Head Coach is also responsible for all decisions that he or she and his or her staff or personnel make. The Head Coach typically is responsible for hiring the Assistant Coaches of the program, and is responsible for recruiting quality student-athletes into the program that represent the team, athletic department, and college or university in a positive manor (Turner, 2015).

Hiring a Head Coach

The level of competition plays a major factor in the hiring of a Head Coach. There is a different philosophy for each level of competition (Division I, II, and III) (Maclean & Zakrajsek, 1996). Division I sports often rely on revenue as a main source of income for the college. Philosophy at the Division I level is different and unique because

of the revenue generated at this level. With money as a driving force, reasoning for hiring a coach can be different than what a Division II or Division III Athletic Director might look for (Maclean & Zakrajsek, 1996). Division II and III Universities and Colleges offer more of a "well-rounded" individual as a student-athlete. At the Division II or III level, winning is important, but other factors are included in assessment due to the fact of lack of TV Contract and Revenue.

In a survey provided to 95 University or College presidents, 51% of them responded stating that Athletics and sports help generate money that helps fund the University or College (Turner, 2015). Most money an Athletic team on campus will bring in will be from a TV contract, whether it be Regional or National. TV Revenue and winning is putting pressure on University Presidents and Athletic Directors to hire coaches that win. With TV Revenue causing the spike in salaries for Head Coaches, compensation has grew 750% over the past 25 years in Division 1 College Football alone (Turner, 2015). Therefore, the pressure to find a Head Coach that wins so the University or College increases so that they can earn that Regional or National Television contract.

When looking to fill a void for a Head Coaching vacancy, there are two different choices that can be made. The next candidate can be either an internal hire or an external hire. An internal hire is one that comes from within the program, typically an assistant coach, usually an offensive or defensive coordinator or a positional coach depending on the sport. The external hires are hiring's that comes from outside of the program, typically a lower level coach moving up to an upper-level program. An external hire can also be from another upper-level school. The hiring process and coaching market is extremely competitive due to compensation depending on sport. A football coach at an

upper level program is routinely the highest paid employee at the university (Maxcy, 2013). Universities and Colleges need to be aware that changing Head Coaches has an effect on more than just wins and losses. The changing of a Head Coach affects the Academic Progress Rate (APR) for the student-athletes as well (Johnson, Blom, Judge, Lee, Pierce, & Ridley, 2013). A recent study shows us that there were 110 "negative" coaching changes compared to only 50 "positive" coaching changes. In this study, there were 80.62% external hires, compared to the 19.18% internal hires. Data and results suggest that hiring a new coach externally increases the chance of reducing APR rate for student-athletes at that university, which means student-athletes are actually suffering in the classroom when a hire is made externally. On the other hand, internal hires saw increase and positive change to APR scores. As a whole, 11/12 conferences in Division 1 football in the study showed more negative changes than positive changes to APR during a coaching switch. In addition to the APR statistics, in the first year of the coaching change, win percentages were also lower in 11/12 conferences compared to the following 8 year win percentages (Johnson, Blom, Judge, Lee, Pierce, & Ridley, 2013).

With that pressure being put on the Head Coaches, Presidents and Athletic Directors value their Head Coaches and base their decisions off of product goals such as wins and losses, along with specific coaching strengths such as; leadership, efficiency, and vision. A study examining 185 coaching changes in Division I Women's basketball in 16 conferences over a 10 year span narrowed down the hiring process to limited factors when looking for a new Head Coach of a program (Pierce, Johnson, Krohn, & Judge, 2017). Factors that were selected as "most important" in hiring a new coach were as followed; demographics, coaching ability, coaching experience, past team

performance, hiring factors, and institutional factors (Pierce, Johnson, Krohn, & Judge, 2017). Division I Women's Basketball draws the largest audience of any other Women's sport at the collegiate level (Pierce, Johnson, Krohn, & Judge, 2017).

With 22 Head Coaching changes in 2015 off-season, and an annual average of 11.5 coaching changes a year, Athletic Directors are forced to "get it right" when selecting a Head Coach for their Women's Basketball team. The data produced results that demonstrate when hiring a new candidate, hiring someone with 1 year of experience resulted in 1 more win per year over a 3 year period in Women's basketball (Pierce, Johnson, Krohn, & Judge, 2017). Studies also found that the more wins that the team had before the coaching change, the higher the chance the team would lose more games increased. The next factor that was deemed most important and effective was the Coaches demographics. Hiring a coach with a similar background showed a 34% increase in wins per season. Coaching experience which showed an increase in 27% wins per season proved to be far less affective on a new team compared to the Coaches ability (interaction with team and daily management of program) which showed an increase in wins the next season at an increase of 37%.

Evaluation Criteria

College coaches must possess various different qualities in order to be successful, and depending on level and school demographics, these qualities may vary. In one study on the criteria used to evaluate College Coaches, Maclean and Zakrajsek (1996) reached out to 87 Administrators and 532 Coaches from 45 different Universities. They were

mailed full population surveys on the importance of the previously mentioned six different specific criteria. Out of all of the participants, four held positions as both Athletic Director and Coach, they were all designated as Athletic Directors, and the title of Coach was excluded. Out of all of the surveys mailed out, 77 Administrators (20F and 57M) (89%) and 363 Coaches (88F and 269M) (68%) responded. Each questionnaire yielded the question: How important is each of the following criteria in evaluating job performance? The order of criteria was randomized, and answered based on a Likert skale, ranging from Not important (1) to Very Important (7). The six most important qualities a coach must possess in order to be successful are; 1. Team Products: Outcomes of coaching that accrue only to the team or individual athletes comprising it, 2. Personal Products: Outcomes of coaching that accrue only to the coach, 3. Direct Task Behaviors: Applying interpersonal skills, strategies, and tactics in enhancing the athletes individually and as a team, 4. Indirect Task Behaviors: Activities such as recruiting, scouting, application of statistics that contribute indirectly to the program, 5. Administrative Maintenance Behaviors: Adherance to policites, guidelines, and interpersonal relations with superiors and peers that strengthen the administration, and 6. Public Relations Behaviors: Liaison activities between the program and relevant community and peer groups (Maclean & Zakrajsek, 1996). The overall results of questionnaire (Average of answer based off of Likert scale 1-7), are as followed: Direct Task Related Behavior: 6.26, Team Products: 5.34, Administrative Maintenance Behaviors: 5.21, Indirect Task Behaviors: 4.96, Public Relations Behaviors: 4.37, Personal Products: 3.69. The notable differences in rating of importance between Coaches and Administrators showed heavily in the indirect task behavior (A= 5.35, C=4.87) and Administrative Task Behavior

categories (A=5.63, C=5.15) (Maclean & Zakrajsek, 1996). The direct task behavior proved to be most important, showing that the relationships that coaches form with their student-athletes are the foundation for success. It also shows that the tactics, strategy, and in game management are also key components to success for the head coach as well.

In another study, 120 Universities Head Football Coaches in the FBS (Football Bowl Subdivision) were evaluated through observations (Maxcy, 2013). 1,186 coaching-year observations occurred over a 10 year span. During this 10 year span, the observations over the span of the first three years are used to calculate talent use efficiency rankings for the next seven years, setting up the 706 evaluations and observations used over that time frame. This time, the coaches were evaluated based on the criteria of W-L%, Conference W-L%, SRS, Talent use efficiency, and Recruiting efficiency, more result based criteria than before. Over the ten year span, the combination of the criteria that the coaches were evaluated on (W-L%, Conference W-L%, SRS, Talent use efficiency, and Recruiting efficiency) yield an efficiency rank. Of the 15 best first-year efficiency ranks, seven Head Coaches held their position until the end of the study, five Head Coaches voluntarily moved to a different position, and three Head Coaches were fired. Of the 15 worst first-year efficiency ranked coaches, 12 were fired from the position before the study ended and three remained head coach at that school. The efficiency of the market is based and assessed on Universities making good choices that on average improve the performance when replacing an underperforming coach. The consistent finding is that the new coach in his first year on the job over a previous coach shows improvement and success. Studies also show that if coaches win immediately with the previous Coaches roster and talent, they will more likely be able to continue success

for a duration of time. Studies show that recruiting efficiency spikes directly at hire, then shows decline as time goes on. This data shows that at the Division I FBS level, Wins and Losses record are weighted a little bit more and show more importance on whether a coach will be kept moving forward.

The Evaluation Process for College Head Coaches

Collegiate Head Coaches have long been evaluated by their Administrative staff, but how? The two main forms of Assessment in evaluating an Intercollegiate Head Coach are a formative and summative assessment. A summative assessment is an evaluation performed at the end of the season, summing up the experience as a whole. In a Head Coaches case, this is a yearly review, or a review of a season. A formative assessment is an assessment that can be done both formally or informally, but one that is conducted throughout the year to give feedback to the individual, once again in a Head Coaches case, this would be as the season or year or season goes on.

It is important to remember the "Chain of Command", where it states that the President of the University is in charge and responsible for all decisions, but it is actually the Athletic Director and other Administrative staff that actually evaluates the Head Coaches.

A recent study suggests that many coaching evaluations are informal, and College Head Coaches are unaware of the criteria utilized in evaluating their coaches. Coaches say that evaluations are fair when they occur frequently, are descriptive, and provide feedback and appropriate strategies for improvement (Barber & Eckrich, 1998).

In a survey that was sent to 660 AD's spanning across all three divisions of competition, 389 responses were accepted and included (143 Division 1, 90 Division 2, and 156 Division 3). Athletic Directors received input from athletes, coaches self-evaluations, senior associate AD's and University Administrators in the evaluation process. Of these responses, 17% of Athletic Directors stated that they have no set formal evaluation in place for their Head Coaches (Barber & Eckrich, 1998). The descriptive analysis of the questionnaire showed that 76.6% of the administrators in this study stated that the primary motives for evaluation were both professional development and contract renewal. The most common methods used in the study were as followed; formal athlete evaluations where athletes fill out questionnaires and surveys about their perceived effectiveness of the head coach, informal athlete evaluations, formal observations, impressions, informal observations, formal meetings with coaches, and informal conversations with coaches (Barber & Eckrich, 1998). All of the aforementioned criteria are the methods that were found and used to evaluate Head Coaches at the Collegiate level.

The purpose of this chapter was to summarize the data found on administrative practices for evaluating intercollegiate Head Coaches. After reviewing all literature, data shows that administration and Head Coaches both want transparency in the evaluation process, along with transparency in the criteria in which the Head Coaches are evaluated on as well.

Chapter 4- Discussion and Recommendation for Future Research

There are different factors that were reviewed as it relates to the processes and methods used in the evaluation process for a Head Coach. Starting at the top, the Athletic Administrators are the ones in charge of the evaluation process, and assessing the Head Coach of a specific program in their Athletic Department.

Throughout the review of literature, data shows that administrators use a number of different methods to evaluate intercollegiate Head Coaches. Although a study showed that 17% of administrators did not have formal evaluations for Head Coaches (Barber & Eckrich, 1998), the study did produce the seven most common methods used. In random order, the most common evaluations for Head Coaches at the intercollegiate level are as followed; formal athlete evaluations, informal athlete evaluations, formal observations, impressions, informal observations, formal meetings with coaches, and informal conversations with coaches.

Data also supports that criteria is not relayed directly to coaches in the hiring process, but the desire for that criteria to be relayed is increasing from Head Coaches (Barber & Eckrich, 1998). Coaches say that evaluations are fair when they occur frequently, are descriptive, and provide feedback and appropriate strategies for improvement. Research shows that many coaching evaluations are informal, and coaches are unaware of the criteria utilized in evaluating their coaches (Barber & Eckrich, 1998). This shows that when criteria for evaluation is transparent, the ability for one to do their job increases (Barber & Eckrich, 1998).

The amount of coaching changes that occur in a program over a certain amount of time also affects the stability of the program. Studies show that win/loss record has a small amount of affect on the program for the following year. Studies show that when programs change Head Coaches, the affects are weighted much more than wins and losses, and can affect more important areas such as APR ratings for the program as well (Johnson, Blom, Judge, Lee, Pierce, & Ridley, 2013). Research shows that there were 80.62% external hires, compared to the 19.18% internal hires when a Head Coach of a program leaves at the Division I FBS level. Data and results suggest that hiring a new coach externally increases the chance of reducing APR rate for student-athletes at that universities. Internal hires saw a slight increase and positive change to APR scores compared to external hires, but still causing APR rates to drop in certain instances (Johnson, Blom, Judge, Lee, Pierce, & Ridley, 2013).

Future Recommendations

For this synthesis, a collection of data showed that there are numerous different ways to look at evaluations and assessments for College Head Coaches. There are many different factors in the evaluation process, starting with the philosophy of an athletic director. The following recommendations are made as a result of the literature review of administrative practices. Researchers should look at the Division I level separately because of contrast in philosophies and the difference in evaluation is more based off wins and losses. Next, looking at Men's and Women's sports separately would also be beneficial to future researchers. Discrepancies in income for Head Coaches are also extremely different, causing the evaluation process and criteria as a whole to be different as well.

Appendix A

Article Grid

Author	Title	Source	Purpose	Methods & Procedures	Analysis	Findings	Discussion/ Recommendations Research Notes – Commonalities/Differences
Maclean & Zakrajsek	Factors Considered Important for Evaluating Canadian University Athletic Coaches	Journal of Sport Management, 1996, 10, 446-462	The purpose of this study was to assess the coaching performance based on the job specific assessment criteria that has been rated by administrators and coaches.	87 Administrators and 532 Coaches from 45 different Universities were mailed full population surveys on the importance of six different specific criteria. Out of all of the participants, four held dual positions (Athletic Director and Coach), and they were all designated as Athletic Directors, and the title of Coach was	Data was compiled using a questionnaire containing 2 sections: The Scale of Coaching Performance (SCP) and demographics. The SCP was developed to focus on job-developing criteria in six domains: Team Products, Personal Products, Direct Task Behaviors, Indirect Task Behaviors, Administra	The mean of the data was found for each criteria, and compiled into a standard deviation chart. ANOVA showed that The direct task behaviors criteria was considered the most important dimension with a combined standard deviation of 6.26 between Administrators and Coaches, oppose to the personal products dimension which was rated the lowest with a	Operational Definitions of criteria for job description: 1. Team Products: Outcomes of coaching that accrue only to the team or individual athletes comprising it. 2. Personal Products: Outcomes of coaching that accrue only to the coach. 3. Direct Task Behaviors: Applying interpersonal skills, strategies, and tactics in enhancing the athletes individually

| | | | | excluded. Out of all of the surveys mailed out, 77 Administrators (20F and 57M) (89%) and 363 Coaches (88F and 269M) (68%) responded. | tive Maintenance Behaviors, and Public Relations Behaviors. Each questionnaire yielded the question: How important is each of the following criteria in evaluating job performance? The order of criteria was randomized, and answered based on a Likert skale, ranging from Not important (1) to Very Important (7). | combined 3.69 standard deviation between coaches and administrators. | and as a team. 4. Indirect Task Behaviors: Activities such as recruiting, scouting, application of statistics that contribute indirectly to the program. 5. Administrative Maintenance Behaviors: Adherance to policites, guidelines, and interpersonal relations with superiors and peers that strengthen the administration. 6. Public Relations Behaviors: Liaison activities between the program and relevant community |

							and peer groups.
							Overall results of questionnaire (Average of answer based off of Likert scale 1-7):
							1. Direct Task Related Behavior: 6.26
							2. Team Products: 5.34
							3. Administrative Maintenance Behaviors: 5.21
							4. Indirect Task Behaviors: 4.96
							5. Public Relations Behaviors: 4.37
							6. Personal Products: 3.69.
							Notable differences in rating of importance between Coaches and Administrators showed heavily in the indirect task behavior (A= 5.35, C=4.87) and Administrative Task Behavior categories (A=5.63, C=5.15).
Maxcy	Efficiency	Journal of	The	120	Efficiency	The efficiency	These constructed

and Managerial Performance in FBS College Football: To the Employment and Succession Decisions, Which Matters the Most, Coaching or Recruiting?	Sports Economics 14(4) 368-388, 2013	purpose of this study is to develop a model of managerial efficiency for the NCAA's (National Collegiate Athletic Association) top division's college football coaches. Efficiency measures are directly linked to the hiring and firing process.	Universities Head Football Coaches in the FBS (Football Bowl Subdivision) are evaluated through observations. 1,186 coaching-year observations occur over a 10 year span. Observations over the span of the first three years are used to calculate talent use efficiency rankings for the next seven years, setting up the 706 evaluations and observations used over that time frame. Coaches are evaluated based on	of input use and input assemblage is estimated using a parametrically estimated efficiency frontier. 120 Universities head coaching positions at the Division 1 level in the NCAA are evaluated over a ten year span. Coaching performance is evaluated strictly on the programs wins/losses in a season. Wins/losses are then weighted by strength of schedule by a simple rating system	of the market is based and assessed on Universities making good choices that on average improve the performance when replacing an underperforming coach. The consistent finding is that the new coach in his first year on the job over a previous coach shows improvement and success. Studies also show that if coaches win immediately with the previous coaches roster and talent, they will more likely be able to continue success over a duration of time. Studies show that recruiting	efficiency rankings in the study are used to evaluate the hiring and firing decisions. Efficiency is also assessed by evaluating if universities are making a good choice and are able to improve the performance of teams while firing an underperforming coach. **Turnover Rate:** Nearly 20% of the 120 Head Coaching positions in the NCAA's FBS (Football Bowl Subdivision) are turned over each year. Reasoning: Highly Effective coaches receive lucrative offers from teams to improve their program, and those who do not meet expectations are dismissed immediately. **Difference in schools:** Half of the members of the FBS belong to "high resource"

| | | | | the criteria of W-L%, Conference W-L%, SRS, Talent use efficiency, and Recruiting efficiency. | (SRS). | efficiency spikes directly at hire, then shows decline as time goes on.

Over the ten year span, the combination of the criteria listed in the methods (W-L%, Conference W-L%, SRS, Talent use efficiency, and Recruiting efficiency) yield an efficiency rank. Of the 15 best first-year efficiency ranks, seven held their position until the end of the study, five voluntarily moved to a different position, and three coaches were fired. Of the 15 worst first-year efficiency ranked coaches, 12 were fired | conferences. These are schools with TV Deals and broadcasting rights etc..

Contracts: Pay for assistant coaches at "upper level" Division 1 schools potentially can be drastically higher than head coaches from a lower level Division 1 school.

Hiring Process: Internal Hires: Hiring that comes from within the program, typically an assistant coach, usually an offensive or defensive coordinator.

External Hires: Hiring that comes from outside of the program, typically a lower level coach moving up to an upper-level program. Can also be from another upper-level school.

The hiring process and coaching market is extremely competitive due to compensation. The football coach at an upper level |

						from the position before the study ended and three remained head coach at that school.	program is routinely the highest paid employee at the university.
Pierce, Johnson, Krohn, & Judge	Who should we hire?: Examining coaching succession in NCAA Division 1 women's basketball	International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching 2017, Vol. 12(2) 151-161	The purpose of this study was to evaluate the performance of newly hired coaches in relation to the previous coach, thus providing guidance to help decision makers in college athletic departments.	The study examined 185 coaching changes in Division I Women's basketball. Data collection occurred from the years 2000-2009. Data was collected from online sources such as; department websites, EADA (Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act) database, and performance rankings for Athletic Directors. Six categories were	The study examined 185 coaching changes in Division I Women's basketball in 16 conferences. Data was collected and analyzed from online sources. Factors affected the analysis by reducing the data to one of the following factors; demographics, coaching ability, coaching experience, past	The data produced results that said when hiring a new candidate, hiring someone with 1 year of experience resulted in 1 more win over a 3 year period in Women's basketball. Data also found that the more wins that the team had before the coaching change, the higher the chance the team would lose more games increased. The Coaches demographics proved to be an effective way to hire a	Division I Women's basketball attracts more viewers than any other Women's sport in the country (8.2 million attendees, 3.1 million viewers for the National Championship in 2015). The Women's basketball coach carries the highest basketball salary, and a successful coach can increase attendance, publicity, and corporate and donor support for the institution. 22 coaching changes in Women's basketball in 2015. On average, 11.5 coaching vacancies a tear. 3 factors for new coaching success; 1. New coaches

				examined:	team	new coach	positively
				1. The Coaches experience. 2. Coaches previous performance. 3. Coaches demographic characteristics. 4. Hiring Factors. 5. Characteristics of the institution. 6. Previous success of the program.	performance, hiring factors, and institutional factors. The study used LCA (Latent Class Analysis) to reduce data to one item per factor.	(34% increase in wins per season). Coaching experience (increase in 27% wins per season) proved to be far less affective on a new team compared to the coaches ability (increase in 37%)	impact team performance (Common Sense Theory) 2. New coaches negatively impact programs (Vicious Cycle Theory) 3. New coaches have no impact on team performance (Ritual Scapegoating theory).

| Barber & Eckrich | Methods and Criterial Employed in the Evaluation of Intercollegiate Coaches | Journal of Sport Management, 1998, 12, 301-322 | The purpose of this study is to examine the procedures used by Division I,II, and III Athletic Directors to evaluate their Coaching staffs. | Questionnaires were mailed to 660 AD's. In total, 389 responses were accepted and included in the study (143 Division 1, 90 Division 2, and 156 Division 3). Athletic Directors received input from athletes, coaches self-evaluations, senior associate AD's and University Administrators in the evaluation process.

Two criteria were used: 1, participants had to be responsible for evaluating coaches in the sports of | Factor analysis of evaluation criteria yielded eight evaluation factors for basketball coaches, along with seven evaluation factors for cross country coaches. MANOVAs examining divisional differences in the evaluation process indicated that significant differences exist between sports. | The descriptive analysis of the questionnaire showed that 76.6% of the administrators in this study stated that the primary motives for evaluation were both professional development and contract renewal. 17% of athletic directors reported that they had no formal system of evaluation in place.

The most common methods used were as followed; Formal Athlete Evaluations, informal athlete evaluations, formal observations, impressions, informal observations, formal meetings with coaches, and | NCAA legislation has increased academic standard, limited the number of practice hours, adjusted the length of seasons, and increased the behavioral expectations for student athletes.

Coaches say that evaluations are fair when they occur frequently, are descriptive, and provide feedback and appropriate strategies for improvement.

"The problem is that we have organized a commercial entertainment activity within an educational environment".

Suggests that many coaching evaluations are informal, and coaches are unaware of the criteria utilized in evaluating their coaches. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | basketball and cross country (Men's or Women's). Two, participants were required to be involved in the evaluation of coaches in the institution.

Other forms of evaluation consisted of one on one meeting with coaches, along with attending and watching contests. | | informal conversations with coaches.

Depending on level, criteria was differently weighted. Program success (defined by outcome) was the lowest rated factor for all basketball coaches, it was rated most important for Division 1 basketball coaches oppose to Division 2 and 3 coaches. Division 1 and 2 schools also valued fundraising skills more in the evaluation process. | |
| Turner | Conflict of Interest in the Intercollegiate Athletics Management Structure- | Sport Journal 2015, p2 1p Database: SPORTDiscus with Full Text. | The purpose of this study is to explore the conflicts of | 61 articles were combined to collect data. Data was collected from 2009-current. In | The study looked in detail at four major criteria points: Trustees, Managerial Conflict | In a survey of 95 presidents, 51% said that sports help generate revenue and fund the rest of the university. | Prior to 1997, management and control had been vested in a council of athletic administrators and faculty representatives. |

The impetus for Nullification of Presidential Authority		interest in the university management structure, in specific, will look to see who overseeing and responsible for the management of the athletic department and college coaches at Universities.	all, 95 presidents over Universities were surveyed by the Knight Commission. Questionnaires and surveys were collected and studied to gather information about the breakdown of management structure in Universities. Surveys also collected data in which reported reasons for hiring and firing coaches in articles collected.	of Interest, Presidential Perspective, and Conflict of Interest Management Strategies. TV Revenue and winning is putting pressure on University Presidents and Athletic Directors to hire coaches that win. With TV Revenue causing the spike in salaries for Head Coaches, compensation has grew 750% over the past 25 years in Division 1 College Football. Presidents and	University presidents are not involved in day-to-day management of programs, but the presidents are in position to ensure policies are in place. Presidents routinely entice private donors with athletic events, sideline credentials, and locker room visits with the team. A winning team makes a donor likely to cut a check for new facilities such as libraries or rec. centers, making it tougher to fire or discipline a coach who is winning (even if it sacrifices morals and values)	As of 1997, the NCAA has given the Presidents of the university full authority for the governance of intercollegiate programs nationally. The root of conflict of interests begins in the environment of large television contracts and the race to increase revenues on university campuses, and here is where the change in mindset that values the importance of athletics over academics lies. "The key in not the existence of conflicts of interests, but the management of conflicts of interest." Process based decision making being strategically deployed with the utilization of analyzing information, evaluating choices, making decisions, and establishing connections must

					Athletic Directors value their Head Coaches and base their decisions off of Coaching Strengths such as; leadership, efficiency, and vision.	Bowl Championship series and TV Rights for the top five conferences produce $14 Billion in TV right fees.	occur. **Scandal:** Outgrowth of infractions of NCAA rules and regulations committed by coaches and student-athletes.
Powers, Judge, & Makela	An investigation of destructive leadership in a Division 1 intercollegiate athletic department: Follower Perceptions and reactions.	International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching. 2016, Vol. 11 (3) 297-311	The purpose of this study is to identify how three head coaches, one associate athletic director, and a facilities manager displayed and reacted to six years of destructive leadership.	The site of the department was at a large Midwestern research institution in the United States, with 16,000 students enrolled. The budget for annual operation was approximately $23 million dollars. In all, 70 people were involved in the research population, which oversaw	A qualitative interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) was conducted. Semi-structured, tape recorded interviews were conducted. Questions asked were: Did you work with a destructive leader?, What was the impact	The focus today is Administrators are focused on raising money, hiring superstar coaches, building and enhancing facilities, signing broadcasting agreements, and growing multi-million dollar operations. Alumni, fans, spectators, media pressure, constant turnover, huge egos, and a continual demand for	**Destructive Leaders:** Charisma, Personalized Powers, Negative Life Themes, Ideology of Hate, Personalized need for power. **Conformers:** Comply with leader out of fear. Unmet needs, Negative Self-Evaluations, Immaturity. **Colluders:** Seek personal gain, Share the same worldview of the leader, Ambitious. **Five Factors are vital for destructive**

| | | | | 460 student athletes (7 Men's teams and 10 Women's teams). The school studied was a Division 1 school.

Invitations to participate in the study were emailed to ten head coaches, five administrative personnel, and two assistant Athletic Directors. In all, seven participants agreed to participate in the study.

Step one: Annotating the text closely.

Step two: Reduction of the object, interpreting | of working within a destructive collegiate program?

Each interview was transcribed verbatim. Each participant was allowed to read their transcript to proof read to ensure clarity in their responses. | success are factors that affect decisions Coaches and Administrators make.

Study found that the president and the Athletic Director of the University were destructive leaders.

In surveys, coaches stated that the Athletic Director needed power and was a narcissist. In a 5 year tenure, the AD fired 16 coaches. 11/12 coaches for the Women's teams were fired or resigned in this time frame.

This resulted in two college coaches that were deemed destructive to | **leadership:** Instability, Perceived threat, Cultural Values, Absence of Checks and Balances, Institutionalization.

Top-down policies have the effect to completely ruin an entire athletic department. Player-coach relationships build a foundation for success, which in turn produces wins, which keeps coaches around by their Athletic Director. |

| | | | | and developing answers into a statement.

Step three: Data grouped and synthesized into structure.

Step four: Researcher analyzed the data. | | the athletic department. Assistant coaches under these coaches committed NCAA rules violations over a time period. Coaches held open gym workouts, and mandated workouts (both NCAA infractions). | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Johnson, Blom, Judge, Lee, Pierce, & Ridley | The Impact of Football Bowl Subdivision Head Coaching Changes on NCAA Academic Progress Rate | Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 2013, 6, 131-154 | The purpose of this study is to measure the potential affect all head coaching changes in NCAA Division 1 FBS have on the APR for student-athletes. | All 160 FBS football coaching changes were reviewed by the NCAA APR portfolio.

Data was measure over the three-year span where coaching changes occurred (previous year, year of change, and following year).

Information to | Step 1: Descriptive analysis was used to measure frequency totals. Step 2: Hypothesis were tested using sampled t-tests. ANOVA was also used to evaluate and compare groups in the data based on single and average | Results show that there were 110 negative coaching changes compared to only 50 positive coaching changes. Also, there were 80.62% external hires, compared to the 19.18% internal hires. Data and results suggest that hiring a new coach externally increases the chance of reducing APR | This study shows the importance of academics during the turnover during a coaching change. |

				determine positive or negative change was extracted from university websites.	annual winning percentage.	rate for student-athletes at that universities. Internal hires saw increase and positive change to APR scores, compared to external hires. 11/12 conferences in Division 1 football in the study showed more negative changes than positive changes to APR during a coaching switch. In the first year of the coaching change, win percentages were also lower in 11/12 conferences compared to the following 8 year win percentages.	

References

Coy, B., & Masterson, G. (2007). Hiring a Winning Coach & Coping with Stress. Coach & Athletic Director, 76(9), 32-35.

Powers, S., Judge, L. W., Makela, C., McKenna, J., & Voight, M. (2016). An investigation of destructive leadership in a Division I intercollegiate athletic department: Follower perceptions and reactions. International Journal Of Sports Science & Coaching, 11(3), 297-311.

Barber, H., & Eckrich, J. (1998). Methods and Criteria Employed in the Evaluation of Intercollegiate Coaches. Journal Of Sport Management, 12(4), 301.

Conflicts of Interest in the Intercollegiate Athletics Management Structure -- The Impetus for Nullification of Presidential Authority. (2015). Sport Journal, 2.

Pierce, D. A., Johnson, J. E., Krohn, B. D., & Judge, L. W. (2017). Who should we hire?: Examining coaching succession in NCAA Division I women's basketball. International Journal Of Sports Science & Coaching, 12(2), 151-161.

Maxcy, J. G. (2013). Efficiency and Managerial Performance in FBS College Football: To the Employment and Succession Decisions, Which Matters the Most, Coaching or Recruiting?. Journal Of Sports Economics, 14(4), 368-388.

MacLean, J., & Dorothy3Zakrajsek. (1996). Factors Considered Important for Evaluating Canadian University Athletic Coaches. Journal Of Sport Management, 10(4), 446-462.

Reid, H. L. (2014). John R. Wooden, Stephen R. Covey and Servant

     Leadership. International Journal Of Sports Science & Coaching, 9(1), 49-52.

Langan, E., Blake, C., & Lonsdale, C. (2013). Systematic review of the effectiveness of

     interpersonal coach education interventions on athlete outcomes. Psychology Of

     Sport & Exercise, *14*(1), 37-49.

Johnson, J.E., Blom, L. C., Judge, L. W., Lee, D., Pierce, D. A., & Ridley, M.J. (2013).

     The Impact of Football Bowl Subdivision Head Coaching Changes on NCAA

     Academic Progress Rate. *Journal Of Issues In Intercollegiate Athletics, 6* 131-

     154.