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What is this madness!
NCAA March Madness

Established 1982
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Overview

• Brief history of women’s basketball.
• Talking Madness.
• Pressing policy issues in today’s NCAA women’s sports.
• Where are the women? Women in NCAA coaching and administration.
• Adding Method to the Madness
• Discussion.
Senda Berenson of Smith introduces an altered form of Naismith’s “basketball” to her students.

Many rule changes, resulting in a game more similar to the men’s.

A women’s basketball rule book is released titled “Basquette”

Commencement of 8 team Women’s Professional Basketball League.

First national women’s intercollegiate basketball championship

UCONN sets longest winning streak in college basketball history.

First NCAA WBB tournament

First national women’s intercollegiate basketball championship

Inaugural WNBA season

All-American Red Heads (1936-1986).
“Queens of the Court”
The 6-on-6 game in Iowa

In 1925, the Iowa High School Athletic Association voted to stop sponsoring girls basketball tournaments. In response, a group of 25 administrators formed the Iowa Girls High School Athletic Union.

Through community sponsorships, the IGHSAU published a rule book and yearbook, ran coaching academies, and tournament games were televised. Especially in rural areas, girls IGHSAU games outsold the boys tournament.
Is there madness without parity?
What Accounts for Madness?

Top Women’s Teams Win — A Lot
Win percentages in NCAA tournament round of 64 since 1995
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Women’s Basketball – Meeting High Expectations

Top Women’s Teams Meet High Expectations
Average margins of victory in NCAA tournament round of 64 since 2003. Expected margins are based on SRS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margin of victory</td>
<td>Margin of victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph showing margin of victory for men's and women's basketball teams" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Women’s Basketball – Growing Talent

Teams have the chance to get good. Women benefit from:

- Player development
- Good recruiting
- Skillful coaching
Pure Basketball

“We have a tendency to cuddle up to good players rather than good teams. But it’s a fundamental part of women’s basketball.”

Women’s Basketball – Opportunity for Greatness

“You don’t tune into witness madness, you tune in to witness greatness.”

–Benjamin Moore, columnist.
Pressing Policy Issues in Today’s NCAA Women’s Sports

"One way or the other, the NCAA has a wrong-headed and discriminatory distribution policy. Title IX made gender equity in higher education the law of the land back in the 1972. Male and female athletes are supposed to be treated equally. Yet 45 years after the passage of Title IX, women are 43.4 percent of all college athletes, yet they constitute 57 percent of the all undergraduate students.”

-Andrew Zimbalist, Hartford Courant, March 29, 2017
Why NCAA Sports are Being Called “racist”

The frame:
Are mostly “white” college sports being supported on the backs of sports with larger “black” participation (Men’s Basketball and Football) with such demanding terms they can’t be true student-athletes?
Too Rich to Resist?

Revenues for Men’s D1 Basketball and Football have increased, making them in some cases more valuable commercial enterprises than professional sports teams.

The question: Are they really “college” sports?
Too Rich to Resist?

How the University of Alabama Makes $88.7 Million with the Crimson Tide Football Program

- Ticket Sales
- Donations
- NCAA/SEC Revenue (e.g. bowl games, TV)
- Other
- Broadcasting Rights
- Sport Camps
- Ad sales, Sponsorships, Licensing
- Endowments and Investments
- Concessions/Parking

SOURCE: BusinessOfCollegeSports.com
Market Risk

The hyper commercialization of Men’s Basketball and Football has been extremely lucrative for top programs – and extremely financially damaging for others in this arms race, who increasingly raise student fees to cover athletic department expenses.
Colleges seem not to know how to treat Women’s DI Basketball. Should they produce revenue – or not? They are included in TV and sponsorships deals, but don’t drive them. Players have demanding schedules, but graduate and go onto careers.
Making Money Moves—or not?

Within UCONN

Between women’s teams

Cost of Ticket | Revenue | Expense
---|---|---
Mississippi State | South Carolina | UCONN
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Trade-off or Balance?

What are college sports for? Making money and grabbing attention? Broad participation? Pre-Pro Development? Is a women’s team making revenue a sign of success – or the entrenchment of commercialism?
Breaking News: Bribery & Corruption

Several Universities May Be Implicated in Basketball Probe, New Report Suggests

Words of NCAA President Mark Emmert

NCAA statement on Yahoo! Sports story

February 23, 2018 7:37am

“These allegations, if true, point to systematic failures that must be fixed and fixed now if we want college sports in America. Simply put, people who engage in this kind of behavior have no place in college sports. They are an affront to all those who play by the rules. Following the
**Where are the Women Coaches & Administrators?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Division III: **45.7%** of coaches are females in 2017-2018*
Women in College Coaching Report Card
DIII Longitudinal Research Series

Athletic Directors

- Female: 19.6%
- Male: 80.4%

Female ADs by Race

- White: 87%
- Black: 9%
- Other: 4%
Percentage of Female DIII Head Coaches 2017-18

Three institutions had 100% women head coaches: Mass College of Liberal Arts, Mitchell and Sweet Briar College

- Squash
- Water Polo
- Golf
- Triathlon
- XC
- Track
- Wrestling

- Fencing
- Diving
- Alpine Ski
- Nordic Ski
- Tennis
- Swimming

- Rifle
- Ice Hockey
- Rowing
- Soccer
- Bowling

- Softball
- Volleyball
- Basketball
- Gymnastics

- Field Hockey
- Equestrian
- Lacrosse

7.9% of institutions
27.7% of institutions
36.5% of institutions
19% of institutions
9% of institutions
DIII Report Card: by school
New England Men’s and Women’s Athletic Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Head Coaches (%)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Holyoke</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babson</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPI</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Coast Guard</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is Progress Slow & Stagnant?

Women face **systematic bias** (LaVoi 2016).

Systemic inequalities within sport (Holloman, 2016; LaVoi 2016; Sabo, Veliz & Staurowsky 2016).

Bias results in unequal treatment, evaluation, perception and interpretation.

Stereotypical behaviors and ideologies linked with coaching are associated with men and masculinity.

Failure to address bias and structural systemic inequalities have likely limited upward change in percentage of women coaches.
How to Create a Family-friendly Athletics Department for Women (and Men)

• Ease concerns around childcare
• Encourage coaches to take a break
• Open doors to family members
Method to the Madness

In 2017, which team stats predicted tournament (bracket) wins? (using Feb. 19 AP top 25 teams)

- Season win-loss percentage
- Season scoring margin
- Seed for Tournament
- Coach years with team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Win %</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScoreMargin</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoachYears</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which teams are successful in ALL three dimensions?
## TEAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Team</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Oklahoma State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Oregon State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mississippi State</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Case for Mississippi State and how they beat UCONN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FG Made/Attempted</th>
<th>Total Rebounds</th>
<th>Offensive Rebs.</th>
<th>Fouls</th>
<th>FT Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State</td>
<td>25/67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCONN</td>
<td>20/46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UCONN, Baylor, Mississippi State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UCONN</th>
<th>Baylor</th>
<th>Mississippi State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FG Attempted</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB per game</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Margin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Margin</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UCONN and Baylor – 28 games
MS – 30 games
Embrace the Greatness!

Thank you!!