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ABSTRACT

Coaches have a significant impact on the sport performances and experiences of student-athletes. Further, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) has continued to professionalize and grow into a multibillion-dollar business. Despite the coaches’ importance and the evolution of the NCAA, human resource practices, specifically performance management of coaches in NCAA athletic departments, is scarcely examined. This leaves a significant gap in the literature and potentially fuels the epidemic of mental health challenges among student-athletes as well as litigation within athletic departments. Therefore, this study sought to fill this gap in the literature and describe the performance management systems for coaches within NCAA, Division I athletic departments. This study employed a mixed-methods approach using surveys and document analysis. Participants were NCAA, Division I coaches (n=310) and NCAA, Division I athletic administrators with direct sport oversight responsibilities (n=208). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and thematic analysis. Results describe the phenomenon of performance management within NCAA athletic departments through the lens of a four-component operationalization of performance management. Further, the results elicit coach and administrator perceptions relative to the four-components of performance management. Theoretical and practical implications as well as study limitations and future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Sport coaching is a dynamic job which requires a diverse skill set and knowledge base to thrive in the rapidly changing sport landscape (Garner & Hill, 2017). Coaches generally report building knowledge through their personal experiences and observations of other coaches (Gummerson, 1992); however, research also suggests that experience is transformed into knowledge more effectively when coaches reflect on their experiences (Gilbert & Trudel, 2005; Martens, 1987). Gilbert and Trudel (2001) highlight that for reflection to happen, sport administrative bodies need to cultivate a space that allows and encourages coaches to engage in reflective practices, ideally in conjunction with their peers. Reflection, an avenue for professional development, is particularly important for coaches because of the lack of formalized education necessary to enter the profession (Gilbert & Trudel, 2005). Although there has been an increase in formalized coach education programs, when coach education occurs out of context, or has limited direct applicability to the real issues coaches face, there may be a limited impact (Gilbert & Trudel, 2001). Therefore, reflection allows coaches to transform their realized experiences into knowledge and move toward more effective coaching practices that meet the needs of today’s student-athlete and the rapidly changing intercollegiate sporting environment.

The concept of reflection and professional development for coaches is particularly important because of the distinct impact coaches can have on athletes. Sport coaches remain the most salient figure in shaping the experiences of athletes. Gano-Overway and
Dieffenbach (2019) stated, “The importance of quality coaches has been associated with elements of sport participation ranging from positive youth development to athlete physical safety to athlete mental wellbeing” (p. 226). However, not all athletes exit sport with outcomes such as positive development and wellbeing (Vertommen et al., 2018). Rather, an athlete’s experience largely hinges on how the sport experience is facilitated, namely through the coach. Negative coaching practices can instigate a range of outcomes for athletes, particularly when athletes experience maltreatment (Kerr et al., 2020). Maltreatment refers to “voluntary acts that result in, or have the potential to result in, physical or psychological harm” (Crooks & Wolf, 2007, p. 3). Kerr et al. (2020) conducted a study with former female athletes on the Canadian National Team to explore the long-term effects of emotionally abusive coaching practices. The participants described being “fearful, anxious, nervous, unhappy, depressed, [and experiencing] occasional suicide ideation” while being subjected to the emotionally abusive team environments (Kerr et al., 2020, p. 83). Further, when the participants retired from sport, the mental health challenges that developed in sport followed them into “real life” with some participants reporting that it took up to six years to reach a healthy mental equilibrium. Further, each participant required the assistance of a mental health professional to guide their recovery from a traumatic sport experience (Kerr et al., 2020). Interestingly, participants had mixed perceptions of how these coaching practices influenced their performance with many participants reporting that these coaching practices were detrimental to their performance (Kerr et al., 2020). However, emotionally abusive coaching practices are normalized within sport culture and largely seen as
necessary for athletes to reach peak performance (Jacobs et al., 2017). This normalization has created a greater barrier for disrupting negative coaching practices. Jacobs et al. (2017) conducted a study with elite youth gymnastics coaches and board of directors members for the National Gymnastics Association (NGA) within the Netherlands. The findings revealed that there is a hierarchy of tolerance for inappropriate coaching behavior. For example, one participant (NGA board of directors member) said, “We have never had incidences of sexual harassment. Instead we have had situations of total control, intimidation, name calling such as: ’fat swine’ or ’pig’ and yelling and embarrassing these kids” (Jacobs et al., 2017, p. 132). The directors positioned sexual abuse and physical abuse as non-negotiable; however, emotional abuse was simply seen as a necessary tactic toward winning, and winning was the priority. Further, the directors placed trust in coaches that they know how to coach and produce “winners.” Therefore, the directors provided little oversight into coaching behavior to ensure the safety of their athletes. Although, when the directors did witness emotionally abusive coaching behavior, it was seen as normal and necessary, and was not addressed (Jacobs et al., 2017). Therefore, the administrators were blind to emotionally abusive coaching behavior because of its normalization within the culture, or they were not willing to disrupt the behavior because they did not want to risk disrupting performance. Jacobs et al. (2017) demonstrated the discourse present within sport suggests that abusive and controlling behavior is necessary in elite sport; However, Kerr and colleagues' (2020) dismantle this notion by demonstrating that many of their participants felt their performance was actually hindered by these behaviors. Furthermore, Kerr and colleagues’ (2020)
participants experienced significant distress, during their time as an athlete and after as a result of these coaching practices.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), the largest governing body for collegiate sport, has experienced significant change in the past three decades with the growing professionalization of collegiate sport and shifting priorities among stakeholders. In 1991, the NCAA called upon its member institutions to promote the holistic development of its student-athletes through the provision of life skills programming within athletic departments (Navarro & Malvaso, 2015). Since 1991, athletic departments responded by providing greater resources within specialized areas such as mental health counseling, nutrition, and academic support; however, it is unclear the role athletic departments play in providing professional development opportunities for coaches to adapt to the changing sport landscape and attend to the needs of their student-athletes. Although resources such as mental health counseling, nutrition, and academic advising are welcomed and aid in the holistic care of student-athletes, the coach has one of the more proximal relationships with student-athletes, and therefore should be educated on and held accountable to coaching practices that further the holistic care movement for student-athletes.

Literature clearly demonstrates the damaging effects of negative coaching practices (Stirling & Kerr, 2008; Kerr et al., 2020). Further, the socialization and culture within sport, widens the power differential between coach and athlete, creating more opportunity for coaching practices to remain unchecked and instances of coach maltreatment to be unreported (Kerr & Stirling, 2019). This heightens the importance of
safeguarding measures within sport (Kerr & Stirling, 2019) and mechanisms to disrupt the normalization of these behaviors (Kerr et al., 2020). Additionally, these issues present greater justification and demonstrate a heightened need for professional development opportunities within coaching to shift the coaching paradigm toward practices that nourish athletes while also facilitating desired performance outcomes rather than viewing these variables as dichotomous. Therefore, it is important to understand the expectations organizations have for their coaches as well as how their performance is measured, managed, and improved.

**Coach Performance and Coach Misconduct**

One of the more objective, mainstream strategies for evaluating a coach’s ability and performance is through performance outcomes such as a team’s record or individual athlete performance outcomes (Mallett & Côté, 2006). Although a coach’s win-loss record does provide insight into the team’s athletic performance, it gives little insight into the mechanisms driving this performance or even the overall effectiveness of the coach. Additionally, winning does not necessarily equate to great coaching (Becker, 2009). Becker (2009) concluded:

…Great coaching cannot solely be determined on the basis of win-loss records or media attention….the true essence of greatness was captured in athlete experiences of who their coaches were, what they did, how they did it, and how it influenced them. (p. 112)

Coach Bobby Knight, former head men’s basketball coach at Indiana University, led his team to three national championships during his tenure. However, Coach Knight
routinely used abusive tactics with players (Puma, n.d.). Similarly, Coach Teri McKeever, head swimming coach at the University of California, Berkeley, led her team to four national championships and five conference championships while earning nine conference coach of the year distinctions and being elected as the head coach of the 2012 women’s Olympic swimming team (Cal Athletics, n.d.). However, Coach McKeever was recently put on administrative leave following allegations of abuse from her athletes, both past and present (Gonzalez, 2022). Athletes allege that McKeever’s abuse has been transpiring for decades resulting in injuries, negative sport experiences, and diminished mental health. Similarly, the head baseball coach at the University of San Francisco was recently fired following litigation amid allegations of sexual misconduct and verbal abuse (ESPN, 2022). One athlete reported that the abuse endured on the team led them to contemplate suicide (NBC Bay Area Staff, 2022). Marlene Stollings, former women’s basketball coach at Texas Tech University was fired after allegations of a toxic culture within her program (Associated Press, 2020). Athletes from Coach Stollings’ program reported experiencing depression, anxiety, and panic disorder while being subjected to the team environment (Schwartz, 2020). Unfortunately, there are a plethora of examples of negative sport experiences caused by toxic team environments and maltreatment which could have been prevented through proper coach education and evaluation (Dodgson, 2020; Stirling & Kerr, 2013; Yancey-Bragg, 2021; Yoesting, 2022). The consequences of this behavioral misconduct is far reaching with implications for both individuals and institutions.
The aforementioned examples highlight the importance of organizations having clear expectations for coaches and providing oversight into their performance.

**Risk Management**

Further, the absence of professional development and performance management systems for coaches pose substantial risk for institutions and athletic departments. Corbett (2002) identifies three steps in risk management: (1) identifying risks, (2) measuring risks, and (3) controlling risks. Anecdotal evidence suggests that there is substantial risk posed when there is little education and oversight into the behavioral processes coaches use to drive performance outcomes. This is evident through the increase in student-athlete suicide, with the loss of more than four student-athletes since the start of 2022 (Dodd, 2022). These social issues leave institutions vulnerable to litigation and financial instability. Therefore, the risk has been identified and now instances of measuring and controlling the risks are warranted. A potential mechanism for measuring and controlling the risk is the performance management of coaches. Performance management encompasses “a continuous process of identifying, measuring, and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning performance with the strategic goals of the organization” (Aguinis, 2013, p. 2).

The literature routinely recognizes performance management (encompassing performance appraisal) as a cornerstone of effective human resource management practices (DeNisi et al., 2021; DeNisi, 2011). Further, literature outlines two different purposes that performance management systems have within organizations: administrative and developmental. Performance management systems fulfill
administrative purposes such as documentation, regulation, and compliance (Cunningham & Dixon, 2003). Further, performance management systems serve developmental purposes such as opportunity for reflection, knowledge generation, and professional development (Cunningham & Dixon, 2003). Research suggests that performance management systems geared toward developmental purposes may be more effective in actually changing employee behavior and enhancing employee performance (Rubin & Edwards, 2020). This suggests that performance management systems geared toward administrative purposes may serve the organization in record keeping, but not actually enhance the performance or development of the employee. Although extant literature recognizes the critical importance of having a performance management system in place, Barber and Eckrich (1998) conducted a study within NCAA athletic departments and found that 17% of athletic departments had no system in place for the performance appraisal of its coaches. Cunningham and Dixon (2003) created a model for NCAA coach performance appraisal, however, this line of work has been relatively dormant since this contribution was made. Additionally, the NCAA and student-athlete needs have changed significantly since 2003.

Therefore, the human resource management literature clearly demonstrates the importance of performance management as a critical practice serving both administrative and developmental purposes. Further, significant evidence demonstrates the rapidly changing landscape of collegiate sport as well as the importance of the coach in facilitating positive sport experiences for athletes. Despite these changes in the collegiate sport landscape as well as the evidence supporting performance management practices
within organizational settings, there is little understanding regarding the current systems in place for performance management within collegiate athletic departments. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to uncover and describe the performance management systems athletic departments employ for coaches.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

There are multiple theoretical lenses through which this issue could be explored. However, two theoretical frameworks were chosen to guide this study because of their direct applicability to the research context (i.e., collegiate sport) and the phenomenon (i.e., performance management). Coaching effectiveness (Côté & Gilbert, 2009) and dimensions of coaching performance (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995) will serve as the guiding theoretical frameworks.

**Background on Coaching Effectiveness Frameworks**

Coaching effectiveness has historically lacked a unified conceptual framework and definition within the literature, despite decades of research on the topic (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). Some scholars have measured coaching effectiveness using a win-loss record while others examined it through the lens of athlete satisfaction and enjoyment (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Horn, 2008). Further, coaching science has repeatedly conceptualized expert coaches differently when conducting empirical research. Some studies have conceptualized the inclusion criteria for “expert coaches” as years of experience while others have relied solely on athlete performance outcomes (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). Although other models of coaching exist (see Becker, 2009; Bennie &
O’Connor, 2011; Côté et al., 1995; Valle and Bloom, 2005), the most widely accepted model is Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) model and therefore, it will be used as one of the guiding theoretical frameworks (Lyle, 2021).

**Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) Model of Coach Effectiveness**

Côté and Gilbert (2009) drew on literature within the fields of coaching, teaching, positive psychology, and athletes’ development to propose a unified definition of coaching effectiveness within three key integrated pillars: (1) knowledge, (2) athlete outcomes, and (3) coaching context.

The first pillar of coaching effectiveness within Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) conceptual model is knowledge. Knowledge is conceptualized as including professional knowledge, interpersonal knowledge, and intrapersonal knowledge. This conceptualization derives from a similar conceptualization of what is required to be an effective teacher (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). Professional knowledge includes sport-specific knowledge as well as pedagogical knowledge. Therefore, the content that a coach intends to teach to an athlete, as well as the best practices for transferring this knowledge from coach to athlete. However, Côté and Gilbert (2009) stated, “It has become apparent that professional knowledge alone is insufficient to become an effective coach” (p. 310). While professional knowledge has been the primary focus on coach education programs, interpersonal knowledge is critical to cultivate relationships where professional knowledge can be disseminated effectively. Interpersonal knowledge refers to a coach’s understanding of interpersonal dynamics and the nuances of relationships. Further interpersonal knowledge allows coaches to be agile in their responses to different
coaching situations and contexts. Therefore, interpersonal knowledge is the knowledge necessary to build and maintain effective relationships with others; which is critically important for coaches because the profession is largely rooted within social systems (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). This is particularly important in the coach-athlete relationship, however, this extends to maintaining relationships with other key stakeholders such as administrators, support staff, and other coaches in the field. Intrapersonal knowledge “refers to the understanding of oneself and the ability for introspection and reflection” (Côté & Gilbert, 2009, p. 311). Therefore, intrapersonal knowledge is a mechanism through which coaches can make sense of their experiences and leverage their experiences into learning and growth. This introspection can challenge their professional and interpersonal knowledge bases to facilitate continued improvement.

Extant literature suggests that the majority of coaching hires (across levels) are based on a candidate's demonstration of professional knowledge either through a history in sport as a high-performance athlete or a high-performing coach (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). Further, coach education primarily focuses on building professional knowledge. However, Côté and Gilbert (2009) demonstrate that these are misguided and limit coaching effectiveness. Rather, coaching effectiveness is rooted in the concurrent integration of three knowledge bases: professional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal. All three knowledge areas should be integrated into the various coaching contexts.

The second pillar of coaching effectiveness is athlete outcomes (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). Horn (2008) denoted athlete outcomes as including performance outcomes (e.g., win-loss record, success at the national or international level) and positive psychological
responses (e.g., high self-esteem, high levels of satisfaction). Côté and Gilbert (2009) also considered the positive psychology literature which denoted five-C’s to measure successful athlete outcomes. The five-C’s: competence, confidence, connection, character, and caring/compassion were later condensed to four-C’s: competence, confidence, connection, and character. The four-C conceptualization provides a more specific lens into Horn’s (2008) more macro-view of desired outcomes. Within this model, each C is defined accordingly. Competence is defined as “sport-specific technical and tactical skills, performance skills, improved health and fitness, and healthy training habits” (Côté & Gilbert, 2009, p. 314). Competence can be measured through relevant sport-specific performance indicators (e.g., achieving a personal best time; mastering a new skill, etc.). Confidence is defined as “internal sense of overall positive self-worth” (Côté & Gilbert, 2009, p. 314). Research suggests that confidence is one of the most vital characteristics a coach and sport experience should cultivate. Connection is defined as “positive bonds and social relationships with people inside and outside of sport” (Côté & Gilbert, 2009, p. 314). Therefore, sport environments should foster a sense of social connectedness and belonging for team members. Character is defined as “respect for the sport and others, integrity, empathy, and responsibility” (Côté & Gilbert, 2009, p. 314). Coaches should strive to use sport as a vehicle for character development which enables athletes to emerge as a productive member of society. This encompasses being a caring member of a team, and then ultimately a caring member of society. Effective coaching should result in positive outcomes in all of the four-C’s (competence, confidence, connection, and character) despite the context in which it takes place.
Further, empirical research supports the connection between the first pillar of coaching effectiveness (knowledge) and the second pillar (athlete outcomes). Rieke and colleagues (2008) conducted a quantitative study using survey methods to assess the relationship between servant leadership (e.g., coach knowledge) and athlete outcomes (e.g., performance, ego orientation, and satisfaction) within high school basketball players. The findings indicated that when athletes perceived their coaches to demonstrate servant leadership behaviors, this catalyzed superior athlete outcomes spanning both performance and satisfaction. Thus, providing empirical support for the connection between the first two pillars of coaching effectiveness within Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) conceptualization.

The third pillar of coaching effectiveness within this model is coaching contexts. Côté and Gilbert (2009) define coaching contexts as: “unique settings in which coaches endeavor to improve athlete outcomes” (p. 314). Trudel and Gilbert (2006) recognize three different coaching contexts: (1) recreational sport, (2) developmental sport, and (3) elite sport. Similarly, Lyle (2002) distinguished between two types of coaching contexts: participation and performance sport. These scholars recognized that for a coach to be effective, they need to recognize the context in which they are coaching to determine the necessary knowledge and behavior suited to that context and adapt accordingly (Lyle, 2002; Trudel & Gilbert, 2006). There is not universally effective coaching behavior; rather effective coaching requires a match between the sport context and coaching behavior. Côté and Gilbert (2009) recognized that, “the performance demands of a sport and the developmental level of its athletes are the two most important variables involved
in defining a specific coaching context” (p. 315). Therefore, Côté and Gilbert (2009) recognize four contextual options along two continuums (participation to performance and children to adults) including: “(a) participation coaches for children, (b) participation coaches for adolescents and adults, (c) performance coaches for young adolescents, and (d) performance coaches for older adolescents and adults” (p. 315).

Côté and Gilbert (2009) define coaching effectiveness as: “the consistent application of integrated professional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal knowledge to improve athletes’ competence, confidence, connection, and character in specific coaching contexts” (p. 316; see Figure 1; all Tables and Figures are located in Appendix A). Effective coaches are those who embody and execute the principles of coaching effectiveness. Côté and Gilbert (2009) define effective coaches as: “effective coaches are those who demonstrate the ability to apply and align their coaching expertise to athletes and situations in order to maximize athlete learning outcomes” (p. 316). Expert coaches are those who embody effective coaching repeatedly over an extended period (Côté & Gilbert, 2009).

**Review of Theoretical Model**

Côté and Gilbert (2009) present a holistic approach to coach effectiveness based on several decades of research within various disciplines. This conceptual framework is the most recent and widely accepted conceptual framework for coaching effectiveness to date (Lyle, 2021). Further, Côté and Gilbert (2009) recommend that coaching effectiveness, such as the one they proposed, should be used as a lens when examining “good” coaching.
Therefore, as the most widely accepted model within coaching science (Lyle, 2021), Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) model is a well-suited theoretical framework to guide this study and the inherent relationship between effectiveness and performance management. MacLean and Chelladurai (1995) stated, “An evaluation is a judgment about quality, value, effectiveness, or impact” (p. 194). Therefore, a sound understanding of the criteria determining effectiveness is a necessary component before engaging in an evaluation.

**Dimensions of Coaching Performance**

The dimensions of the coaching performance framework (see figure 2; MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995, p. 197) was developed through a review of literature (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995). Further this framework resulted in the coaching performance scale, which was psychometrically explored with athletic administrators within the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union. It was later tested empirically with administrators and coaches within the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic System (MacLean & Zakrajsek, 1996). Although this model was empirically examined within Canadian intercollegiate sport (MacLean & Sakrajsek, 1996), it is rooted in literature that spans geographic boundaries and encompasses a broader sense of coaching performance, thus making it applicable within the NCAA.

The model includes two major branches of performance: (1) behavioral product factors and (2) behavioral process factors. Behavioral product factors further collapse into team products and personal products. The behavioral products are performance results
accrued to either the team or an individual within the team. Team products include performance outcomes accrued by the team (e.g., conference standing, win/loss record) or individual awards to team members (e.g., SEC pitcher of the year; MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995). Personal products refer to products that directly recognize the coach (e.g., conference coach of the year award, national coach of the year award; MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995).

Behavioral process factors are the processes that lead to these results such as methods of teaching and practice organization as well as processes that lead to the overall sustainability and vitality of the organization (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995). Behavioral process factors collapse into two categories: (1) task-related and (2) maintenance related. This distinction originated in literature related to organizational effectiveness. MacLean and Chelladurai (1995) further distinguish between direct task behaviors and indirect task behaviors. MacLean and Chelladurai (1995) define direct task behaviors as the “application of interpersonal skills and appropriate strategies and tactics used to enhance the performance of individual athletes and the team as a whole” (p. 199). Examples of direct task behaviors include: “the quality of interaction with athletes, management of practice sessions, teaching skills, the ability to apply appropriate tactics and strategies, and proper utilization of the available talent” (p. 198). Indirect task behaviors indirectly impact a coach’s direct role. Examples of indirect task behaviors include “activities such as recruiting, scouting, and applying statistics that contribute indirectly to the success of the program” (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995, p. 199). Maintenance processes are defined as “behavioral processes [that] bring the coach into the larger context of the total
organization, its maintenance, and its overall effectiveness” (p. 198). Maintenance processes further collapse into administrative maintenance and public relations maintenance. Administrative maintenance behaviors include adhering to NCAA rules as well as departmental policies while maintaining healthy and functioning relationships with coworkers including other coaches, support staff, and administrators. Administrative maintenance also includes tasks such as replying to emails, adhering to a budget, and the operational processes to successfully run a team. Public relations behaviors include facilitating activities within the community and serving as a liaison for the program with different stakeholders such as the media, alumni, and community members (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995).

This model focuses on both behaviors and outcomes and suggests that a sole focus on outcomes can lead to unethical behavior and unfavorable work environments (Landy & Farr, 1983; MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995). Thus, this theoretical model recognizes the importance of both processes and outcome working coherently to inform a coach’s performance. For example, if a coach is winning but can’t maintain healthy relationships, this would negate important behavioral processes. A coach that maintains good relationships but isn’t winning negates important behavioral outcomes. Thus, the combination of the two provides a more holistic view of job performance for NCAA coaches (MacLean & Zakrajsek, 1996).

This model is particularly suitable because it is rooted in human resource management (HRM) and management literature, yet it was created to apply directly to intercollegiate athletic coaches, the population in question within this study. Further, it
differentiates between behavioral product factors and behavioral process factors, another key point of inquiry within this study.

**Justification of Theoretical Frameworks**

To my knowledge, the model of coaching effectiveness (Côté & Gilbert, 2009) and domains of coaching performance model (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995) have not been used together within scholarship. However, taken together, these models provide a more holistic approach to better understanding the performance management of coaches. The model of coaching effectiveness provides insight into the developmental needs of coaches (i.e., knowledge areas) as well as four distinct athlete outcomes to measure. These outcomes (confidence, character, competence, and connection), provide additional insight into athlete outcomes to measure outside of athletic performance outcomes (or team and personal products as recognized within MacLean & Chelladurai’s framework). Further, it demonstrates the importance for coaches to fully understand the coaching context and the goals/priorities associated with this coaching context and adapt their behavior accordingly. This is particularly important within the NCAA as there are three divisions with differing priorities between divisions as well as high levels of competitive variation within divisions. Furthermore, although other models of coaching effectiveness exist, Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) model is the most up to date, as well as the most recognized and accepted model (Lyle, 2021). Further, Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) model takes a more holistic approach to coaching effectiveness rather than other models which are tied to a specific theory or further understanding a specific facet of coaching (i.e., building a successful program, effective leadership, etc.).
For these reasons, Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) model of coaching effectiveness is being used as a guiding theoretical framework in conjunction with the domains of coaching performance.

The domain of coaching performance recognizes the unique nature of collegiate sport and the nuanced roles within a collegiate coaching position. Further, the domain of coaching performance model makes a clear delineation between products and processes and suggests that both are important to measure when evaluating the performance of a coach. Although one other model of coach performance exists (see Cunningham & Dixon, 2003), MacLean and Chelladurai’s (1995) model was intentionally chosen because of its alignment with this study. Cunningham and Dixon’s (2003) model is situated at the team level, therefore, it is suited to measuring the performance of an entire coaching staff. Further, Cunningham and Dixon (2003) state that their model is more suited toward administrative performance appraisal purposes while MacLean and Chelladurai’s (1995) model is more suited to uncover particular behaviors leading to performance outcomes and serve more development performance appraisal purposes. Therefore, MacLean and Chelladurai’s (1995) model is better suited to understanding and describing the specific criteria athletic departments measure (separated by products and processes) to determine their ultimate performance evaluation.

Therefore, these models, taken in totality, are uniquely situated to inform this study.
Statement of the Problem

Athletic departments are one of the more visible units within higher education institutions and are provided with the autonomy to regulate themselves (NCAAa, 2022). The NCAA reports that two of the Division I priorities include: institutional control and compliance and student-athlete well-being (NCAAb, 2022). However, it is unclear how athletic departments are implementing these priorities through the performance management of their coaches, one of the most critical stakeholders influencing athlete well being, performance, and experience (Kerr et al., 2020; Lever, 2022; Lopez et al., 2020; Reid, 2022; Stirling & Kerr, 2008). Further, there is a large body of evidence suggesting that sound human resource practices, such as performance management, enhance organizational performance, a critical outcome for any organization including athletic departments (Bednall et al., 2014). However, our understanding of the human resource practices, particularly in relation to measuring coach performance and influencing their continued development, is limited and outdated. While there are valid and reliable scales to measure coach effectiveness (Becker, 2009) and coach performance (MacLean & Chelludurai, 1995), it is unclear if these are being used in any meaningful way within collegiate athletics and/or other mechanisms employed to manage the performance and development of coaches.
Purpose Statement and Research Questions

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to understand and describe the performance management systems NCAA, Division I athletic departments utilize to manage the development and performance of their coaches.

Research Questions

Ten research questions (RQ) will guide this study. The RQs are:

RQ1: How do coaches perceive their performance management regarding establishing clear performance and behavioral expectations?
RQ2: How do coaches perceive their performance management in regard to collecting data to understand the achievement of expectations?
RQ3: How do coaches perceive their performance management in regard to providing consistent feedback and coaching throughout the performance cycle?
RQ4: How do coaches perceive their performance management in regard to rendering a formal performance evaluation report followed with a formal performance review meeting?
RQ5: Are administrators trained to evaluate the performance of coaches within their supervision?
RQ6: How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches regarding establishing clear performance and behavioral expectations?
RQ7: How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches in regard to collecting data to understand the achievement of expectations?

RQ8: How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches in regard to providing consistent feedback and coaching throughout the performance cycle?

RQ9: How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches in regard to rendering a formal performance evaluation report followed with a formal performance review meeting?

RQ10: How do the documents corroborate or contrast the survey findings?

**Definition of Terms**

**Performance Management**

Performance management is defined as “a continuous process of identifying, measuring, and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning performance with the strategic goals of the organization” (Aguinis, 2013, p. 2). A performance management system can include more frequent performance appraisal interactions as well as goal-setting, feedback, training, and coaching (DeNisi, 2011; DeNisi & Murphy, 2017; Schleicher et al., 2018). Therefore, for the purpose of this study, performance management similarly encompasses performance appraisal within its conceptualization. However, it extends this conceptualization to include: (1) establishing clear performance and behavioral expectations, (2) collecting data based to inform the achievement of these expectations, (3) providing consistent feedback and coaching throughout the performance cycle, (4) rendering a formal performance evaluation report that is followed with a formal performance review meeting.
Performance Appraisal

“A formal process, which occurs infrequently, by which employees are evaluated by some judge (typically a supervisor) who assesses the employee’s performance along a given set of dimensions, assigns a score to that assessment, and then usually informs the employee of his or her formal rating” (Murphy, 2017, p. 421). Thus, for the purpose of this study, performance appraisal is conceptualized as a formal, infrequent evaluation that includes the synthesis of objective and subjective data to form an impression regarding the effectiveness of a coach in fulfilling their role.

Coaching Effectiveness

Côté and Gilbert (2009) define coaching effectiveness as: “the consistent application of integrated professional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal knowledge to improve athletes’ competence, confidence, connection, and character in specific coaching contexts” (p. 316).

Effective Coaching

Côté and Gilbert (2009) define effective coaches as: “those who demonstrate the ability to apply and align their coaching expertise to particular athletes and situations in order to maximize athlete learning outcomes” (p. 316).
This study draws on various disciplines such as coaching science, sport psychology, sport management, organizational behavior, and human resource management. Therefore, various research within these disciplines related to the phenomenon in question were reviewed to inform the current study.

**Strategic Human Resource Management**

Human resource management (HRM) refers to processes employed within an organization to manage the people who work for the organization (e.g., employees, contractors; Kramar, 2014). Strategic human resource management (SHRM) is defined as “the pattern of planned human resource deployments and activities intended to enable the firm to achieve its goals” (Wright & McMahan, 1992, p. 298). Therefore, SHRM requires the strategic alignment between organizational goals with HRM practices (Kramar, 2014). SHRM involves leveraging the knowledge, skill, and abilities of employees to gain competitive advantage within the marketplace (Kramar, 2014). Significant empirical evidence exists to suggest a relationship between SHRM and improved organizational performance (Delery & Roumpi, 2017). Delery and Roumpi (2017) stated, “HRM practices are viewed as a firm’s most direct means of eliciting and sustaining desired employee behaviours, such as task-related behaviour and organisational citizenship behaviours” (p. 3). Therefore, various HRM practices should be directed toward the hiring, development, and retention of employees while working toward organizational goals. Performance appraisal and performance management, are practices nested within
human resource management which are utilized toward the achievement of organizational goals.

**Performance Appraisal**

Performance appraisal practice dates back to ancient China, however, systematic research on this topic did not emerge until the 1920s (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). DeNisi and Murphy (2017) define performance appraisal as:

A formal process, which occurs infrequently, by which employees are evaluated by some judge (typically a supervisor) who assesses the employee’s performance along a given set of dimensions, assigns a score to that assessment, and then usually informs the employee of his or her formal rating. (p. 421)

This formalized process usually culminates with a performance appraisal meeting where the evaluation is reviewed and future improvement is discussed (DeNisi, 2011). Human resource management (HRM) literature has routinely recognized performance appraisal as a key component for organizational effectiveness (DeNisi, 2011) with organizations employing various methods for their performance appraisal. Performance appraisal is at the heart of the employee and employer relationship as it is many times used to determine pay increases, promotions, development and training needs, as well as dismissals (Brown & Heywood, 2005). It is generally considered one of the most critical components for an organization and its human resources department. Various approaches to performance appraisal will be reviewed.
360 Degree Feedback

One of the most prominent approaches to performance appraisal is 360 degree feedback. This method for performance appraisal includes a multi-rater approach with differing relationships to the ratee assessing their performance (Oh et al., 2009). For example, raters can include supervisors, subordinates, peers, and the performer to provide a more holistic view of performance perceptions held by different stakeholders. Within practice, this approach is seen as offering different perspectives regarding the performance of the ratee which can direct their developmental needs (Borman, 1997). This perspective purports to provide more incremental validity because of the ability to assess interrater reliability. However, Borman (1997) outlines two different approaches to assessing the importance of inter-rater reliability in relation to 360 degree feedback. The first approach suggests that there should be low to moderate inter-rater agreement when the raters come from different departments (e.g., athletic training, academic advisor, student-athletes, Borman, 1997). This supports the notion that the purpose of 360 degree feedback is to provide different perspectives to uncover different weaknesses and thus uncovering the necessary development and behavior change needed to increase performance (Borman, 1997). Therefore, different perspectives should emerge. In contrast, moderate to high inter-rater agreement should be present when assessing multiple perspectives within the same unit or level (e.g., asking for feedback from multiple student-athletes about the coach; Borman, 1997). Borman (1997) stated, “it is important to know…if raters from different organizational levels actually observe different behaviors, or see essentially the same behavior but interpret it differently or
weight it differently” (p. 301). Therefore, it is important to understand the levels with which 360 feedback takes place as this helps to interpret the validity of the information provided in relation to the performance of the ratee.

While many organizations have taken a 360 degree approach to performance appraisal (including intercollegiate athletics; Barber & Eckrich, 1998), there are some limitations to the approach that should be acknowledged and mitigated. For example, Atwater and colleagues (2000) found that when leaders received low ratings from subordinates, they altered their attitudes and behavior toward that subordinate. This finding risks the ability of raters to be honest in their assessments. Further, negative feedback could cause the ratee to become defensive and limit the effectiveness of the feedback provided.

**Other Performance Appraisal Approaches**

Another form of performance appraisal involves high levels of participation from the ratee. Therefore, the performer is involved in their self-evaluation and there are high levels of communication present throughout the performance appraisal process (Rubin & Edwards, 2020). Performance appraisals with high levels of participation from the ratee, demonstrate increased levels of satisfaction in relation to the performance appraisal process and outcomes (Cawley et al., 1998).

Another performance appraisal system is a relative rating system. This takes all employees and rates their performance relative to other employees. For example, in the context of collegiate coaching, it would take all head coaches and rate their performance
relative to the basketball coach, swimming coach, baseball coach, etc. to create a hierarchy of performance within the organization (Rubin & Edwards, 2020).

**The Purpose of Performance Appraisal**

Performance appraisal can be used for distinct administrative purposes such as allocating merit pay, contract extension or termination, promotion, and legal documentation (Cunningham & Dixon, 2003). Performance appraisal can also serve developmental purposes by illuminating training needs and providing feedback for improvement (Cunningham & Dixon, 2003).

However, these two purposes, administrative and developmental, can be perceived as contradictory, particularly from the perspective of the ratee (Bindels et al., 2021). Therefore, Bindels et al. (2021) demonstrates that the felt disposition surrounding performance appraisal should be more developmental in nature. Further, Boswell and Boudreau (2000) suggest that employees perceive the performance appraisal more favorably (higher levels of satisfaction) when there is a developmental component. A developmental component also influences how the employee views the person who delivers the performance appraisal (Boswell & Boudreau, 2000). However, performance appraisal fulfills a certain level of accountability necessary within professions which can then be combined with developmental purposes.

Although performance appraisal can serve both administrative and developmental purposes, scholars recognize that performance appraisal is not universally applicable and should be designed to meet the needs of the organization (Bayo-Moriones et al., 2020).
Performance Appraisal Evolution

Within scholarship, performance appraisal has seen prolific attention within varying fields such as psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). Early research on performance appraisal of employees focused on the accuracy of rating scales based on psychometric qualities as well as evaluator competence and training. However, in the 1970s, employee perceptions (e.g., perceived fairness) of the performance appraisal process was introduced into the literature (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). This line of research has become particularly important, especially since the literature never landed on a precisely accurate rating system (since it is nearly impossible to know how much error is involved in rating performance since the “true” score is unknowable; DeNisi, 2011). Therefore, perceptions of fairness regarding performance appraisal are a leading indicator of the effectiveness of the performance appraisal process (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017; Keeping & Levy, 2000). When performers perceive the performance evaluation as fair and accurate, they are more likely to change their behavior to adhere to the feedback of the performance appraisal (Ilgen et al., 1979; DeNisi, 2011). Therefore, less attention has been devoted to creating a psychometrically sound performance appraisal measure, and more attention has been devoted to creating a performance appraisal system that resonates with the employees and thus, actually stimulates the desired behavior changes that a performance appraisal illuminates as necessary for improved performance.
Performance Appraisal Effectiveness

Research suggests that formal appraisal systems may be more effective when monitoring the performance of highly autonomous employees (e.g., coaches; Brown & Heywood, 2005). Therefore, formalized performance appraisal systems within collegiate athletic departments may be worth the undertaking. However, the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system is also dependent on the perception from its stakeholders and appraisees. Research on the performance appraisal of medical doctors suggests that the performance appraisal procedure should be framed as an opportunity for learning and professional development rather than an obligation to meet compliance requirements (Bindels et al., 2021). Additionally, Ikramullah and colleagues (2016) suggest that performance appraisal should take a more holistic approach “such as setting employees’ performance targets, conducting appraisals, giving feedback, assessing employees’ developmental needs” (p. 335). This is particularly important because the success or failure of a performance appraisal system partially depends on the perception of fairness among employees (Ikramullah et al., 2016). Further, more stringent and formal performance appraisal systems can lead to the constriction of innovative behavior from employees (Bednall et al., 2014). Therefore, if coaches are subject to a performance appraisal and do not see the benefit in the system or think it is conducted fairly, it is unlikely to be effective in improving future performance or eliciting a change in behavior.

Teacher performance appraisal has seen resistance as it is a time-consuming practice that has been seen by some as simply performatory without real benefit (Tuytens
& Devos, 2012). However, with the proper structure, Tuytens and Devos (2012) suggest that the practice can be useful within the education system and should not be given up within human resource practices. Therefore, a standards-based approach has been developed. The standards based approach includes three criteria: “(1) a comprehensive definition of teaching with standards for acceptable performance; (2) good procedures to collect information about and assess the teaching practice; and (3) trained evaluators” (Tuytens & Devos, 2012, p. 758).

A well-designed and executed performance appraisal can promote informal learning among employees, knowledge sharing, and innovative behavior (Bednall et al., 2014). However, an effective performance appraisal system within an organization needs to take into account the purpose behind performance appraisal as well as the methods used to assess performance. Ahmed et al. (2013) stated, “A properly designed system can help achieve organizational objectives and enhance employee performance” (p. 719). However, it can be a costly and time-consuming undertaking, and therefore, it is important to design it to drive organizational performance and provide a return on investment. Although, on the other hand, employee turnover can be one of the most costly events for a company (Sahai, 2018).

Although there is mixed research regarding the effectiveness of performance appraisal of employees, it remains one of the most important aspects of human resource management. Additionally, one of the key elements regarding its effectiveness is the perception of fairness among employees subjected to the performance appraisal.
Therefore, perceptions related to the performance appraisal process is an important element to understand in relation to performance appraisal (Sharma et al., 2016).

**Reconceptualization of Performance Appraisal**

Although performance appraisal is largely utilized within organizations and viewed as a cornerstone of effective HRM (DeNisi et al., 2021), it is also being reconceptualized as a singular part of a more complex construct: performance management (DeNisi, 2011). This reconceptualization takes into consideration a more complex purpose for performance appraisal: behavior change. Therefore, rather than primarily focusing on if the evaluation accurately reflects the “true” performance of the performer; it is more important to focus on how effective the performance appraisal is at stimulating behavior change and improved performance (DeNisi, 2011). DeNisi (2011) stated, “if appraisals and feedback are intended to help employees improve their job performance, the employee must accept the feedback, feel able to improve their performance as desired, and see some reason for exerting the effort to change their behavior” (p. 267). Thus, for the purpose of this study, performance appraisal is conceptualized as a formal, infrequent evaluation that includes the synthesis of objective and subjective data to form an impression regarding the effectiveness of a coach in fulfilling their role. However, performance appraisal represents one component (e.g., the deliverable) of the overarching concept of performance management. Therefore, moving forward performance management will be used to recognize performance appraisal and accompanying activities (e.g., goal setting, professional development) surrounding performance appraisal.
**Performance Management**

Research has moved away from a more formalized, one-time performance appraisal event to a more comprehensive performance management system which includes more frequent performance appraisal interactions as well as goal-setting, feedback, training, and coaching (DeNisi, 2011; DeNisi & Murphy, 2017; Schleicher et al., 2018). This necessitated a change in the underlying theoretical models from measurement-oriented models to motivational models. That is, rather than focusing on the accuracy of the ratings, studies began exploring what drove employees to try to improve their performance and how feedback was received, or not received (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017).

Performance management is defined as “a continuous process of identifying, measuring, and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning performance with the strategic goals of the organization” (Aguinis, 2013, p. 2). Further, Van Waeyenberg and colleagues (2022) stated:

Performance management is a cyclical process that intends to promote genuine employee development via ongoing management and feedback. This process is usually led by the direct supervisor and structured around formal moments of formulating, monitoring, and evaluating performance expectations that ultimately aim to align employee performance with the strategic goals of the organization.

(p. 626)

Schleicher and colleagues (2018) review of literature identified seven key components to performance management: “(1) setting performance expectations, (2) observing
employee performance, (3) integrating performance information, (4) the rendering of a formal summative performance evaluation, (5) generating and delivering performance feedback, (6) the formal performance review meeting, and (7) performance coaching” (p. 2219). It is notable and intentional that the word “performance” occurs in each of the aforementioned key areas. Thus, this is what distinguishes performance management from other human resource/talent management practices. It is the management of their performance within their current roles (Schleicher et al., 2018).

Performance management has been studied in different industries including business, healthcare, education, and military (Molan et al., 2019) with approximately 91% of organizations having a performance management system in place (Cascio, 2006; Schleicher et al., 2018). The culmination of empirical research indicates that effectively designed and executed performance management leads to higher levels of employee performance and thus organizational performance (Van Waeyenberg et al., 2022). Although the design of a performance management system has garnered significant attention in the literature, the focus has widened to include other factors such as social context and interpersonal relationships (Rubin & Edwards, 2020). Scholars have recognized the importance of examining the social milieu present within the organization and the context surrounding the performance management process, and this may in fact have more of an impact on its effectiveness than the structural design of the evaluation (Levy & Williams, 2004). Thus, Levy and Williams (2004) “argue that identifying, measuring, and defining the organizational context in which appraisal takes place is integral to truly understanding and developing effective performance appraisals” (p. 883).
Therefore, the approach may not matter (i.e., 360 degree approach, supervisor-only rating), rather the social milieu and relationships therein enables effective performance management (Rubin & Edwards, 2020).

Thus, for the purpose of this study, performance management is conceptualized as: (1) the process of setting explicit behavioral and performance expectations that align with organizational values and goals, (2) observing performance and collecting data to measure performance in relation to the expectations set forth, (3) providing resources (e.g., coaching, feedback, check points, professional development) to calibrate performance en route to realizing expectations, and (4) culminating with a formal evaluation report and meeting to discuss the performance evaluation.

**Performance Management Effectiveness**

As performance appraisal evolved into performance management, more focus has been given to employee perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the process. This has resulted in its own construct of performance management system effectiveness (PMSE; Sharma et al., 2016). Sharma and colleagues (2016) define PMSE as the extent to which “a PMS [Performance Management System] meets its intended outcomes” (p. 226). Thus, PMSE can be difficult to measure within practice and depends on an organization’s intended outcomes for their PMS (e.g., employee retention, employee behavior change, employee compliance/regulation, etc.). However, research suggests that one of the main factors driving PMSE is acceptance from employees and their perception that the PMS is fair and accurate (Sharma et al., 2016). Sharma et al. (2016) stated, “Levy and Williams (2004) purported that employee perceptions about appraisal are the best criteria to
evaluate its effectiveness as even the most psychometrically valid appraisals would be ineffective if they were unacceptable to employees” (p. 227). Therefore, Sharma and colleagues (2016) sought to validate PMSE with two factors: perceived accuracy and perceived fairness. Sharma and colleagues (2016) defined perceived accuracy as “the extent to which PMS provides an exact basis for recognition of employee performance to accurately enhance performance that contributes value to the organization” (p. 238). Further, PMS fairness “implies the righteousness of PMS ensured through procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational justice” (Sharma et al., 2016, p. 238). Therefore, for the purpose of this study, perceptions of the performance management process will focus on both perceptions related to accuracy and fairness.

**Performance Management in Sport**

Performance management research specific to sport is not as prolific as other areas of the field (e.g., coach-athlete relationship, consumer behavior). Further, performance management research in sport is more limited compared to other industries (e.g., business; Molan et al., 2019). Early research in this area has provided a significant foundation (Barber & Eckrich, 1998; Cunningham & Dixon, 2003; MacLean & Zakrajsek, 1996; MacLean, 1993; MacLean, 2001); however, this line of inquiry has gone dormant and requires resurrection, particularly because of the dynamic change present within the NCAA and the persistent need for accountability and development among coaches.

Coaching, particularly within the NCAA, is a complex job with vast responsibility, differing job duties, and tension between priorities (e.g., education and
business; Barber & Eckrich, 1998). Thus, these conflicts have complicated the evaluation process for NCAA coaches. MacLean and Zakrajsek (1996) stated “athletic departments have not kept pace with the larger institution” in regards to performance management of its constituents, namely athletic coaches (p. 448). Further, Molan and colleagues (2019) conducted a review of literature assessing the performance management literature in sport in relation to other disciplines (i.e., business, performing arts, high-risk professions).

Molan and colleagues (2019) suggested that “the study of performance management within elite sport is in its infancy, and there is a lack of understanding as to the mechanisms that might underpin the performance management process…” (p. 89). Further, after comparing the performance management literature within elite sport, Molan and colleagues (2019) concluded that sport had an underdeveloped and less professionalized process for developing personnel in relation to business and high-risk professions (e.g., surgeons). Elite sport is primarily focused on measuring athlete outcomes as a means for assessing the performance of elite sport staff (Molan et al., 2019), however, this neglects important behavioral processes that elicit athlete outcomes and could result in unethical behavior (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995). Molan and colleagues (2019) stated, “Despite evidence supporting the use of feedback mechanisms for staff and encouraging personal growth, the review indicates that the professional development of coaches, support staff, and management in elite sport organizations is heavily focused toward informal or on-the-job learning” (p. 99). However, various scholars provide a foundation for understanding the performance management practices within sport settings and this scholarship will be reviewed.
MacLean and Zakrajsek (1996)

MacLean and Zakrajsek (1996) conducted a study with administrators and coaches employed within the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU) to assess the perceived importance associated with the six dimensions of criteria (i.e., team products, personal products, direct task behaviors, indirect task behaviors, administrative maintenance behaviors, public relations behaviors) within the scale of coach performance (SCP; MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995).

MacLean and Zakrajsek’s (1996) findings revealed that administrators and coaches rated direct task behaviors as the most important factor to consider within the performance appraisal of coaches. Direct task behaviors refers to the “application of interpersonal skills and appropriate strategies and tactics in enhancing the performance of individual athletes and the team as a whole” (MacLean & Zakrajsek, 1996, p. 452). Although coaches and administrators agreed that this was the most important criteria to evaluate, they differed on other rankings. Following direct task behaviors, coaches believed team products were second most important followed by administrative maintenance behaviors, indirect task behaviors, public relations maintenance behaviors, and personal products. Administrators also viewed direct task behaviors as most important followed by administrative maintenance behaviors, indirect task behaviors, team products, public relations behaviors, and personal products. When examining the between group differences (administrators vs. coaches), coaches rated team products and direct task behaviors as more important than administrators. Further, coaches with more experience rated administrative maintenance behaviors as less important than coaches.
with less experience. Overall, coaches rated one process criteria and one product criteria as the top two most important criteria to assess their performance. However, administrators rated process criteria as their top three most important factors to consider when evaluating the performance of a coach. Both groups agreed upon the two least important criteria when evaluating coach performance: personal products and public relations behaviors.

Although MacLean and Zakrajsek (1996) advanced theoretical understanding of performance appraisal within intercollegiate athletics, a gap remained in the understanding of performance appraisal in practice.

**Barber and Eckrich (1998)**

Therefore, Barber and Eckrich (1998) conducted a descriptive study with administrators at NCAA Division I, II, and III institutions to explore the performance management of revenue generating and non-revenue generating coaches. Barber and Eckrich (1998) sought to understand (1) “the individuals involved in the process, (2) the methods of evaluation, and (3) the criteria for evaluation” (p. 305). Findings elicited a 360 degree approach including raters ranging from “senior associate ADS, athletes, the coaches themselves, and college or university administrators” (Barber & Eckrich, 1998, p. 307). Further, Division I administrators seemed to utilize support staff (e.g., academic advisors, compliance) more heavily in their evaluation process while Division III administrators relied more heavily on formal student-athlete evaluations. Approximately 76% indicated a dual purpose for coach evaluation including both professional development and contract renewal. However, 17% of the sample indicated that there was
no formal performance evaluation process in place for coaches. Further, the most common methods of formal evaluation included meetings with the coaches as well as observations over the course of a season, thus negating the use of any valid and reliable measure of performance, description of criteria measured, or ways to mitigate the biases of raters. The study did not uncover how these meetings and observations are standardized and what criteria was assessed within these methods of evaluation. Although Barber and Eckrich (1998) provide important insight into the performance management process employed within NCAA athletic departments and the divisional differences, gaps remain and the NCAA has significantly evolved since their inquiry.

**Cunningham and Dixon (2003)**

Cunningham and Dixon (2003) created a theoretical framework for the performance appraisal of intercollegiate athletic coaches within the NCAA system. Their framework drew on previous frameworks developed within the Canadian athletic system (See MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995; MacLean & Zakrajsek, 1996). Further, Cunningham and Dixon’s (2003) model of performance appraisal for intercollegiate coaches is rooted in the human resource management literature with regards to performance appraisal practices. The model was developed within a multilevel perspective (individual, team, organizational), suggesting that a coaches’ performance is most effectively measured at the team level of performance rather than the individual level because of the interdependent nature of a coaching staff and team. Cunningham and Dixon (2003) drew on DeNisi’s (2000) description of three types of team interdependence: (1) pooled, (2), sequential, and (3) reciprocal. Pooled interdependence refers to the aggregate of
individual performances coming together separately to build a team performance. An example of pooled interdependence is a relay within swimming. Each athlete does their own performance and the aggregate of all four swimmers equates to the relay team’s performance. DeNisi (2000) suggests that individual performance appraisal is most appropriately suited to pooled interdependent teams. Sequential interdependence refers to a team that is hierarchical in nature where the input of team members are accumulated, however, the leader makes the ultimate decision and is held responsible for decisions and outcomes (Cunningham & Dixon, 2003; Hollenbeck et al., 1995). DeNisi (2000) suggests that sequentially interdependent teams should be evaluated at both the individual and the team level. Finally, reciprocal teams are highly interdependent and “the performance of one team member is dependent upon the performance and behavior of other team members, as when the output of one team member is the input for a different team member” (DeNisi, 2000, pp. 127-128). DeNisi (2000) suggests that reciprocal teams are most appropriately evaluated at the team level. Cunningham and Dixon (2003) argue that intercollegiate coaching staffs are reciprocal in nature and thus, their performance should be evaluated at the team level rather than the individual level. Therefore, Cunningham and Dixon (2003) built upon the domains of coaching performance framework (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995), a coaching performance framework from an individual perspective, and created a framework from the perspective of a team level evaluation.

Cunningham and Dixon’s (2003) performance appraisal model for intercollegiate coaches considers six team outcomes as critical in evaluating the performance of a coaching staff: “(1) team athletic outcomes, (2) team academic outcomes, (3) ethical
behavior, (4) fiscal responsibility, (5) recruit quality, and (6) athlete satisfaction” (p. 183).

**Team Athletic Outcomes**

Team athletic outcomes refers to meaningful metrics assessing the overall performance of the team such as a win/loss record, post-season competition, and athlete improvement. Both Cunningham and Dixon (2003) and MacLean and Chelladurai (1995) recognize the importance of measuring athletic outcomes as a measure of coach success. However, both recognize that this cannot be the sole criterion for evaluating the performance of a coach and coaching staff. A sole focus on athletic performance as an indicator of coach performance can instigate unethical behavior, and does not represent the complete mission of athletics, particularly when situated within higher education.

**Team Academic Outcomes**

Extant research (see Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000) suggest that academic outcomes, such as student-athlete graduation rate, are important measures representing not only team performance, but directly reflecting the organizational effectiveness of an athletic department. Further, the NCAA lists academics as one of their three priorities (their other priorities are fairness and wellbeing; NCAAc). Further, Cunningham and Dixon (2003) demonstrate that the firing of some coaches have been attributed to low graduation rates among their student-athletes. Therefore, academic outcomes are an important element to consider when evaluating the performance of a coaching staff.
**Ethical Behavior**

Cunningham and Dixon (2003) describe ethical behavior as the “extent to which the staff conducts its affairs in an ethical manner” (p. 185). One element specifically outlined within ethical behavior is a coaching staff’s adherence to the legislation set forth by the NCAA bylaws as well as an institution’s respective conference bylaws. However, beyond this specific example, ethical behavior received a vague description.

**Fiscal Responsibility**

Cunningham and Dixon (2003) designate fiscal responsibility as the fourth measure of coach performance because of its intertwined nature with organizational effectiveness. Therefore, individual teams should maintain fiscal responsibility and budget adherence to contribute to the overall financial wellbeing of the athletic department, especially considering that most athletic departments are not profitable.

**Recruit Quality**

HRM literature demonstrates the critical importance of recruiting, developing, and retaining human capital to achieve competitive advantage, and this can be applied at the team level within intercollegiate athletic departments. Recruiting is an integral part of the first two outcomes within this model: athlete outcomes and academic outcomes. Therefore, recruiting is the input necessary to achieve these outcomes. Cunningham and Dixon (2003) said, “the ability of the coaching staff to secure quality recruiting classes is paramount” (p. 186). Therefore, recruit quality represents the fifth measure of coaching performance.
**Athlete Satisfaction**

Athlete satisfaction represents the final measure of coach performance within this model. Measuring athlete satisfaction provides an opportunity to delve deeper into the experience of the primary stakeholders within intercollegiate athletics, which provides information above that of athletic and academic outcomes. See Figure 3 for a visual representation of Cunningham and Dixon’s (2003) performance appraisal model for intercollegiate coaches.

**Gillham and Colleagues (2017)**

More recently, Gillham and colleagues (2017) sought to understand how strength and conditioning coaches (collegiate, high school, and professional) are evaluated (since they don't have a direct win-loss record). The study was exploratory and sought to understand the evaluation process experienced in their role, criteria used in the evaluation process, criteria they think should be used in the evaluation process, and the process of professional development after the evaluation process. Participants were five strength and conditioning coaches working within various contexts within the sport industry. Data were collected by emailing the participants the questions and having them formulate responses via electronic word processing to respond to the questions.

Participants reported experiencing formal and informal methods for evaluating their performance with head coaches, human resource employees, and athletic administrators. The main finding was that there is no systematic approach to evaluating these coaches as their experiences varied widely. Further, the purposes for evaluation included both administrative and developmental purposes; however, these were the
perceptions of the participants with one participant stating a lack of understanding of the purpose of their evaluation. However, despite the wide variation in evaluative practices and purposes, the coaches were open to in-depth evaluations in order to improve their performance as a coach.

**Mallett and Côté (2006)**

Mallett and Côté (2006) proposed a methodology for evaluating the performance of coaches within high-performance sport contexts. High performance sport contexts are characterized by “higher levels of commitment, more stable coach-athlete relationships, and greater focus on medium- to long-term planning, monitoring, decision-making, and management skills to facilitate control of performance variables” (Mallett & Côté, 2006, p. 213). The methodology included three steps: (1) collecting comprehensive performance data through an instrument, (2) creating a summary report with objective measures of performance, and (3) reviewing the report and developing a plan for further developing as a coach to improve performance. Their recommendations include the use of a reliable and valid comprehensive coach evaluation tool such as the coach behavior scale for sport (CBS-S; Côté et al., 1999). The CBS-S measures coach performance in seven categories: physical training and planning, goal setting, mental preparation, technical skills, personal rapport, negative personal rapport, and competition strategies. This recommendation is rooted in their premise that coaches should be evaluated comprehensively rather than on their win-loss record solely. Assessments such as these allow for longitudinal tracking of behavior changes. For instance, the coaching staff may have low mean scores within physical training and planning in year one and work to
improve in this area thus potentially seeing an improvement in their mean scores in subsequent years. Therefore, dialogue through the evaluation process allows coaches to provide context regarding why they received a low score in this area, and thus provide insight into necessary resources and development to improve in this area. For instance, coaches may receive low mean scores from the athletes in mental preparation; however, the team may not have access to a mental performance coach and the coaches may not be competent in this area to provide it to the team themselves.

However, there are also limitations with a cross-sectional coach evaluation measure such as the CBS-S. Mallett and Cole (2006) recommend using multiple forms of data collection in addition to the CBS-S (or a similar measure) such as observation and results based measures of performance such as a win-loss record. Further, they recommend evaluators seek context from the coaching staff regarding their evaluation, suggesting dialogue as an integral part of the evaluation process (Mallett & Cole, 2006). Further, their methodology recommends the integration of the athlete voice into the coach evaluation process because the coach-athlete relationship is paramount within high-performance sport contexts. Mallett and Côte (2006) concluded by saying:

The work of high-performance coaches is complex, and subsequently the examination of their work is problematic. There are no simple solutions to this complex problem, but that should not deter scholars, consultants, and coaches alike from attempting to pursue the challenge. (p.220)
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Thus, there are theoretical foundations for models of coach performance purporting what should be measured (MacLean & Chelludurai, 1995; Cunningham & Dixon, 2003). Further, Barber and Eckrich (1998) described the process of performance appraisal within NCAA Divisions I, II, and III institutions and made comparisons between divisions. However, there is no current understanding of what performance management systems are in place within NCAA athletic departments, particularly within the conceptualization of performance management (rather than performance appraisal). The conceptualization of performance management used within this study begins with expectations. Therefore, literature pertaining to effective coaching will be reviewed as this can provide a basis for providing expectations.

Coaching Effectiveness

Coaching effectiveness has historically lacked a unified conceptual framework and definition within the literature, despite decades of research on the topic (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). Some scholars have measured coaching effectiveness using a win-loss record while others examined it through the lens of athlete satisfaction and enjoyment (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Horn, 2008). However, because of the dynamic nature of coaching within various contexts (e.g., youth, recreational, competitive), defining and measuring effective coaching has posed a challenge in scholarship and practice.

The word, effectiveness means “the fact or quality of producing the intended or desired result” (Dictionary.com, n.d., definition 1). Thus, to understand if a coach is
effective or not, there needs to be a clear expectation regarding the desired outcome(s) as well as strategies toward measuring the realization of these outcomes.

**Measures of Coach Effectiveness/Coach Performance**

The primary and most recognized form of coach performance evaluation has been through performance results (e.g., number of medals, international standing). However, this negates important components of effective coaching (e.g., behavioral processes and 4 C’s). Thus, various scholars have developed instruments to fill this gap. Various measures of coach effectiveness and coach performance, as well as their psychometric qualities, will be reviewed.

**Coach Performance Scale**

MacLean and Chelladurai (1995) created the conceptual model for the dimensions of coaching performance and subsequently developed a scale to measure the latent constructs within the model. MacLean and Chelladurai (1995) employed rigorous testing to assess the psychometric qualities of the scale. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha and test-retest, and both analyses resulted in adequate reliability results. Validity was assessed through content validity with a team of 10 experts reviewing the items proposed for the survey. The last step in the scale development included confirmatory factor analyses. The final stage resulted in a 35-item scale (the scale previously had 56 items). The final analyses revealed that the data fit the conceptual model reasonably well. However, MacLean and Chelladurai (1995) stated, “it should be noted that the scale measures only the importance attached to the criteria by the
administrators and coaches” (p. 204). Therefore, the coaching performance scale may be used as a preemptive measure toward the development of a performance management system that aligns and measures the dimensions of coach performance deemed most important.

**Coaching Behavior Assessment System**

The coaching behavior assessment system (CBAS; Smit et al., 1977) was created with the intent to measure directly observed coaching behaviors directed toward athletes within applied settings (e.g., practice, competition; Smoll & Smith, 1989). The CBAS consists of 12 sub-units which were all derived from empirical research. Reliability of the CBAS was assessed through interobserver reliability estimates, which resulted in adequate estimate of reliability (.088; Curtis et al., 1979). However, this measure was designed to assess coaches working within youth sport settings (Côté et al., 1999).

**Coach Behavior Scale for Sport**

A more recent instrument, the coaching behavior scale for sport (CBS-S; Côté et al., 1999), is rooted in athlete and coach experiences and seeks to measure seven dimensions of high-performance coaching: physical training and planning, goal setting, mental preparation, technical skills, personal rapport, negative personal rapport, and competition strategies (Mallett & Côté, 2006). The scale has 7-items pertaining to physical training and planning which assesses coaches’ “involvement in the athlete’s physical training and planning for training and competition” (Mallett & Côté, 2006, p. 216). Goal setting has 6-items “assessing the coach’s involvement in the identification,
development, and monitoring of the athlete’s goals” (Mallett & Côté, 2006, p. 216). Mental preparation contains 5-items which are used to assess “how the coach helps the athlete to perform under pressure, stay focused, and be confident” (Mallett & Côté, 2006, p. 216). Technical skills contains 8-items on the scale assessing “coaching feedback, demonstration, and cues” (Mallett & Côté, 2006, p. 216). Personal rapport carries 6-items on the scale “assessing the approachability, availability, and understanding of the coach” (Mallett & Côté, 2006, p. 216). Negative personal rapport has 8-items “examining the coach’s use of negative techniques such as fear and yelling” (Mallett & Côté, 2006, p. 216). Lastly, competition strategies has 7-items on the scale “focusing on the coach’s interaction with the athlete in competition” (Mallett & Côté, 2006, p. 216).

The instrument was developed through a review of qualitative research with coaches and athletes. The first draft of the scale resulted in 75 items. Face validity was assessed with a panel of 11 experts of 8 academics and 3 coaches. Next steps included an exploratory factor analysis which resulted in 37 items representing six factors and pilot testing with athletes followed by additional exploratory factor analyses. Results indicated reasonable measures of factor and discriminant validity. Reliability was assessed through Cronbach’s alpha and test-retest, which resulted in satisfactory levels of reliability estimates; however, the negative rapport dimension had the lowest level of reliability requiring additional testing.

CBS-S moves beyond performance results as a sole measure of coaching effectiveness and is similar to how teachers are evaluated within higher education.
Further, it is psychometrically sound and has been used within practice to provide a criterion based source of information to use in coach evaluation (Mallett & Côté, 2006).

**Leadership Scale for Sport**

The leadership scale for sport (LSS; Chelladurai & Salleh, 1980) measures five dimensions of leader behaviors including: training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995). Chelladurai and Salleh (1980) pilot tested their scale with physical educators, and found reasonable estimates of reliability assessed through test-retest (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995). Construct validity was tested and confirmed using confirmatory factor analysis (Horn et al., 2011). Subsequent research within sport has continued to demonstrate the reliability and validity of the LSS within empirical studies (Horn et al., 2011).

**Assessment of Coaching Tone**

The assessment of coaching tone (ACT; Erickson & Côté, 2015) represents an observational coding system to systematically code coaches behavior within youth sport settings. This coding system brings additional context to the behaviors and interactions between coaches and athletes. Although the CBAS is an observational coding system for coach behavior, it primarily addresses the “what” of coach behavior. The ACT, primarily addresses the “how” of coach behavior (Erickson & Côté, 2015). The development and validation of the ACT progressed through five steps resulting in a psychometrically sound instrument assessed through inter-rater reliability, intra-rater reliability, and discriminant validity.
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The aforementioned instruments provide more comprehensive insight into coach behavior, effectiveness, and performance beyond a win-loss record. However, some of these instruments are grounded in a specific theoretical framework and are partial to evaluation in particular environments (e.g., training or competition) as well as particular sport contexts (e.g., youth sport). Further, scholars argue that an athlete's voice must be considered when evaluating the effectiveness of a coach, particularly within a performance context because of the centrality of this relationship (d’Arripe-Longueville et al., 1998; Mallett & Côté, 2006).

Although many valid and reliable instruments exist to measure a coach’s performance or effectiveness, we lack an understanding regarding if these tools are being utilized in practice.

Role of Sport Management Professionals in Performance Management and Program Evaluation

It is well-established and accepted that coaches can impact athletes, negatively and positively, both within the realm of sport and outside the realm of sport. Therefore, the importance of a coach’s role cannot be underestimated. Empirical research demonstrates that coaches can impact athletes' intent to continue in sport (Wekesser et al., 2021), their level of enjoyment within sport (Lorimer & Jowett, 2009), development (Vella et al., 2013), and wellbeing (Simons & Bird, 2022). Thus, the impact of a coach is far-reaching beyond the immediate sport experience. Therefore, sport management professionals have a distinct responsibility for recruiting, retaining, developing, and
evaluating coaches to best fulfill the mission of their organization. This is important because of coaches’ impact on athletes, prospective litigation associated with poor coaching, and coaches’ overall impact on organizational effectiveness.

Lopez et al. (2020) explored instances of abusive supervision by a coach within the Division I student-athlete population. Their results suggest that student-athletes who experienced abusive supervision had decreased performance, however, this relationship was moderated by their core self-evaluation. Thus, athletes with higher core self-evaluations were able to cope more effectively with abusive supervision. Additionally, the findings suggest that female athletes had lower levels of core self-evaluations than their male athlete counterparts, thus suggesting that abusive leadership could be more detrimental to female student-athletes. This research debunks the common notion within sport that these abusive practices are necessary to achieve high performance. Lopez et al. (2020) stated, “the majority of the responsibility for improving the coach-student-athlete relationship falls on the coach and the administration” (p. 138). Their practical implications, building off of the work of Stirling and Kerr (2008) suggest that there needs to be more opportunities for intervention when abusive supervision is present, greater monitoring of coaches and their team environments, specific codes of conduct for coaches, and greater coach education surrounding the outcomes of abusive supervision (Lopez et al., 2020). Additionally, coaches need to understand that research suggests that these practices, intended to improve athlete and team performance, have the opposite effect. Athletes actually perceive abusive coaches as less credible while also experiencing lower levels of satisfaction and performance (Kassing & Infante, 1999).
Further, when organizations lack clear expectations and oversight for coaches, this can result in undesirable outcomes such as the use of poor coaching tactics resulting in allegations of coach abuse, misconduct, and eventual litigation. This can have serious consequences for the athletes within these environments as well as the health of the overall organization.

A broader conceptualization of effective coaching highlights the different skills needed to be successful within sport—suggesting that sport specific technical knowledge and skills do not capture the range of skills necessary to be successful in a coaching role. This broader conceptualization of effective coaching does not negate the importance of performance; rather it integrates positive coaching practices with high performance. Therefore, behavioral skills, otherwise known as “soft skills” are also necessary for coaches to be effective.

**Soft Skills**

In the 1970’s management scholars sought to differentiate between different types of work resulting in the terms “hard skills” and “soft skills.” Hard skills refers to “content expertise” while soft skills primarily refer to the necessary skills to manage people such as leadership, communication, conflict management, and building trust (Palarmis & Monnot, 2019). However, because of the associations with the term soft, particularly its denotation of submission in relation to the word hard, Palarmis and Monnot (2019), made a call to reframe the term soft skills to CORE skills. CORE is an acronym that means “Competence in Organizational and Relational Effectiveness” (Palarmis & Monnot, 2019, p. 227). Palarmis and Monnot (2019) stated:
Shifting the lexicon is critical to transforming the perception of these skills, so reframing the notion as CORE is more likely to increase legitimacy, broaden research attention, and expand the scope of influence to areas of training, early education, [and] hiring practices. (p. 227)

Thus, the lexicon of soft skills in relation to hard skills frames these skills as lesser than. However, scholars and practitioners have begun to realize the value and necessity for skill development outside of technical skills (Palarmis & Monnot, 2019). For example, Klaus (2010) reported that long term career success is more highly affected by soft skills, or people skills, rather than technical skills. Further, employers are now placing an increased emphasis on soft skills when making hires, particularly amid a fast changing workplace due to various influences such as technology and the pandemic (Succi & Cannovi, 2020). LinkedIn conducted a survey with more than 23,000 workers worldwide and found that two-thirds reported that soft skills are just as important as technical skills (Their, 2022). Therefore, soft skills, although framed as lesser than through lexicon, are critical skills to train, develop, measure, and value within the workplace as they have a substantial impact on performance and effectiveness.

**Soft Skills in Sport**

Further, soft skills are necessary for sport employees, as achievement in life and work is largely mediated through successful social exchanges (Robinson et al., 2019). Scholarship within the broader sport industry, demonstrates the importance of these skills. A Delphi study conducted with athletic trainers working in health care management sought to understand the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities (SKAs)
to be successful in their work role (Hazelbaker, 2013). Their findings revealed that both management skills (i.e., business and administration skills) and interpersonal skills (i.e., communication, leadership) are critical, particularly as they move into management positions. However, athletic training education primarily focuses on technical skills, thus revealing a gap in KSAs that needs closing (Hazelbaker, 2013). Further, Robinson et al. (2019) conducted a study with interscholastic athletic directors and their corresponding head coaches to examine the relationship between an athletic director’s political skill (a latent construct comprising social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability, and apparent sincerity) and its impact on head coaches through perceived leadership effectiveness, job satisfaction, performance, and affective commitment. The results indicated that “politically skilled athletic directors do appear to influence head coach perceptions of leader effectiveness” (Robinson, 2019, p. 202). Further, the study indicated significant, positive relationships between perceived leader effectiveness and job satisfaction and affective commitment. This study reinforced the importance of interpersonal skills, such as political skill, in facilitating desired outcomes within sport settings. Robinson et al. (2019) stated “periodic evaluation and feedback from colleagues or superiors are recommended to aid in developing social astuteness because certain individuals may lack a keen sense of what is appropriate or tasteful” (p. 203). Therefore, while soft skills are necessary within the sport industry, they are also important to train and evaluate throughout employee tenure.
More specifically, soft skills are instrumentally important for effective coaching. Côté and Gilbert (2009) define coaching effectiveness as: “the consistent application of integrated professional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal knowledge to improve athletes’ competence, confidence, connection, and character in specific coaching contexts” (p. 316). Thus, technical knowledge (deemed professional knowledge), only represents one third of effective coaching, with “soft skills” representing the majority. Further, empirical evidence suggests that coaches’ soft skills have an important role in facilitating positive youth development (Vella et al., 2013) and positive sport experiences (Gano-Overway, 2021). This is demonstrated through the plethora of research focused on the importance of the coach-athlete relationship in facilitating high sport performance, as well as facilitating positive sport experiences (Davis & Jowett, 2014; Hampson & Jowett, 2014; Jowett, 2017). Therefore, sport is not inherently positive and is largely mediated by how the sport experience is facilitated, namely through a coaches’ leadership. Therefore, athletes can exit their sporting career with different experiences and perceptions depending on how it was facilitated and the behavioral processes within the sport experience. Therefore, soft skills aid coaches in facilitating sport success, as well as affecting how athletes perceive their sport experience.

However, “soft skills” within sport coaching have not received as much attention within scholarship as technical and tactical skills. Further, technical skills are often perceived as necessary while interpersonal/intrapersonal skills are viewed as supplementary. The perceived value differential between these skill sets is evident when
examining the layout of coach development programs (CDPs). Lefebvre et al. (2016) conducted a review to further understand the information being disseminated and skills being targeted within CDPs. The findings revealed that the majority of CDPs focus on the technical and tactical skills necessary for coaching with very few incorporating any development within interpersonal and intrapersonal coaching skills. Thus, scholars have made a call for CDPs to be “(a) focused on coaches’ interpersonal knowledge/behaviour, (b) grounded in theory, with regards to interpersonal and behaviour change theories, and (c) systematically evaluated” (Lefebvre et al., 2016, p. 315). Therefore, research demonstrates the critical importance of soft skills for coaches; however, this importance is not reflected in the allocation of space within CDPs. CDPs should be intentional in implementing time and space to further developing interpersonal and intrapersonal skills of coaches, as these serve as critical skills facilitating the development of athletes (Lawrason et al., 2019). However, performance management also offers an applied space allocation to evaluate and develop skills necessary to be an effective coach.

Coach Abuse

Coach abuse has received noticeable attention within the media, particularly within intercollegiate athletics. For example, the head baseball coach at the University of San Francisco was recently fired following litigation amid allegations of misconduct (ESPN, 2022). Further, Teri McKeever, longtime head coach of the women’s swimming team at the University of California, Berkeley is currently on paid administrative leave amid allegations of abuse (Gonzalez, 2022). Marlene Stollings, former women’s basketball coach at Texas Tech University was fired after allegations of a toxic culture
within her program (Associated Press, 2020). Unfortunately, the presence of abuse within coaching is not isolated and there are a plethora of other examples which have surfaced (Dodgson, 2020; Stirling & Kerr, 2013; Yancey-Bragg, 2021; Yoesting, 2022). Instances of coach abuse can be costly, with outcomes as tragic as diminished mental health as well as death. Late Maryland football player, Jordan McNair, was hospitalized following a team workout and died two weeks later from heatstroke (Multiple Contributors, 2018). Following McNair’s death, allegations surfaced regarding a toxic culture within the football program. This resulted in the head coach, Coach Durkin, being placed on administrative leave to conduct an investigation regarding the culture of the program. Coach Durkin was reinstated as head coach, and when social uproar occurred following this announcement, he was fired one-day later and paid over 5 million as a result of being fired “without cause” (ESPN, 2020). The strength and conditioning coach for the University of Maryland football team, Rick Court, was also fired. The external review report contained details of Court’s consistently abusive behavior such as throwing items at athletes, using homophobic and misogynistic slurs, and telling a player to kill himself (Torchinski, 2021).

These incidents can be costly for the organization in many ways beyond the negative and costly impact on student-athletes. First, the attention directed toward allegations of coach misconduct can then detract from the fulfillment of the overall mission of the athletic department and thus decrease organizational effectiveness. Further, coaches may be on paid administrative leave during the investigation, such as Coach McKeever. Additionally, if the investigation results in firing, there is an additional
cost of employee turnover. When an employee leaves an organization, voluntarily or involuntarily, it can cost up to two times that employee’s salary to replace them (Heinz, 2022). Thus, incidents such as these require investigative power (i.e., time and money), potential litigation, and ultimately the cost to replace the employee if a firing occurs.

However, a potential solution to mitigating issues such as these is investing resources in the evaluation and development of coaches, thus providing additional oversight into the behavioral processes leading to the products. A systematic and holistic operationalization of effective coaching coupled with an aligned system for oversight and evaluation could provide an opportunity to mitigate issues before they escalate and result in more tragic outcomes.

**Rationale for Current Study**

The models of coaching effectiveness demonstrate that effective coaching requires far more than achieving more wins than losses. Further, while sport may seem trivial to some, there are distinct outcomes that carry significant weight (i.e., physical and mental health; Kerr et al., 2020). Therefore, the mitigation of negative outcomes, and the elevation of positive outcomes, should be a primary concern among sport management professionals. However, it is unclear how athletic departments operationalize effective coaching and what strategies are in place to educate and evaluate coaches according to this operationalization. Therefore, research regarding the evaluation of intercollegiate athletic coaches is a timely and necessary pursuit.
The current study employs a descriptive research design seeking to understand the current performance management systems within NCAA, Division I athletic departments. The purpose of descriptive research is to examine “the characteristics of a population; identify problems that exist within a unit, an organization, or a population; or look at variations in characteristics or practices between institutions or even countries” (Siedlecki, 2020, p. 8). Descriptive studies can solely describe a population or practice, or they can both describe and compare different groups within a population or practice (Siedlecki, 2020).

**Variables/Constructs**

The construct that will be described within the survey is employee performance management.

**Performance management**

For the purpose of this study, performance management is operationalized as a four step process which is employed for administrative and developmental purposes. The four steps include: (1) establishing clear performance and behavioral expectations, (2) collecting data based to inform the achievement of these expectations, (3) providing consistent feedback and coaching throughout the performance cycle, and (4) rendering a formal performance evaluation report that is followed with a formal performance review meeting.
Methods

The study employed a cross-sectional, mixed methods, descriptive research design utilizing surveys and secondary data collection as the primary methods of data collection. “Descriptive research addresses what a phenomenon looks like rather than how it works or functions” (Anastas & MacDonald, 2012, p. 124). Descriptive research seeks to find out what is normal for a particular phenomenon in a particular population (Anastas & MacDonald, 2012). The collection of quantitative (non-experimental-descriptive; surveys; Johnson & Christensen, 2019) and qualitative (document collection and analysis; Johnson & Christensen, 2019) data happened simultaneously. Documents included, but were not limited to, rubrics athletic departments use in their evaluation process, expectations they provide for coaches upon hiring, professional development curriculum targeted toward coaches within the athletic department, and the resulting document from a performance appraisal. Document analysis refers to “skimming, reading, and interpretation” of documents relevant to the research study (Bowen, 2009, p. 32). Constant comparative analysis was utilized for document data analysis. “The constant comparative analysis method is an iterative and inductive process of reducing the data through constant recoding” (Fram, 2013, p. 3). Therefore, the documents were read and inductively coded. Further, memoing was used to start to make sense of the data. This was followed by another round of coding to start to uncover categories. The categories formed through the document analysis were then compared with the data elicited from the survey and thus document analysis was primarily used as a mechanism for triangulation and corroboration of survey data (Bowen, 2009; Braun & Clarke, 2006,
Open-ended survey data was analyzed thematically according to Braun and Clarke’s (2006, 2019) six-step thematic analysis. The steps are: (1) familiarization with the data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining the themes, and (6) producing the report.

A mixed methods approach is particularly suitable for this study because it provided both breadth and depth of information regarding the performance management of coaches. Surveys provide access to a larger number of participants and use more objective measures to succinctly present the information. However, there are also limitations to surveys such as social desirability bias, non-response bias, and survey fatigue. Therefore, document analysis served as a supplementary method to further triangulate the data elicited through the surveys (Bowen, 2009; Johnson & Christensen, 2019). Triangulation refers to the convergence of information to ensure the credibility of findings (Bowen, 2009). While surveys generally reflect subjective perceptions, beliefs, and feelings, document analysis should provide a more historical or institutional representation of the performance management criteria and procedures (or lack thereof) in place within athletic departments (Bowen, 2009). Thus, the use of multiple methods provided different sources of information to strengthen the overall findings and thoroughly describe the phenomenon.

**Sampling Procedures**

A census was utilized for the survey. Therefore, all NCAA, division I coaches and administrators were emailed the survey with an equal opportunity for participation. Email addresses were collected through athletic department staff directories on publicly
available websites. These email addresses were compiled throughout the summer of 2022 and the survey was administered in November 2022. However, there are limitations with this process. For example, an employee may have switched positions, been fired, or quit between the time the email addresses were collected and the time the survey was distributed. Additionally, some athletic departments do not list email addresses for particular members of their staff, specifically those associated with higher status teams such as football and basketball. For example, Nick Saban, head football coach at the University of Alabama, does not have an email address listed on the staff directory, nor does the rest of the football staff. Therefore, there are some limitations to acquiring a true census for this population. Additionally, all athletic administrators, regardless of title, were emailed the survey. However, the criterion for participation is specific (see below). Therefore, administrators had to self-select into the study based on the criteria and actually meet these criteria. There is some risk that administrators self-selected into the study without meeting the specific criteria below.

The target population for the survey was: (1) Sport specific (e.g., not strength and conditioning coaches or academic coaches) coaches within division I, NCAA athletic departments who have served in their current position for at least one complete season (2) Athletic administrators who have direct sport-oversight (e.g., oversee women’s basketball and golf) responsibility who have served in their current position for at least one calendar year.
Participant Recruitment

Upon approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) an initial email soliciting participation was sent to all prospective participants. This email was sent on Tuesday morning and a reminder email about the survey was sent seven and 14 days after the first email to anyone who did not participate thus far. The survey was closed 21 days after the first email was sent.

Throughout the time the survey was open, the question designating a desire to provide the PI with documents was monitored. Anyone who designated that they would be willing to provide documents related to the study was contacted.

After closing the survey, four winners of the incentives ($25 amazon gift cards) were randomly selected and emailed a gift card.

Data collection methods

One survey served as the primary method for data collection. However, this survey was branched based on a primary question designating if the participant was a coach or an administrator with direct sport oversight responsibility. Depending on how they answered this question, they were directed into the correct survey instrument. Rigorous pre-testing and pilot testing occurred before distributing the survey to prospective participants.

Pre-testing

Pre-testing of the survey instrument occurred in three waves. The survey was first assessed by peers and professors within a graduate level course. They reviewed the
stems, survey flow, response categories, and overall ease of taking the survey and offered feedback for improvement. Then, two faculty members within sport management reviewed the survey paying particular attention to the quality of questions and applicability for NCAA, Division I coaches and administrators as well as the items in relation to the operationalization of performance management. Faculty completed this individually with each faculty member reviewing the survey and commenting and tracking changes throughout the document. This was followed with the necessary dialogue to fully understand and address any concerns they posed in their review. Finally, one member of each population (NCAA collegiate coach and NCAA administrator) were consulted to provide feedback on the applicability of the questions for coaches and administrators, response categories, as well as ease of understanding the directions and questions. This was done individually and changes were tracked in the document and then sent to the PI via email. The PI then initiated dialogue to discuss any suggested changes and concerns. All of the feedback from each wave of pre-testing was taken into consideration to adapt the survey before pilot testing. The members of the sample population (e.g., coach and administrators) that participated in pre-testing the survey, were not sent the survey for participation. Pre-testing resulted in minor changes to the administrators’ survey and moderate changes to the coaches’ survey.

Pilot Testing

Convenience sampling was used to pilot-test the survey. These participants were sourced from the PI’s professional connections within collegiate coaching and athletic administration, as a former member of this population. Participation in pilot testing was
solicited by email and participation was via the online Qualtrics platform. Three coaches pilot tested the coaches survey and two pilot tested the administrators survey. The PI followed up with each pilot tester individually to ask about their experience and any suggestions they have to improve the survey (primarily focused on flow and directions). Pilot testing resulted in no changes to the survey instrument.

**Reliability and Validity**

Reliability refers to the extent the same instrument will produce consistent data while validity refers to the accuracy of the data elicited from a survey (Fink, 2013).

Threats to external validity were mitigated through census distribution as well as a mixed-methods approach to corroborate the findings within a particular method (Fink, 2013). Internal validity was asserted through face validity and content validity. Face validity was addressed by conducting a thorough review of literature prior to the creation of the survey instrument. Additionally, content validity was established through consultation with a team of experts within the sport management field as well as members of the population (i.e., coaches and administrators). Sport management faculty (n=2) reviewed the survey instrument individually in relation to the operationalized constructs it proposes to measure.

Further, members from the population (i.e., coaches and administrators) also assessed the instrument, further reinforcing content validity. One member from each population segment reviewed the survey instrument and made comments regarding any issues and questions about the instrument.
Procedures

Survey data and documents were collected subsequently. An email soliciting participation was sent three times over the course of 21 days with each email 7 days apart. After 21 days, the survey data was exported from Qualtrics into SPSS. The question regarding if they would like to provide any documents for review was then examined and email addresses for participants indicating they wanted to be contacted about document sharing were compiled. Solicitation of documents occurred for 14 days beyond when the survey closed. A total of 93 participants from the survey indicated that they would be willing to share documents associated with the performance evaluation process in their athletic department. After soliciting documents via email, eight documents were eligible for review. There was a total of 10 responses with documents; however, after an initial review, eight documents were deemed applicable to the study. Further, all participant data was exported into one file and a random selection of four participants was generated using SPSS. These four participants were emailed a $25 e-gift card to Amazon for participation.

Data Cleaning

Morrow’s (2017) guide to data cleaning was used as a framework to guide the data cleaning process. This data cleaning framework has 12-steps: 1) create a data code book, 2) create a data analysis plan, 3) perform initial frequencies, 4) check for coding mistakes, 5) modify and create variables, 6) a second round of frequencies and descriptive statistics, 7) search for outliers, 8) assess for normality, 9) deal with missing data, 10) examine sample size, 11) final round of frequencies and descriptive statistics,
and 12) assumption testing (Morrow, 2017). Therefore, the data cleaning process for this project began with creating a data code book. However, because this survey was primarily descriptive and did not utilize already existing scales, the code book was minimal. Therefore, the codebook included variables to include in composite score testing, reliabilities of composite scores, an organization of specific variable labels needed to check to answer specific research questions, and a data cleaning memo journal. Further, a data analysis plan was created which included the research questions, specific items used to answer these research questions, and the proposed analyses for each item (see Table 1). During step three of the data cleaning process, initial frequencies and descriptive statistics were run to ensure that the data elicited fell within the anticipated Likert rating ranges (i.e., 1-5). Step four, checking for coding mistakes, was unnecessary to complete because the data were collected electronically via Qualtrics, and therefore there was no error related to transitioning the data from paper to software database. Next, the matrices used within the coaches’ data were assessed for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha to see if this data could be reported together as a composite score (range 0.84-0.92). All four matrices related to the four-part operationalization of performance management reported Cronbach’s alphas of 0.80 or higher which is an acceptable alpha within social science research (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010), and thus could be reported together as a composite score. Therefore, the matrix items related to a particular part of the performance management process, were transformed into a new composite variable resulting in four composite variables added to the data set. A similar process was conducted with the administrator data set as they had four matrices related to the four
components of the performance management process. However, Cronbach’s alpha revealed that these items were not in an acceptable range to be reported together (range 0.69-0.77), and thus are reported as individual items. Step 6 of data cleaning, the second round of frequencies and descriptives revealed that the newly created coaches’ composite scores fell within the expected range (i.e., 1-5) and were transformed correctly. Step 7, search for outliers, was not necessary within this project because no data elicited was continuous. Step 8, assess for normality, was done by examining the mean scores for each scale measurement variable as well as standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis. All statistical values for skewness and kurtosis fell within the range of plus or minus two and most were within plus or minus one. Step 9, dealing with missing data, was one of the main challenges within the data cleaning process. There was significant missing data because of the branching and ability to skip questions. Further, it seemed as though some participants entered the survey without meeting the necessary criteria. Therefore, all participants’ names were checked within their staff directory to ensure they were in a position that allowed for eligibility in the study. For example, within the coach study, this resulted in strength and conditioning coaches’ data being deleted as they ultimately were not sport specific coaches and did not meet participation criteria. However, because all proposed analyses are descriptive, any participant that answered one or more questions above and beyond gatekeeper questions and demographic questions were left in the data set. Step 10, estimate cell sample size, was not necessary because no inferential analyses were proposed. Step 11, conduct the final round of frequencies and descriptive statistics, led to the results of this project and were used to create data visualizations within excel to
best represent the data. Step 12, assumption testing, was not necessary because of the lack of inferential statistical analyses being conducted. Therefore, following thorough data cleaning, the data moved into the data analysis phase.

Data Analysis

Data analysis primarily consisted of descriptive statistics, thematic analysis, and document analysis. See Table 1 for a full description of data analysis by research question.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The sample consisted of 310 coaches and 208 administrators. The data were
separated into two different data files based on position (i.e., coach or administrator) and
analyses were conducted separately and used in conjunction to answer the research
questions.

Further, eight documents were provided by participants for a document analysis,
all of which came from coaches. The documents provided were copies of performance
evaluation reports used within their athletic department/institution.

Demographic Information

Coaches

Approximately 79% of the sample of coaches indicated their demographics with a
total of 246 responses. Most of the sample consisted of males in head coaching positions
working with a variety of sports within Division I. The sample primarily coached male
sports and had more than 16 years of experience working in collegiate athletics. Sports
with more than 5% of the sample are represented in the table. See Table 2 for
demographics of the study sample. See Table 3 for gender demographics of the NCAA
Division I coaching population. Race/ethnicity demographics were not collected from the
sample and thus are not reported for the overall NCAA Division I coaching population.
However, gender identity demonstrates that the sample is generally reflective of the
overall NCAA Division I population (see Tables 2 and 3).
Administrators

Approximately 74% of the overall sample of administrators indicated their demographic information. The sample was primarily male working as Associate Athletic Directors at their respective institutions. Most of the sample had more than 16 years’ experience working in collegiate athletics. See Table 4 for complete demographics. See Table 4 for gender demographics of the NCAA Division I athletic administration population. Race/ethnicity demographics were not collected from the sample and thus are not reported for the overall NCAA Division I athletic administration population. However, gender identity demonstrates that the sample is generally reflective of the overall NCAA Division I administration population (see Tables 4 and 5).

Research Question 1

RQ1: How do coaches perceive their performance management regarding establishing clear performance and behavioral expectations? RQ1 was answered using 10 items. Further, seven items created a composite score reflecting the overall perception of the establishment of clear performance and behavioral expectations. The results indicate that coaches perceive to have a moderate understanding of the expectations for their coaching roles. However, qualitative results indicate that there are potential shortcomings in the current strategies for communicating expectations with coaches. See Tables 6 and 7 for quantitative results.

Two open-ended questions were analyzed to further contextualize the expectations athletic departments have for coaches and the way in which the expectations are communicated to coaches. The first question, “What performance expectations does
your athletic department have for you as a coach?” resulted in three themes: (a) Not Sure, (b) Academic and Athletic Performance Outcomes, and (c) Student-Athlete Satisfaction.

There was a total of 204 responses to the question asking “What performance expectations does your athletic department have for you as a coach?” and 30 responses (14.7%) indicated that they were unsure of the expectations the athletic department has for their role and performance. Some of the responses indicated that the expectations are self-directed, but the athletic department has never explicitly stated expectations for them. For example, one participant wrote, “I have no idea what my athletic department expects of me, or how they evaluate the job that I am doing.” Another participant wrote, “Expectations have never been explicitly communicated. I have inferred that the most important thing to leadership is the appearance of a smooth-running organization.” Other responses began with phrases such as, “my thought is” or “it seems” thus indicating that their expectations have been inferred rather than clearly communicated. Another participant wrote:

Not sure about the athletic department, but from our coaching staff’s perspective we intend to achieve the following: - Perennial top 10 team - Perennial 3.5 Team GPA - Team involved in community & in good legal standing - 100% job placement upon graduation.

Thus, there is still a high level of ambiguity regarding the expectations athletic departments have for coaches. The perceptions of coaches seem to be highly inferred rather than based on clear communication. Further, many coaches are explicit in the
expectations they have for themselves and their teams; however, this seems to involve
little collaboration with the athletic department.

The second theme, academic and athletic performance outcomes, appeared as the
most clearly communicated or inherently understood expectations for coaches.
Approximately 37 responses (18.1%) were coded as academic and athletic performance
outcomes. Many open-ended responses indicated a list of expectations/measures used to
gauge their performance. For example, one participant wrote, “GPA, grad rate, retention,
make tournament.” Another participant wrote, “conference performance, graduation
rate.” Therefore, many of the responses indicated some combination of athletic
performance outcomes and academic outcomes. However, other comments (57, 27.9%)
primarily referenced athletic performance outcomes as expectations for the coach/team.
One participant wrote, “Winning Conference Championships is the only goal for our
program.” Another wrote, “to win a national championship.” Therefore, either a singular
focus on athletic outcomes or a combination of athletic and academic outcomes seemed
to be expected of coaches.

The last theme, student-athlete satisfaction, was the other most recognized
expectation for coaches. However, satisfaction is being used to recognize a more holistic
thematic representation of various codes such as: positive student-athlete experience (19),
student-athlete satisfaction (24), team culture (5), parents/student-athletes happy (3), kids
happy (4), kind and fair treatment of student-athletes (2), and not creating problems (5).
The combination of these codes to create the theme student-athlete satisfaction
represented approximately 30% of the total responses. Therefore, there seems to be a lack
of consensus and understanding regarding what student-athlete satisfaction really means and the coaches’ role in facilitating student-athlete satisfaction. For example, one participant wrote, “Win...but no complaints of any kind from student-athletes or their parents.” Another participant wrote: “That we don't cause problems. That we work all the time. They don't care about our performance.” Therefore, not causing problems and/or having little complaints from student-athletes seemed to be one interpretation of student-athlete satisfaction. However, other respondents simply indicated student-athlete satisfaction as an important expectation, but without context regarding what student-athlete satisfaction really means. One participant wrote, “I would say (from my understanding) it's a cross between athletic success measured in W/L as well as student athlete satisfaction.” Therefore, student-athlete satisfaction seems to be important, but lacks consistency and understanding regarding what that term really means and how it is being measured other than a lack of complaints from student-athletes.

The second question, “How does/did your athletic department communicate these expectations to you?” resulted in 195 comments and four themes: (a) They Do Not, (b) Annual Performance Review, (c) Employment Contract, and (d) Meetings.

The theme, They Do Not, resulted in 35 comments (approximately 18% of the total comments). This theme represented the sentiment that expectations are not communicated to coaches and/or explicitly outlined. Therefore, many of the comments simply said, “they don’t” while some provided additional context. One participant wrote:

They don't. We don't even know what our department goals are (whenever I ask other coaches, they state that they also don't know). I am unsure as to how you
ever justify firing a person if you have never communicated goals/expectations with them, but that's apparently how we do things here.

Another participant stated that the only way they truly understand the athletic department’s values and expectations is based on their actions. This participant wrote, “Actions. Nothing is ever verbal or written. If you have one or two kids that are even slightly dissatisfied with their experience, your job is at risk. I have seen way too many coaches fired over this.” This demonstrates the importance an athletic department's actions are in communicating their priorities. Again, this denotes the importance of student-athlete satisfaction, but also seems to be defined by a lack of complaints/problems. Another participant wrote:

Expectations are what I have assumed and what I have seen happen previously. I am told when I haven't met expectations, but I am still not sure what the expectations actually are. We are more reactive versus establishing goals before.

Therefore, this theme demonstrates that expectations are not clearly defined and communicated for coaches. Rather, coaches are inferring expectations based upon an athletic department's reactions to certain scenarios.

The second theme, Annual Performance Review, indicated that the annual performance review is used as an opportunity to set and discuss expectations for coaches’ performances. A total of 22 comments (11.3%) indicated this annual review process as the main driver of expectation communication. Responses coded as Annual Performance Review were generally concise, with responses such as “end of year evaluation with sport supervisor,” “annual review,” and “yearly performance evaluations.”
The third theme, Employment Contract, resulted in 11 comments (5.6%) of the overall comments. These comments indicated that their contract, and their bonus structures, are means of communications from employer to employee regarding the main expectations for their performance. Example responses are “contract” and “written in annual contract.”

Finally, meetings resulted in 24 comments (12.3% of overall comments). Therefore, meetings were a primary strategy used to communicate and discuss expectations of coaches. However, the types of meetings varied within the comments from all-staff meetings to one-on-one meetings with their direct sport supervisors. Therefore, meetings were widely used to discuss current issues, restate expectations, and demonstrate the values of the department. One participant wrote, “Reiterated on a regular basis in individual and department meetings.” Further, other comments indicated that symbolism throughout the department helped to communicate expectations. One participant wrote, “Staff meetings - and the culture commitments are on the walls everywhere to see!” Other participants referenced meetings in conjunction with the department mission and vision statement to communicate the expectations of the department. Therefore, meetings served as a primary forum for discussing expectations. However, it was unclear if there were planned meetings to discuss expectations, was reactionary, or organically occurred throughout meetings.
Research Question 2

RQ2: How do coaches perceive their performance management in regard to collecting data to understand the achievement of expectations? RQ2 was assessed using eight items as well as a composite score. Quantitative results indicated that the majority of coaches (61.7%) perceived information additional to a win-loss (or other relevant performance metric) record that is used to evaluate their performance as a coach. The most highly agreed upon data point used to evaluate a coach outside of win-loss record was compliance adherence (83.6%) followed by student-athlete satisfaction (81.2%) and student-athlete academic outcomes (77.6%).

However, coaches only moderately agreed that data are collected from various groups (i.e., student-athletes, support staff) to inform their evaluation. Therefore, it seems as though the relationship with the sport supervisor or athletic director (whomever evaluates the coach’s performance) is critical for drawing data/perceptions regarding other evaluation criteria. See Figure 4 and Tables 8, 9, and 10 for results.

Research Question 3

RQ3: How do coaches perceive their performance management in regard to providing consistent feedback and coaching throughout the performance cycle? RQ3 was assessed using five items as well as a composite score. One of the items was open-ended and thematically coded to elicit results. The results indicated that this aspect of performance management had a mean score lower than the other three aspects of performance management. Therefore, coaching and feedback seems to be less prevalent within the performance management of coaches and may be an area of opportunity to
strengthen the developmental aspect of the system. See Tables 11 and 12 for quantitative results.

The open-ended question asked: “What resources, coaching, and/or training are provided through your athletic department to improve your performance and/or effectiveness as a coach?” The analysis resulted in four themes: (a) None, (b) Conferences/Conventions/Clinics, (c) Regulatory/Athlete Health Related Training, and (d) Internal/Campus Offerings. The open-ended question resulted in 218 comments and 74 of those comments (34%) responded saying none or something similar. One participant wrote, “None. Literally zero. Nada. Never talked about.” However, some participants (n=13) did indicate that they seek learning opportunities/professional development on their own time and with their own money. Therefore, although the athletic department does not provide any training and/or professional development opportunities, this doesn’t necessarily mean coaches are not doing any professional development.

The second theme, Conferences/Conventions/Clinics, seemed to be the most popular strategy for coach education/professional development. These educational opportunities were generally taking place within their sport specific coaching organizations or gender specific coaching organizations (i.e., WeCoach). Some participants indicated that their department would pay for them to attend a specific conference, or the department devoted money toward professional development, which coaches could then decide the best conference/clinic/convention to attend with this money. Although this professional development was not necessarily taking place
internally within the athletic department, it seemed to be primarily supported and funded by the athletic department.

The third theme, Regulatory/Athlete Health Related Training, referred to regulatory training that takes place on campus such as Title IX training and athletics related compliance training. Further, many participants referenced having training sessions related to student-athlete mental health, concussions, and CPR/First Aid. However, most of these training sessions seemed to occur once per year (e.g., Title IX), while some were more regular (e.g., athletics compliance education sessions).

The final theme, Internal/Campus Offerings, referred to meetings and professional development opportunities that happened more regularly and were housed within athletics and/or leveraged the resources of the broader university. One participant wrote, “We're provided once per month with the opportunity to meet with our entire department of coaches as an opportunity to generate discussions or have speakers of various topics.” Other activities referenced within this theme included coach lunch and learns, coach roundtable discussions with sport psychology staff members, and coach think tanks to leverage the coaching expertise and share ideas across sports within the department. However, there were other references to more minimal internal educational offerings. For example, one participant wrote, “We do meetings, I guess.”

**Research Question 4**

RQ4: How do coaches perceive their performance management in regard to rendering a formal performance evaluation report followed with a formal performance review meeting? RQ4 was assessed using seven items and a composite score. Results
indicated that most coaches perceive a formal evaluation process in place; however, 25% of the sample were either unsure or did not have a formal performance evaluation process. Further, those with a formal evaluation process generally had a formal performance evaluation meeting with their supervisor; however, less indicated that they received a document outlining their performance evaluation. See Figures 5, 6, and 7 and Tables 13 and 14 for results.

**Research Question 5**

RQ5: Are administrators trained to evaluate the performance of coaches within their supervision? RQ5 was assessed using two items, one of which was an open-ended question that was thematically coded to elicit results. The results indicate that more than 50% of athletic administrators with sport oversight responsibilities are not trained to evaluate the coaches they oversee. The qualitative data primarily elicited different strategies administrators use to learn to effectively evaluate coaches rather than formal training. See Figure 7 for quantitative results.

The question, “What guidance and/or training does the athletic department provide for you to evaluate the performance of coaches effectively?”, elicited 101 responses that were thematically coded.

Coding resulted in four themes: (a) None, (b) Sport Administrator Meetings/Mentorship, (c) Standardized Department Evaluation Documents/Procedures, and (d) University Human Resources System/Training.

The first theme, None, represented 26.7% of the total comments. Some of the comments simply wrote “none” or “zero training”; however, other comments provided
further context. For example, one participant wrote, “Very little training other than loose criteria shared by the head Athletic Director, coupled with any University HR procedures such as a performance management system for all employees.” Another wrote, “None, you have to figure it out.” Therefore, this theme supports the quantitative data that many of the sport administrators with supervisory roles were not trained to evaluate coaches.

The theme, Sport Administrator Meetings/Mentorship, resulted in 20 comments (19.8%). Many of the participants indicated open communication and mentorship among the senior executive staff members to work together to address concerns and establish best practices/procedures for evaluating coaches in their department. One participant wrote, “No formal training, more just asking other sport administrators questions.” Other participants indicated that their athletic department has a secondary sport administrator program where secondary administrators shadow and observe primary administrators to learn how to be a sport administrator. One participant wrote, “A more senior sport administrator served as a mentor in my first year as a sport administrator, and then all sport administrators collaborate and share on a regular basis.” Another participant wrote, “We have a monthly sport administrator meeting to discuss any concerns/issues, but no real direct training.” Therefore, mentorship and learning from each other seemed to be a primarily training strategy.

The third theme, Standardized Department Evaluation Documents/Procedures, represented 24.75% of the total responses. This theme recognized that one of the main resources administrators use to guide the evaluation process for coaches are standardized documents/templates. However, it isn’t clear if these documents are primarily created for
specific use within the athletic department and specific to coaches or if they are standardized documents from University Human Resources. One participant wrote, “We have a sports administrator form we use in conjunction with feedback from the student-athletes.” Another participant wrote, “We have a standard coaching evaluation form (consistent for all coaches). They self-evaluate first and then the supervisors evaluate and a face-to-face discussion is had about both to review documents.” Therefore, although administrators are not formally trained, they may be systematically following the directions of the documents used to evaluate a coaches’ performance.

The third theme, University Human Resources System/Training, resulted in 16 comments (16.8%) and seemed to represent the only formal evaluation training sport administrators were receiving if they were trained. For example, one participant wrote, “Within the Athletics department, none. The institutional HR office provides educational guidelines about how to evaluate the performance of coaches.” Another participant wrote, “Supervisor/Management training through HR. Tool is also self-explanatory as you work through it.” Therefore, University HR seemed to be an important partner in providing the training necessary for administrators to receive formal training regarding best practices for performance management/evaluation and/or the tools/forms used to evaluate university employees.

**Research Question 6**

RQ6: How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches regarding establishing clear performance and behavioral expectations? RQ6 was assessed using four items. The results indicate that administrators perceive they provide clear
expectations for the coaches they oversee. However, mean scores were slightly lower regarding coaches having a clear understanding of those expectations. Therefore, the results hint at a potential gap within setting clear expectations. Therefore, potentially administrators are clear on their expectations of coaches, but this isn’t being explicitly communicated. See Table 15 for quantitative results.

**Research Question 7**

RQ7: How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches in regard to collecting data to understand the achievement of expectations? RQ7 was assessed using four items. Results indicate that the primary data sources sport administrators use to inform their evaluation of coaches are their own observations (95%) and support staff (95%) followed by information from student-athletes (91%). Further, the most common data collection method is communication with coaches (about once a week) and the least common data collection method is practice oversight (about once a month). See Figures 9 and 10 and Table 16 for results.

**Research Question 8**

RQ8: How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches in regard to providing consistent feedback and coaching throughout the performance cycle? RQ8 was assessed using three items. Results indicate that administrators feel as though they are in constant communication with coaches and provide ongoing feedback throughout a performance cycle. However, administrators feel less strongly that the athletic department as a whole provides support for coaches to develop in their craft. Therefore, although administrators may feel as though they are doing their part to
develop coaches, it seems as though there may be room for improvement at a departmental level. See Table 17 for quantitative results.

**Research Question 9**

RQ9: How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches in regard to rendering a formal performance evaluation report followed with a formal performance review meeting? RQ9 was assessed with two items. Administrators seem to agree or strongly agree that they conduct a formal performance evaluation with both an evaluation document and performance evaluation meeting. However, administrators, similarly to coaches, indicated that they were more likely to have a meeting than to provide coaches with a formal document outlining their performance evaluation. See Table 18 for quantitative results.

**Research Question 10**

RQ10: How do the documents corroborate or contrast the survey findings? RQ10 was assessed by analyzing the eight documents solicited from survey participants.

All eight documents were provided by coaches. The document analysis resulted in the following findings: (a) Self and Direct Supervisor, and (b) Perception Based.

The first theme, Self and Direct Supervisor, refers to the people directly involved in the evaluation process. All of the documents demonstrated that the process entailed two primary persons: the employee and the employee’s direct supervisor. Generally, the employee would conduct a self-evaluation and the direct supervisor would provide an employee evaluation. This would then result in a meeting and final performance appraisal document (i.e., the documents reviewed) which then required signatures to move up the
chain of command for review and further signatures. Some of the documents appeared to allow the employee to add comments and/or to the supervisor’s evaluation and both evaluations were moved up the chain of command. However, some documents seemed as though the employee self-evaluation was created and then used by the supervisor to complete their evaluation and then only the supervisor’s evaluation was sent up the chain of command as the official performance appraisal document.

The second theme, Perception Based, referred to the information within the evaluation forms. The rating assigned to each item (e.g., encourages participation in programming) seemed to be based on the perception of the employee or supervisor rather than any explicit data provided to inform the rating. For example, one performance evaluation form rated coaches on a 5-point scale from unsatisfactory to exemplary. Example items in which they were rated included: overall record, team cohesiveness, performance of young players, and strength of schedule (among many other items). The employee and supervisor then assigned a rating based on their perception rather than any evidence to support their assigned rating. However, most sections on performance evaluation forms did provide a space to add comments if necessary to provide additional context to ratings assigned. However, the exception to this was one performance evaluation form that had a section designated “annual activities tracking.” This section had many designated criteria items such as: APR score, team GPA, community engagement activity (employee would insert date and name of activity conducted with team), professional development (employee would insert date and name of any professional development activities). Therefore, on the annual activities tracking sheet,
the employee then had to add in “evidence” to support each section such as an event and date for a professional development activity or the date and event of a team community service event. This method required more documentation of actual events that occurred; however, this seemed to be in addition to the ratings section and did not necessarily inform the ratings. For example, some of the ratings sections included inclusiveness and commitment to quantity and quality of work and the “annual activities tracking” sheet did not seem to necessarily inform these ratings.

**Summary of Results**

The results described coaches’ and administrators’ perceptions of performance management within NCAA Division I athletic departments. Collectively, the results indicate that the majority of coaches (70.6%) report having a formal performance evaluation. However, the formal performance evaluation is reflective of performance appraisal, rather than reflective of the more holistic performance management system. These results indicate that collegiate coaches may still be working within a system that utilizes performance appraisal rather than performance management; thereby limiting performance behavior changes needed to perform at the highest level.

When examining the results through a holistic performance management perspective, it appears as though there are large gaps that may prevent it from being a holistic and systematic performance management system. First, although the quantitative results indicate that coaches primarily agreed with having clear expectations, qualitative data told otherwise. Therefore, perhaps coaches have expectations for themselves, but it is not necessarily clearly communicated and/or in conjunction with their sport supervisor...
and the athletic department. Therefore, a systematic approach to establishing criteria used to evaluate coaches’ performance coupled with intentional and clear communication are lacking yet necessary.

Further, the document analysis demonstrated that the final rating assigned to all criteria on the performance evaluation seemed to be solely on the perception of the sport administrator. Although the sport administrator reported utilizing other data sources (e.g., support staff, student athletes) to inform their perceptions of a coach’s performance, it is unclear how they collect data from these data sources. Therefore, a more robust system for collecting data with a clear sampling strategy is an important consideration for improving the coach performance management system. Further, this may improve coaches' feelings toward the system and thus, influence the internationalization of results making the performance management system more effective in motivating behavior/performance changes.

Finally, the composite score reflecting coaches’ perceptions of feedback and coaching was lower than the composite scores reflecting the other components of performance management. Therefore, coaches may be eager for more coaching, feedback, and professional development opportunities to continue to hone their craft and serve their student-athletes to the best of their ability. Most Division I athletic departments have robust student-athlete development programs; however, research also demonstrates that the coach has the greatest influence on student-athlete experience (Gano-Overway & Dieffenbach, 2019). Therefore, more resources may be needed toward developing coaches and thus improving student-athlete experience. Additionally, adding
in more robust feedback and coaching for Division I coaches throughout the performance cycle may contribute to viewing the performance management system as developmental rather than administrative; thus, influencing its effectiveness (Boswell & Boudreau, 2000).
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The results from the study are foundational in updating outdated literature regarding the performance management processes in place within NCAA Division I athletic departments for coaches. Prior to this study, the most recent systematic inquiry of this topic was conducted in 1998 (Barber & Eckrich, 1998). Further, Barber and Eckrich’s (1998) study sought to understand the differences between the performance evaluation systems at NCAA Divisional levels (I, II, III). This study updates and expands Barber and Eckrich’s (1998) work by developing a nuanced understanding of the systems in place within NCAA Division I athletic departments from a more holistic performance management perspective (rather than performance appraisal). Further, this study explored the coach and administrators’ perceptions of the performance management systems. Thus, this study provides a holistic description of the performance management systems within NCAA, Division I and provides a foundation for future research. A discussion of the results and implications for each research question is provided.

Research Question 1

Results from RQ1 demonstrate that coaches perceive to have a clear understanding of the expectations the athletic department has for their performance. However, the clarity of these expectations seem to be primarily the outcomes that are important to the athletic department. For example, coaches seem to have an understanding that their athletic departments have expectations surrounding athletic performance, academic performance, and student-athlete satisfaction. Athletic
performance and student-athlete academic outcomes are easily quantifiable; however, student-athlete satisfaction poses more of a challenge to define and measure, and there seems to be significant concern and confusion from coaches regarding student-athlete satisfaction. Therefore, athletic departments need to be more strategic in defining and operationalizing student-athlete satisfaction. Further, the strategies toward the achievement of expectations seem to be dictated by the coaches’ perception rather than clarity of how the athletic department defines a healthy team culture, student-athlete satisfaction, or other factors. Therefore, athletic departments may need to provide more detail into the expected strategies, behaviors, and communication toward the achievement of these expected outcomes (i.e., student-athlete satisfaction, “good” team culture). This would provide greater clarity into the achievement of these expectations and the ability to measure the progress toward these expectations. For example, one open-ended response to a question regarding the expectations of coaches wrote, “all are expected to ‘produce good leaders’ though the application of that is very inconsistent.” Therefore, more guidance may be required to fully describe how the athletic department operationalizes a “good leader” and how “good leaders” are best developed rather than leaving this open to interpretation for each individual coach. Therefore, while the coaches seemed to agree that there is clarity in their expectations (understanding the importance of athletics, academics, and student-athlete satisfaction), the qualitative data uncovered that these may just be assumptions rather than explicitly communicated, operationalized, and systematically examined through the evaluation process.
Establishing expectations/performance criteria and the clear of these expectations are foundational in a strong performance management system. Therefore, athletic departments striving to implement a strong performance management system should first ensure they have clearly defined and communicated their expectations to coaches.

**Research Question 2**

Further, of those who perceive to have a formal performance evaluation approximately 34% of coaches perceive that the data collected to measure their performance does not include any data in addition to their win-loss record or other relevant performance metric. This is problematic because research suggests that outcome driven evaluations may cause/contribute to unethical behavior toward the achievement of these outcomes (Cunningham & Dixon, 2003; MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995). This could encourage more transactional relationships between coaches and athletes where athletes are merely a means toward a desired outcome; thus, limiting the health and wellbeing of student-athletes, a pillar within the NCAA. Further, this could also encourage compliance related issues within the NCAA with the presence of a “win at all costs” mentality, thereby putting the entire athletic department in jeopardy of NCAA sanctions.

However, coaches that perceive to be evaluated on criteria in addition to those of athlete performance outcomes, denoted some of the most used criteria to gauge their performance. Compliance adherence and student-athlete satisfaction are perceived to be the most used criteria to gauge coach performance. These are followed by student-athlete academic outcomes, budget adherence, and quality of interpersonal relationships with student-athletes. However, there is limited understanding regarding how data is collected.
to reflect each of these criteria, and if each criteria item is weighted equally or if they are all secondary to athletic performance or vice versa. For example, one coach wrote: “It's truly all about wins/losses because if you do not win enough games, the other stuff doesn't matter.”

Further, document analysis demonstrated that performance criteria are commonly gauged through the perceptions of the sport administrator. Therefore, all data collected (i.e., support staff, athletes) regarding the performance of the coach is filtered through the lens of their direct sport administrator. Therefore, athletic departments may think they are conducting a 360-performance evaluation; however, a 360 approach would require actual ratings and data from different data sources. Instead, athletic administrators may ask for feedback from data sources (i.e., student-athletes, support staff); however, all this data is filtered through their perspective and only the administrator assigns a rating to the coaches’ performance.

Additionally, coaches seemed concerned about how student-athlete feedback/data is handled and used to inform their performance evaluation. One participant responded to an open-ended question by writing: “Some administrators also seem like they will always side with the S-As in confrontational situations, which also makes me nervous. It can feel like if you make one decision that a S-A doesn't like, they can get you fired.” Therefore, more transparency with student-athlete data, and a systematic approach to handling negative feedback from student-athletes would likely be beneficial for all parties involved.
Research Question 3

Coaching and feedback was the lowest rated component of performance management for coaches, suggesting that this could be an area of improvement for athletic departments in relation to the performance management of coaches. Therefore, although coaches demonstrated agreement with clear expectations, data collection, and a formal performance review process-they have much less agreement in relation to getting feedback and coaching to actually meet these expectations and improve their performance. This creates a large gap in the performance management of coaches and suggests that coaches may want/need more coaching and professional development throughout performance cycles. Further, the majority of professional development/training opportunities coaches reported were clinics and/or conferences which generally take place once-per-year, and thus are inconsistent professional development opportunities. Research demonstrates that experience is turned into knowledge through consistent reflection practices (Gilbert & Trudel, 2005). This is especially true when the reflection is occurring in real time (or shortly after an event) and addressing real scenarios coaches are encountering (Gilbert & Trudel, 2001). Therefore, the addition of consistent coaching, feedback, and reflection throughout a performance cycle would provide an opportunity for applied reflection to elicit the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities as well as potential behavior changes relevant to performance achievement of coaches.

Further, performance management generally serves two functions to the organization—administrative/regulatory and development (Cunningham & Dixon, 2003).
These results suggest that performance management within athletic departments leans more toward regulatory/administrative rather than developmental. This poses an issue based on the work of Boswell and Boudreau (2000). Boswell and Boudreau (2000) suggest that performance management is more effective in actually improving performance when it is perceived as more developmental in nature rather than administrative and regulatory. Therefore, athletic administrators should reexamine and work collaboratively with coaches to understand how performance management systems can become more developmental rather than administrative. Further, the system should be intentionally curated for coaches and their work rather than the universal performance management system used for every employee within the university. One participant wrote:

I wish coaches were asked/allowed the opportunity to have more say in what the evaluation should look like/ask. The individuals that write these evaluations often have had little to no experience in a coaching role/working so closely with a team at the Division 1 level.

The aforementioned quote demonstrates that a level of collaboration may be missing in regard to establishing the performance management system, which then limits coach buy-in and the overall effectiveness of the performance management system (Sharma et al., 2016).

However, important questions remain regarding the coaching element of performance management. For example, what position within the athletic department would be most equipped to coach coaches? Would the value of additional coaching
specifically for coaches throughout a performance cycle outweigh the costs (i.e. time, resources)? Do sport supervisors have the capacity and/or expertise to provide detailed feedback and coaching to coaches under their supervision? Should coaching and/or professional development for coaches be outsourced and managed through a third-party?

The data from this study demonstrates that coaches are receiving limited feedback and coaching to improve their performance throughout a performance cycle. However, more work needs to be done to understand how best to address this finding.

**Research Question 4**

Only 70.6% of the sample indicated that their performance as a coach is formally evaluated by their athletic department. Of the coaches that reported having a formal performance evaluation, 72.2% reported receiving a document outlining their performance evaluation and 84.7% reported having a formal performance evaluation meeting to discuss their evaluation. Therefore, many employees are not receiving a performance evaluation report. This further reinforces the idea that perhaps this is because the evaluation is solely based on supervisor perception and the criteria used in the evaluation are not clearly defined or communicated; therefore, athletic departments do not have a systematic approach to the performance evaluation process and therefore cannot produce a reflective report.

Further, performance evaluation within collegiate athletic departments may have actually regressed since Barber and Eckrich’s (1998) study reported that 17% of athletic departments do not have a performance evaluation system in place for coaches. Barber and Eckrich’s (1998) study was inclusive of all divisions while this study focused only on
Division I. This finding demonstrates a potential risk factor and liability within athletic departments with 25% of coaches not participating in a performance evaluation. Further, this negates any accountability necessary within collegiate coaching as the level of oversight is diminished without a formal performance evaluation in place to hold coaches accountable to certain professional standards and expectations (and communicate standards and expectations). Additionally, this limits the ability to use the performance evaluation as a developmental tool to understand areas of opportunity to improve a coach’s performance in the future.

**Research Question 5**

More than 50% of athletic administrators indicated that they are not trained to evaluate the performance of coaches within their supervision. Qualitatively, administrators indicated that in-house training consists of being provided standardized documents to use and those indicating a more extensive training are generally trained through their university human resources department. However, in open-ended qualitative data, some administrators responded that they are former coaches and thus, can connect with the coach experience and understand better how to evaluate coaches. This could potentially elicit buy-in from coaches to have former coaches in administrative roles with supervisory responsibilities. However, having supervisors responsible for evaluating coaches without being trained to do so can also be problematic. Tuytens and Devos (2012) outlined three standards for successful performance appraisals, one of which was having trained evaluators.
Further, having sport administrators evaluating coaches without a coaching background can also be problematic. In an open-ended response, one coach wrote: “Coaches are being evaluated by administrators who do not have experience coaching and may not understand the nuances of the profession.” Further, another coach commented:

My concern is my evaluation might be done by an administrator that isn't knowledgeable. If the athletic department hands out sport administration duties to senior staff, instead of a sport administration division, then I might be evaluated by the director of media relations. I wouldn't respect that person's knowledge base in relation to any evaluation.

This is an important consideration because of the research demonstrating the importance of the social milieu surrounding the evaluation process. Therefore, an athletic department can have a systematic approach to a coach evaluation, but if the coach doesn’t believe the person evaluating their performance understands coaching and the coach does not respect their feedback and perspective, they are unlikely to change their behavior based on this feedback. This would potentially negate the effectiveness of a performance management system. Therefore, since not all sport administrators with sport oversight responsibilities have a coaching background, other strategies may be necessary to fill this gap. For example, sport administrators should really immerse themselves in the team’s culture and be present to ensure they understand the goals, culture, and processes of the team.

Further, an evaluation training system could be beneficial. Therefore, administrators can confidently speak to how the coach will be evaluated and the process they will use to
Research Question 6

Administrators perceive that they provide clear expectations for the coaches they oversee. However, one item (“The coaches in my athletic department have a clear understanding of the criteria used to evaluate their performance”) demonstrated that administrators may not feel as though they are clear regarding the actual criteria used to measure coach performance. Therefore, perhaps administrators do not have a clear understanding of the exact criteria they are observing and forming judgements about and thus cannot explicitly communicate these to coaches. Therefore, athletic departments should explicitly designate the criteria used to evaluate a coaches’ performance and how these criteria will be measured. This could alleviate confusion regarding the expectations for coaches and thus enable a more streamlined performance management system moving into the other elements (i.e., data collection, coaching, and formal evaluative judgment and review).

Research Question 7

Administrators report primarily using their own observations as a mechanism for data collection in conjunction with the observations of support staff. Further, the primary mechanisms administrators use to oversee coaches and their teams are communication with coaches and support staff as well as competition observation. Therefore, an administrator's overall observations and judgements may be filtered through the communication that coaches and support staff provide and/or influenced by the outcome
of a competition. Strategies used least often to oversee a team and collect data are communication with student-athletes and practice observations. Thus, a more systematic and balanced approach to data collection could create a more holistic representation of a coach and their performance.

**Research Question 8**

There is stark contrast between the perceptions of administrators and coaches regarding the amount of coaching and feedback coaches receive to improve their performance. Administrators primarily agreed or strongly agreed that they provide ongoing feedback and coaching to the coaches they oversee (“I provide ongoing feedback and coaching to the coaches I oversee;” \( \bar{X}=4.18 \)). However, coaches demonstrated much less agreement with similar items (“I get the coaching I need throughout a performance cycle to improve as a coach;” \( \bar{X}=2.84 \)). Further, administrators had a greater level of agreement with statements that were directly tied to them rather than the athletic department as a whole. For example, administrators felt as though they provided consistent feedback and coaching to coaches within their supervision but had less agreement with an item assessing the amount the department supported coach development (“As a department, we provide adequate support for coaches to continue to develop their skills as coaches;” \( \bar{X}=3.58 \)). Therefore, while administrators may be individually seeking to provide coaches with adequate development opportunities and feedback, improvement may be necessary at a departmental/systematic level. Further, the perception between administrators and coaches are clearly different regarding this aspect.
of performance management. Therefore, perhaps more conversations and structure is warranted regarding the feedback/coaching coaches want and need to improve.

**Research Question 9**

Similarly to coaches, administrators agreed that they render a formal performance evaluation and a formal performance review meeting with coaching following their performance review. However, administrators had stronger rates of agreement in conducting a formal performance evaluation meeting ($\bar{X}=4.40$) than providing coaches with a formal document outlining the evaluation ($\bar{X}=4.17$). This corroborated the coach's responses to similar questions. Therefore, it would be important to understand the value a formal performance evaluation report brings and why some athletic departments are providing them while others are not.

**Research Question 10**

Document analysis demonstrated that many Universities have a similar system in place for performance evaluation/performance appraisal which generally involves an employee and their supervisor and is largely based on supervisor perception. Further, many of these performance evaluations seem to be characteristic of the entire university and applied to coaches rather than created specifically with coaches in mind. Therefore, if athletic departments truly want to maximize the benefits from a robust performance management system, they should invest the time to curate a system that is directly applicable to coaches. While this may have significant upfront costs (i.e., time and resources needed to build the system), it could lead to a better use of time and better performances moving forward. A coach-specific evaluation system may have two
specific benefits: (a) coaches develop more positive perceptions toward their performance evaluation because it feels relevant and specifically made for them, (2) coaches are more likely to use the feedback from the evaluation to drive their professional development efforts.

Therefore, athletic departments may want to consider completely customizing their performance evaluation system or adding a component that feels more specific to coaches to gain more value from the system.

Theoretical Contributions and Expansions

Two theoretical frameworks guided this study: Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) model of coaching effectiveness and MacLean and Chelladurai’s (1995)’s dimensions of coach performance. Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) model of coaching effectiveness provides guidance into the athlete outcomes necessary to gauge coaching effectiveness. The four athlete outcomes (competence, confidence, connection, and character) seem to take different levels of importance and different measurement strategies within the performance management process for coaches with competence, both academically and athletically, taking priority. However, it is unclear if there are expectations surrounding the development of confidence, connection, and character among student-athletes during their intercollegiate athletic career, or if these are represented within the construct of student-athlete satisfaction. Additionally, it is clear that coaches working in collegiate athletic departments have duties and responsibilities well beyond more traditional coaching roles. Therefore, coaching effectiveness is really only one part of their overall job description with other important factors such as compliance adherence and fiscal
responsibility (fundraising, budget adherence, roster management). Therefore, perhaps the coaching effectiveness framework provides a starting point for operationalizing necessary student-athlete outcomes to measure in addition to athletic and academic outcomes. Adding these criteria (confidence, connection, and character) would provide more specificity to coaches regarding how they should approach coaching and may ease their concerns regarding the fickle nature of student-athlete satisfaction. Further, significant qualitative data suggested that coaches felt as though student-athlete satisfaction was primarily based on whether the student-athlete received playing time which provides little insight into their actual experience on the team and relationship with the coaching staff. Therefore, confidence, connection, and character may be a better gauge of a coach’s effectiveness than student-athlete satisfaction.

The second theoretical framework, MacLean and Chelladurai’s (1995)’s dimensions of coach performance suggest that coaches should be evaluated based on behavioral product and behavioral process factors. Findings from this study designated quantitatively that behavioral products (i.e., graduation rate, win/loss record) and behavioral processes (i.e., compliance adherence, student-athlete satisfaction, relationship building) are important within the coach evaluation process. However, behavioral products are much easier to quantify and measure improvement over time. Behavioral processes, while designated as an important criteria in the coach evaluation process, seem to be reactionary rather than proactively established and explicitly communicated. Therefore, MacLean and Chelladurai’s (1995) framework provides an opportunity to use it as a goal setting tool that is then revisited throughout the performance cycle and
ultimately at the performance evaluation stage of performance management. The documents used in document analysis demonstrated that a common performance evaluation process is for the coach to engage in self-evaluation, the administrator to engage in coach evaluation, and then the two come together to discuss their individual evaluations of the coaches’ performance. Therefore, this framework would provide an opportunity to be more thorough in the goal setting and expectation setting process and make the process directly applicable to collegiate coaches.

**Practical Recommendations**

This study is descriptive in nature; however, comparing and contrasting the results of this study with previous studies elicits important practical implications for athletic departments to improve the performance management process for coaches.

Further, as Rubin and Edwards (2020) suggest, the social milieu surrounding the performance management process may be even more important than the actual structure or system itself. Therefore, there is no universally accepted system for performance management. Rather, administrators and coaches need to develop an open relationship where coaches feel supported and respected and then come to an agreement that is explicitly communicated to understand how they will be evaluated in which they both agree upon. Thus, reinforcing, if coaches don’t believe that the performance management process is developmental, an accurate reflection of their performance, and/or providing useful feedback, the performance management system may provide organizationally required documentation (i.e., administrative purpose), but will have little effect on actual behavior change and performance improvement (Sharma et al., 2016).
Further, athletic administrators may need to have a more visible presence around the team environment to truly understand the team culture, coach-athlete relationships, and behavioral processes in place. This is important because administrators’ perceptions seem to be the primary data point in an evaluation of the coach, and thus, this needs to be well-informed through primary data as well as secondary data (feedback from student-athletes, support staff, etc.). When administrators lack a presence with a coaches’ team, it seems as though their feedback is not seen as valuable or accurate—thus limiting a coaches’ desire to use their feedback to drive future improvements/behavioral change. However, an administrators’ presence with a team should not be approached from a regulatory standpoint; rather, this should be framed as seeking to truly understand the team, the relationships therein, the processes, and the team culture. Therefore, having a greater presence can also strengthen the relationship between coach/administrator and thus reinforce that any feedback from the administrator is well-informed and seeking to help the coach be even better.

Based on the findings from the current study (and previous literature surrounding performance management inside and outside of sport), the following recommendations are proposed:

(a) Athletic departments need to operationalize student-athlete satisfaction and provide a systematic approach to measuring this construct. Coaches from the athletic department should be involved in this process.

(b) Athletic administrators with sport oversight responsibilities should spend more time “behind the scenes” with coaches (e.g., observing practice, sitting in on team
meetings, traveling with the team, participating in team building activities, etc.) to better inform their perceptions of the coaches they evaluate. Further, this could elicit more buy-in from coaches because they may feel as though administrators really know what goes into their job as a coach and the true culture of their team. (c) Athletic departments should provide evaluation training for administrators to learn how to systematically evaluate coaches. (d) Athletic administrators with sport oversight responsibilities should establish a systematic approach to data collection to inform their perceptions regarding a coach’s performance. (e) Athletic departments should consider leveraging more university and internal resources to connect and develop the coaches within their departments. For example, there are many experts on campus covering various topics such as leadership, team culture, communication, physiology, psychology, etc. in which they could bring in for round table discussions among all coaches in the department. This would provide an opportunity for coaches to learn from experts in their field as well as connect with each other, as they likely have many shared experiences as coaches, yet many athletic departments can be siloed and disconnected by sport. Further, this would aid in providing consistent developmental opportunities to reflect on experiences and develop knowledge. (f) Athletic departments and universities should work collaboratively to ensure that the performance management system is adapted and applicable to coaches. For example, some coaches commented in open-ended responses that their evaluation
takes place in the middle of their season because that is when University human resources wants it done. However, this limits the ability to really gauge their performance within a natural coaching performance cycle (i.e., their season).

**Performance Management System Proposal**

Although performance management systems should be adapted to the individual needs of the athletic department, the following guidelines are proposed for creating a robust performance management system within the athletic department.

**Clear Performance and Behavioral Expectations**

Coaches and direct sport supervisors should individually brainstorm performance and behavioral expectations for the upcoming performance cycle. After each party has created an individual list, they should come together to compare their list and then ultimately create a list of agreed upon performance and behavioral expectations for the upcoming performance cycle. Further, these performance expectations, particularly behavioral expectations, should then be operationalized.

**Data Collection**

Each performance and behavioral expectation should have an appropriate method of data collection in order to fully understand if the expectation has been met. Performance expectations will more than likely have an organic data collection measure (e.g., win/loss record, recruiting class ranking, NCAA qualifiers, post-season qualifications). However, there should be significant focus placed on the data collection plan to inform the behavioral expectations. For example, administrators may use surveys, field notes, observations, and interviews to fully understand the achievement of these
expectations. However, it may be appropriate to also outsource this process to a third-party because it will be a time-consuming process if done properly.

**Feedback and Coaching**

Data collection should include both formative and summative assessments. Formative assessments should be done periodically throughout the performance cycle (pre-determined and agreed upon prior to the performance cycle) and be used to provide coaches with feedback. Further, coaches should periodically reflect on their expectations and where they feel they stand in relation to the expectations. This can then be used to further understand their needs regarding feedback and coaching throughout the performance cycle. Further, there may also be an opportunity to connect coaches with outside executive coaches/performance coaches as a form of professional development. This will ensure coaches have a person outside of the organization who is invested in their personal and professional development, and they are supported in the pursuit of their expectations.

**Render a Formal Performance Review**

Every performance cycle should be met with a performance review report and a performance review meeting. The performance review report should entail all expectations and the associated data collection results (both formative and summative) that is used to inform their final performance evaluation determination. Like the current structure, each coach should conduct a self-review and the administrator (or outside evaluator) should complete the evaluation report separately. There should then be a meeting to compare and discuss their evaluation determinations.


Study Limitations

Limitations of the research design and data elicited deserve acknowledgement to provide full data transparency. First, one of the main limitations to this project was the response rate and sample size. This is a very transient community with career changes and institutional changes happening often. This resulted in invalid email addresses during the recruitment process because employees may have moved to another institution or department after their email address was added to the database. Further, this limited the number of potential participants because participation criteria required having worked at their current institution for at least one complete season. Additionally, collegiate athletic employees are a unique population that may have adverse feelings toward academic research because they feel over-researched and do not have the time to dedicate to completing all the surveys they are recruited to complete (Hardin et al., 2014). Moreover, the survey was administered in November, which is historically a busy time for collegiate coaches and administrators. One survey participant wrote in an open-ended question response, “You picked the worst time to conduct this survey. We are all slammed this time of year.” Therefore, because of the timeline of the project and the need to recruit participants in the Fall, this likely affected the response rates and participation in the survey.

Another limitation was the inability to pinpoint collegiate athletic administrators with specific sport oversight responsibilities prior to recruitment. Many staff directory websites do not specifically state which administrators have sport oversight responsibilities. Further, Division I has a significant variability of resources where some
lower resourced athletic departments have administrators with various responsibilities. In an effort not to make assumptions regarding who may or may not have sport oversight responsibilities, a census recruitment method was used. Therefore, all athletic department personnel were emailed soliciting participation which required participants to correctly self-select into the survey if they met the criteria. Further, the census recruitment strategy required significant survey branching to handle potential participants not meeting criteria and correctly exiting the survey. Although additional measures were taken to ensure the integrity of the data (names of participants were cross examined with staff directories), it is impossible to ensure that all participants met the requirements for participation and is therefore recognized as a limitation.

**Future Research**

Research exploring the performance management processes of collegiate coaches is scarce and outdated; therefore, this project was sorely needed. However, this study merely provides a foundation for future research and much more work is needed to fully understand the performance management process and make inferences regarding best practices. The current study was descriptive in nature, and while beneficial as a starting point, causal inferences cannot be drawn, and decisions made without further empirical research. Therefore, various methods of data collection and analysis are needed moving forward to elicit a more comprehensive understanding of this topic.

Future research should specifically explore the instruments used to measure coach performance in practice with particular attention paid to instruments used to collect data from student-athletes. For example, most coaches and administrators indicated that
coaches are evaluated on the quality of relationships with student-athletes (among many other socially constructed criteria); however, it is still unclear how administrators and/or athletic directors are collecting data surrounding these criterions and using it to make judgements about the overall quality of the relationships between coaches and student-athletes. Therefore, this study elicited what coaches perceive they are being evaluated on and what administrators perceive they are evaluating coaches on; however, further research is needed to understand the data collected to inform these evaluations.

Additionally, one of the primary concerns for coaches regarding the performance evaluation process was the instrument used to collect data from student-athletes and how that data was then interpreted and used to inform their performance evaluation. It appears coaches valued student-athlete feedback; however, they were concerned that the nature of the comments from student-athletes were based on playing time and/or more attention/weight was given to student-athletes who were dissatisfied rather than satisfied. Future research could explore the connection between playing time and student-athlete satisfaction by examining student-athlete feedback and coding as either positive or negative and then correlating this with playing time (for sports where playing time is a viable measure) to explore the presence of this phenomenon. Additionally, future research is needed to specifically assess instruments used to solicit student-athlete feedback and understand what is being measured and how this data is being analyzed and then used to inform decisions. How should athletic departments manage negative feedback from student-athletes regarding coaches? One participant in the study responded to an open-ended question by writing:
If you upset one athlete, they can bring your entire world down on you by complaining to the administration. It doesn't matter that hundreds of other athletes would back you up, they only listen to the complainers. I personally have been very lucky over the course of my long career, but I have seen countless solid coaches fired over this stuff.

This sentiment seemed resounding throughout the open-ended qualitative data and should be further explored in research. Another participant wrote: “Keeping athletes happy seems to be the primary point of value to our department.” Are coaches coaching in fear of negative student-athlete feedback? Would a systematic approach to handling negative feedback from student-athletes alleviate coaches’ fear and provide a level of clarity regarding the due process for handling this feedback? If so, how should this be handled and how do athletic administrators understand what negative feedback deserves additional investigation and attention?

Therefore, future research is needed to fully understand performance management within collegiate athletic departments.

Conclusion

NCAA Division I athletic departments seem to conduct performance evaluations that are more reflective of performance appraisal rather than performance management systems. Therefore, athletic departments should strive to move toward a performance management system by providing clear expectations/criteria for coaches, collect robust data to inform the achievement of these expectations, and then provide coaching and feedback throughout the performance cycle. Therefore, a more systematic approach is
necessary to establish a performance management system rather than a one-time performance evaluation report that is followed by a meeting. The clear area of opportunity that needs the most improvement is feedback and coaching provided to coaches. The other components of performance management (i.e., expectations, data collection, and formal reporting) seem to have a baseline while coaching and feedback is significantly lagging the other components. Therefore, this study described the current state of performance management within NCAA Division I athletic departments and provided practical suggestions for improvement. Further, the study provides a scholarly impetus to continue to merge human resources and sport management and more specifically explore performance management of coaches in future research.
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Appendix A: Tables and Figures

Figure 1

*Côté and Gilbert’s (2009) model of coaching effectiveness*
Figure 2

MacLean & Chelladurai’s (1995) Domains of Coaching Performance
Cunningham and Dixon’s (2003) performance appraisal model for intercollegiate coaches
Table 1.

Data analysis plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 How do coaches perceive their performance management regarding establishing clear performance and behavioral expectations?</td>
<td>3.18 3.19 3.20</td>
<td>Mean/Composite Thematic Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 How do coaches perceive their performance management in regard to collecting data to understand the achievement of expectations?</td>
<td>3.3 3.4 3.21</td>
<td>Frequencies Frequencies Mean/Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 How do coaches perceive their performance management in regard to providing consistent feedback and coaching throughout the performance cycle?</td>
<td>78 3.16 3.23</td>
<td>Mean Thematic Mean/Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 How do coaches perceive their performance management in regard to rendering a formal performance evaluation report followed with a formal performance review meeting?</td>
<td>3.1 3.8 3.9 3.22</td>
<td>Frequencies Frequencies Frequencies Mean/Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Are administrators trained to evaluate the performance of coaches within their supervision?</td>
<td>4.2 4.3</td>
<td>Frequencies Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches regarding establishing clear performance and behavioral expectations?</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches in regard to collecting data to understand the achievement of expectations?</td>
<td>4.5 4.7 4.12</td>
<td>Frequencies Frequencies Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches in regard to providing consistent feedback and coaching throughout the performance cycle?</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 How do administrators perceive the performance management of coaches in regard to rendering a formal performance evaluation report followed with a formal performance review meeting?</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>How do the documents corroborate or contrast the survey findings?</td>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

**Demographic data of coaches.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Coach</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Head Coach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Head Coach</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Sport Coached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Gender</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Coached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming and Diving</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years working in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

*Demographic data for the entire NCAA division I coach population*

Note. This data was reported in a gender binary with only two genders represented. Data retrieved from NCAA Research (2022).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Assistant Coach</th>
<th>Head Coach</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.

Demographic data of administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Athletic Director</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Athletic Director</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Athletic Director</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years working in collegiate athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years working at current institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Demographic data for the entire NCAA athletic director positions*

Note. This data was reported in a gender binary with only two genders represented. Data retrieved from NCAA Research (2022).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Assistant Athletic Director</th>
<th>Associate Director of Athletics</th>
<th>Director of Athletics</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Coaches’ perceptions of clear performance and behavioral expectations.*

Note. Rating scale was from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>( \sigma_M )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of the expectations my athletic department has for my performance.</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My athletic department clearly communicated their expectations of me when I was hired.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how my expectations are tied to the overall goals of the athletic department.</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expectations my athletic department has for me are dominated by athletic outcomes (e.g., conference standing, win-loss record).</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My athletic department has clear expectations for the application of interpersonal skills and appropriate strategies used to enhance the performance of individual athletes and the team as a whole.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the expectations my direct supervisor has for me.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in the process of setting my performance goals.</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expectations my direct supervisor has for my performance are fair.</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The athletic department's expectations for coaches are primarily outcome driven (i.e., win/loss record, conference standing, awards, etc.)</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The athletic department's expectations for coaches are primarily behavioral/process driven (i.e., fostering a healthy team culture, cultivating strong relationships, etc.)</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

*Composite score reflecting perceptions of performance and behavioral expectations.*

Note. The composite score includes items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>$\sigma_M$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P_1 Composite</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.

Coaches’ perceptions of being evaluated on more than performance outcomes.

Note. Valid percentages are reported.
Table 8.

*Criteria coaches perceive to be used in their evaluation in addition to win/loss*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>total n</th>
<th>yes n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete behavioral outcomes</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget adherence</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of administrative work</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance adherence</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan attendance</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media appearances</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue generation</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete satisfaction</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete academic outcomes</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recruiting classes</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with support staff</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with student athletes</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of team culture</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.

*Coaches’ perceptions regarding data collection in relation to their performance.*

Note. Rating scale was from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>(\sigma_M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who evaluates my performance regularly observes my coaching.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have clear lines of communication with the person who evaluates my performance as a coach.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person who evaluates my performance observes my performance in various contexts (e.g., practice, competition).</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person who evaluates my performance oversees the strategies I use to enhance the performance of individual athletes and the team as a whole.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My team’s performance outcomes (e.g., win-loss record, NCAA championship qualifiers) are primarily used to oversee my performance as a coach.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data is collected from various groups (i.e., athletes, support staff, etc.) to assess my performance.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.

*Composite score reflecting coaches’ perceptions of data collection*

Note. The composite score includes items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>(\sigma_M)</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P_2 Composite</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.

*Coaches’ perceptions of feedback and coaching throughout their performance cycle.*

Note. Rating scale was from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>(\sigma_M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I get the coaching I need throughout a performance cycle to improve as a coach.</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the performance cycle, my areas for improvement are clearly pointed out to me.</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive ongoing feedback about my performance during a given performance cycle.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feedback I receive helps me be a more effective coach.</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.

*Composite score reflecting coaches’ perceptions of feedback and coaching*

Note. All items were included in the composite score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>(\sigma_M)</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P_3 Composite</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.

Coaches’ reporting if their performance is formally evaluated.

Note. Percentages are based on the number of valid responses.
Figure 6.

*Coaches’ reporting if a document is provided to them to reflect their evaluation.*

Note. Percentages are based on the number of valid responses.
Figure 7.

*Coaches’ perceptions of a formal meeting to discuss their evaluation*

Note. Percentages are based on the number of valid responses.
Table 13.

*Coaches’ perceptions of a formal performance evaluation report and meeting.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>$\sigma_M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The athletic department provides me with a written report to</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrate how my performance was evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance evaluation report is easy to understand.</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My direct supervisor engages in a formal evaluation review meeting</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to discuss my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My direct supervisor provides me with feedback based on my</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14.

*Composite score reflecting a formal performance evaluation report and meeting.*

Note. All items were included in the composite score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>$\sigma_M$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P_4 Composite</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.

*Administrator’s reporting if they are formally trained to evaluate coach performance.*

Note. Percentages are based on the number of valid responses.
Table 15.

Administrators’ perceptions regarding clear performance and behavioral expectations

Note. Rating scale was from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X̄</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>σM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I set clear expectations for the coaches I oversee.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coaches in my athletic department have a clear understanding</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the criteria used to evaluate their performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collaborate with the coaches I oversee in the process of setting</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expectations I have for coaches are clearly aligned with the</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals of the athletic department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9,

*Data sources administrators use to evaluate a coaches’ performance.*

Note. Percentages represent the amount of administrators in the sample to select option.
Figure 10.

*Frequency of data collection strategies administrators used to oversee teams*

Note. Rating scale: (1) never, (2) infrequency/a couple times a year, (3) somewhat frequently/about once a month, (4) frequently/about once a week, (5) constantly/daily
Table 16.

Administrators’ perceptions regarding data collection to inform a coaches’ evaluation

Note. Rating scale was from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>$\sigma_M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I collect data about a coaches’ performance to inform my evaluation of their performance.</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data is collected from various groups (i.e., student-athletes, support staff, etc.) to provide a more holistic view of a coaches’ performance.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17.

Administrators’ perceptions of providing feedback and coaching to coaches

Note. Rating scale was from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X̄</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>σM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I provide ongoing feedback and coaching to the coaches I oversee.</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide the coaches I oversee with consistent feedback to fill</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the gap between their current performance and their performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a department, we provide adequate support for coaches to</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continue to develop their skills as coaches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18.

Administrators’ perceptions of conducting a formal performance evaluation report and meeting

Note. Rating scale was from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>( s )</th>
<th>( \sigma_m )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I provide the coaches within my oversight with a written document outlining their performance review.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I meet with the coaches I oversee to go over their performance evaluation.</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Your confidentiality will be protected in that only the research team has access to your data associated to your name. When data is reported, your name will not be included. Rather various demographic information will be used to report your data at the group level of analysis.

Further, if you choose to furnish documents associated with human resource practices within your athletic department, these will be securely stored in the Google Drive of the principal investigator.

If information from this study is published or presented at scientific meetings, your name and other personal information will not be used.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information or what information came from you. Although it is unlikely, there are times when others may need to see the information we collect about you. These include:

- People at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville who oversee research to make sure it is conducted properly.
- Government agencies (such as the Office for Human Research Protections in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services), and others responsible for watching over the safety, effectiveness, and conduct of the research.
- If a law or court requires us to share the information, we would have to follow that law or final court ruling.

What will happen to my information after this study is over?

We will keep your information to use for future research. Your name and other information that can directly identify you will be kept secure and stored separately from your research data collected as part of the study. We may share your research data with other researchers without asking for your consent again, but it will not contain information that could directly identify you.

What else do I need to know?

If we learn about any new information that may change your mind about being in the study, we will tell you. If that happens, you may be asked to sign a new consent form. The University of Tennessee does not automatically pay for medical claims or give other compensation for injuries or other problems.

IRB NUMBER: UTK IRB-22-0140-XM
IRB APPROVAL DATE: 10/07/2022
IRB EXPIRATION DATE: 10/06/2025
Who can answer my questions about this research study?

If you have questions or concerns about this study, or have experienced a research related problem or injury, contact the principal investigator, Kelsie Saxe, or her advisor, Dr. Robin Hardin:

Kelsie Saxe, kssxe@vols.utk.edu
Dr. Robin Hardin, robh@utk.edu

For questions or concerns about your rights or to speak with someone other than the research team about the study, please contact:

Institutional Review Board
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville
1534 White Avenue
Bioult Hall, Room 408
Knoxville, TN 37996-1520
Phone: 865-974-7697
Email: utkirb@utk.edu

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I have read this form and the research study has been explained to me. I have been given the chance to ask questions and my questions have been answered. If I have more questions, I have been told who to contact. By participating in this survey, I am agreeing to be in this study.
Appendix C: Participant Recruitment Email

Hi *name*,

I am writing to request your participation in a survey about human resource practices within NCAA, Division I athletic departments. Participation is voluntary and confidential and should take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete.

Should you choose to participate, you are able to enter your email address at the end of the survey for a chance to win a $25 amazon gift card.

Participation is limited to 1) NCAA, Division I coaches who have completed at least one season at their current institution 2) NCAA, Division I administrators who have direct sport oversight responsibilities and have served at their current institution for at least one calendar year.

More specific information regarding the survey is on the informed consent form, which is the first page of the survey.

Here (hyperlinked) is the survey link. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me (ksaxe@vols.utk.edu) or my faculty advisor, Dr. Robin Hardin (robh@utk.edu).

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Best,
Kelsie Saxe
Appendix D: Survey Instrument

Consent for Research Participation

Research Study Title: Human Resource Practices within NCAA, Division I Athletic Departments

Researcher(s): Kebbe Saxe, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
               Dr. Robin Hardin, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Why am I being asked to be in this research study?

We are asking you to be in this research study because you are a current coach or administrator within an NCAA, Division I athletic department.

What is this research study about?

The purpose of the research study is to explore human resource practices within NCAA, Division I athletic departments. More specifically, this study seeks to understand the performance management practices for coaches.

Who is conducting this research study?

This study is being conducted by researchers at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

How long will I be in the research study?

If you agree to be in the study, your participation will last for the duration of the online questionnaire. The questionnaire takes approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. Further, you can provide documents associated with the performance management practices within your athletic department to the research team for further review. This would extend your participation time approximately 10-15 more minutes should you decide to do so.

What will happen if I say “Yes, I want to be in this research study”?

If you agree to be in this study, you will take an online questionnaire assessing the human resource practices within your athletic department, specific to the performance management of coaches. You can choose to stop your participation at any time by exiting the questionnaire.

There will be a drawing for (4) $25 gift cards to Amazon in which you will be eligible if you choose to register for the drawing at the end of the survey.

What happens if I say “No, I do not want to be in this research study”?

Being in this study is up to you. You can say no now or choose to disengage by exiting the questionnaire if you no longer want to participate.

Either way, your decision won’t affect your relationship with the researchers, the University of Tennessee.

You can also enter to into the drawings for (4) $25 gift cards by emailing the research team (kebbee@utk.edu) and requesting your name be entered into the drawing. You must email the research team within 21 days of when you received your first enrollment email.

IRB NUMBER: UTK IRB-22-0743-KM
IRB APPROVAL DATE: 03/07/2022
IRB EXPIRATION DATE: 10/06/2023
What happens if I say “Yes” but change my mind later?

Even if you decide to be in this study now, you can change your mind and stop at any time before the questionnaire has been submitted.

Are there any possible risks to me?

It is possible that someone could find out you were in this study or see your study information, but we believe this risk is small because of the procedures we use to protect your information. These procedures are described later in this form.

Are there any benefits to being in this research study?

We do not expect you to benefit directly from being in this study. However, we hope the knowledge gained from this study will benefit others in the future.

Who can see or use the information collected for this research study?

Your confidentiality will be protected in that only the research team has access to your data associated with your name. When data is reported, your name will not be included. Rather, various demographic information will be used to report your data at the group level of analysis.

Further, if you choose to turn in documents associated with human resource practices within your athletic department, these will be securely stored in the google drive of the principal investigator.

If information from this study is published or presented at scientific meetings, your name and other personal information will not be used.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information or what information came from you. Although it is unlikely, there are times when others may need to see the information we collected about you. These include:

- People at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville who oversee research to make sure it is conducted properly.
- Government agencies (such as the Office for Human Research Protections in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services), and others responsible for monitoring the safety, effectiveness, and conduct of the research.
- If a law or court requires us to share the information, we would have to follow that law or final court ruling.

What will happen to my information after this study is over?

We will keep your information for use for future research. Your name and other information that can directly identify you will be kept secure and stored separately from your research data collected as part of the study. We may share your research data with other researchers without asking for your consent again, but it will not contain information that could directly identify you.

What else do I need to know?

If we learn about any new information that may change your mind about being in the study, we will tell you. If that happens, you may be asked to sign a new consent form. The University of Tennessee does not automatically pay for medical claims or give other compensation for injuries or other problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRB Number</th>
<th>UTK RE 30207-01 KM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB Approval</td>
<td>01/01/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Expiration Date</td>
<td>01/01/2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who can answer my questions about this research study?

If you have questions or concerns about this study, or have experienced a research related problem or injury, contact the principal investigator, Kasee Saxe, or her advisor, Dr. Robin Hardin.

Kasee Saxe, ksaxe@vols.utk.edu
Dr. Robin Hardin, rohh@utk.edu

For questions or concerns about your rights or to speak with someone other than the research team about the study, please contact:

Institutional Review Board
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville
1334 White Avenue
Bont Hall, Room 408
Knoxville, TN 37996-1529
Phone: 865-974-7697
Email: irbinfo@utk.edu

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I have read this form and the research study has been explained to me. I have been given the chance to ask questions and my questions have been answered. If I have more questions, I have been told who to contact. By participating in this survey, I am agreeing to be in this study.

I agree to the statement of consent and wish to continue with the survey.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Gatekeeper Questions

Are you currently serving in the role of assistant coach, assistant head coach, associate head coach, or head coach at an NCAA, Division I institution?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Have you served in this role (or another role...i.e., promoted from assistant to associate head coach) at your current institution for at least one complete season?

☐ Yes
☐ No
Are you currently serving in an administrative role with direct sport oversight responsibilities at a NCAA, Division I institution?

- Yes
- No

Have you served in this role with direct sport oversight responsibilities for at least one year at your current institution?

- Yes
- No

**Coaches**

All data elicited from this survey is confidential and is being collected to further understand the performance evaluation process for coaches in NCAA, Division I athletic departments. You can skip any question you do not want to answer.

Does your athletic department formally evaluate your performance as a coach?

- Yes
- No
- I’m not sure
- Other

Does your performance evaluation include criteria additional to a win-loss record or other performance outcomes relevant to your sport (e.g., conference standing, number of athletes who qualify for the NCAA championship or Olympics)?

- Yes
- No
- I’m not sure
- Other
What are you evaluated on in addition to athlete performance outcomes? Check all that apply.

☐ Athlete behavioral outcomes (i.e., confidence, connection, character, etc.)
☐ Budget adherence
☐ Community involvement
☐ Completion of administrative work
☐ Compliance adherence
☐ Fan attendance
☐ Media appearances
☐ Revenue generation
☐ Student-athlete satisfaction
☐ Student-athlete academic outcomes (i.e., GPA, graduation rate)
☐ Quality of recruiting classes
☐ Quality of interpersonal relationships with support staff
☐ Quality of interpersonal relationships with student athletes
☐ Quality of team culture
☐ Other

Of the criteria selected in the previous question (and the addition of athlete performance outcomes), please rate the level of importance for each item in your evaluation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athlete behavioral outcomes (i.e., confidence, connection, character, etc.)</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget adherence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of administrative work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance adherence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media appearances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>Slightly important</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete academic outcomes (i.e., GPA, graduation rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recruiting classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with student athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of team culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you were to design your performance evaluation, what criteria do you think should be considered in your evaluation?

- Athlete behavioral outcomes (i.e., confidence, connection, character, etc.)
- Athlete performance outcomes (i.e., win/loss record, NCAA qualifiers, etc.)
- Budget adherence
- Community involvement
- Completion of administrative work
- Compliance adherence
- Fan attendance
- Media appearances
- Revenue generation
- Student-athlete satisfaction
- Student-athlete academic outcomes (i.e., GPA, graduation rate)
- Quality of recruiting classes
- Quality of interpersonal relationships with support staff
- Quality of interpersonal relationships with student-athletes
- Quality of team culture
- Other
Please rate the level of importance you think should be assigned for each item selected in the previous question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete behavioral outcomes (i.e., confidence, connection, character, etc.)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete performance outcomes (i.e., win/loss record, NCAA qualifiers, etc.)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget adherence</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of administrative work</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance adherence</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan attendance</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media appearances</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue generation</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete satisfaction</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete academic outcomes (i.e., GPA, graduation rate)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recruiting classes</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with support staff</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with student-athletes</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of team culture</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you provided with a document outlining your performance evaluation at the end of an evaluation cycle?

□ Yes
□ No
□ I don’t know
□ Other
Does someone from the athletic department formally review this document with you?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Other

Who do you meet with to review your performance evaluation?

☐ Athletic Director
☐ Head Coach
☐ Human Resources Employee
☐ Direct Sport Supervisor
☐ I don't know
☐ Other

What components are missing from your performance evaluation that you think should be included? How can those be measured?


Do you have any concerns about your performance evaluation process as a coach?


How would you describe your relationship with the athletic administrator who oversees your sport?

- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Very Good
- Excellent
- Other

How would you describe the role and responsibilities of the athletic administrator who oversees your sport in relation to your team? (i.e., what do they do for you?, how do they help you?, what contact do you have with them?)

What criteria do you use to measure your performance as a coach each season?

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement is not applicable to you or you prefer not to answer.

I am provided with training/resources/coaching within my
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>athletic department to improve my effectiveness as a coach.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaches in our athletic department receive training/coaching to improve our interpersonal skills/knowledge (i.e., conflict resolution, giving feedback, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches in our athletic department receive training/coaching to improve our intrapersonal skills/knowledge (i.e., self-awareness, emotional regulation, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches in our athletic department receive training/coaching to improve our technical sport specific knowledge (i.e., drills, training philosophies, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate each knowledge area in regard to the level of importance it has in your effectiveness as a coach. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal knowledge/skills (i.e., conflict resolution, communication, feedback delivery)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal knowledge/skills (i.e., reflection, self-awareness, emotional regulation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical knowledge/skills (i.e., training philosophies, sport specific knowledge, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement is not applicable to you or you prefer not to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be interested in education/training pertaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I would be interested in education/training pertaining to interpersonal knowledge/skills (i.e., conflict resolution, communication, feedback delivery).

   ![Likert Scale](image)

2. I would be interested in education/training pertaining to intrapersonal knowledge/skills (i.e., reflection, self-awareness, emotional regulation).

   ![Likert Scale](image)

3. What resources, coaching, and/or training are you provided through your athletic department to improve your performance and/or effectiveness as a coach?

   ![Blank Box](image)

4. What resources, coaching, and/or training would you be interested in receiving to enhance your performance and/or effectiveness as a coach?

   ![Blank Box](image)

5. Is your performance evaluation tied to specific benefits/rewards (i.e., bonus, pay increase)?

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have a clear understanding of the expectations my athletic department has for my performance.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My athletic department clearly communicated their expectations of me when I was hired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how my expectations are tied to the overall goals of the athletic department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expectations my athletic department has for me are dominated by athletic outcomes (e.g., conference standing, win-loss record).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My athletic department has clear expectations for the application of interpersonal skills and appropriate strategies used to enhance the performance of individual athletes and the team as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the expectations my direct supervisor has for me.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in the process of setting my performance goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expectations my direct supervisor has for my performance are fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The athletic department's expectations for coaches are primarily outcome driven (i.e., win/loss record, conference standing, awards, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The athletic department's expectations for coaches are primarily behavioral/process driven (i.e., fostering a healthy team culture, cultivating strong relationships, etc.)

What performance expectations does your athletic department have for you as a coach? These performance expectations can be outcome driven (i.e., conference standing, win/loss record, graduation rate, revenue generation, etc.) or behavioral driven (i.e., student-athlete satisfaction, media appearances, etc.).

How does/did your athletic department communicate these expectations to you?

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.

The person who evaluates my performance regularly observes my coaching.

I have clear lines of communication with the person who evaluates my performance as a coach.

The person who evaluates my performance observes my performance in various contexts (e.g., practice, competition).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who evaluates my performance oversees the strategies I use to enhance the performance of individual athletes and the team as a whole.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My team's performance outcomes (e.g., win-loss record, NCAA championship qualifiers) are primarily used to oversee my performance as a coach.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data is collected from various groups (i.e., athletes, support staff, etc.) to assess my performance.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The athletic department provides me with a written report to demonstrate how my performance was evaluated.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance evaluation report is easy to understand.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My direct supervisor engages in a formal evaluation review meeting to discuss my performance.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My direct supervisor provides me with feedback based on my performance evaluation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I get the coaching I need throughout a performance cycle to improve as a coach.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the performance cycle, my areas for improvement are clearly pointed out to me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive ongoing feedback about my performance during a given performance cycle.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feedback I receive helps me be a more effective coach.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The performance evaluation process in my athletic department is well-organized.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance evaluation process in my athletic department provides me with useful feedback to improve my performance as a coach.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance evaluation process in my athletic department is strictly regulatory and compliance driven.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the feedback from my performance evaluation to drive my professional development.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance evaluation report accurately reflects my true performance.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The athletic department values my development as a coach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The data collected throughout a performance cycle provides an accurate reflection of my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation is used as a part of the developmental process within my athletic department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Admin**

All data elicited from this survey is confidential. You can skip any question you do not want to answer.

Are you responsible for evaluating the performance of the coaches for which you serve as a direct sport supervisor?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Other

Were you trained to evaluate the performance of coaches within your supervision?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Other

What guidance and/or training does the athletic department provide for you to evaluate the performance of coaches effectively?
How do you evaluate the performance of the coaches you supervise?

- Formally
- Informally
- Combination of formal and informal methods
- I don’t have a system
- Other

When evaluating the performance of coaches within my supervision, I seek information from the following data sources (check all that apply):

- Alumni
- Donors
- Fans
- Media
- My own observations
- Parents of the student-athletes
- Student-athletes
- Support staff (i.e., athletic trainers, compliance, academic support)
- None of the above
- Other

I take the following criteria into consideration when evaluating the performance of coaches within my supervision (check all that apply)

- Athlete behavioral outcomes (i.e., confidence, connection, character, etc.)
- Athletic performance outcomes (i.e., win/loss record, postseason play, NCAA qualifiers)
- Budget adherence
- Community involvement
- Completion of administrative work
When evaluating coaches, I put the most weight into the following criteria. Rate level of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete behavioral outcomes (i.e., confidence, connection, character, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic performance outcomes (i.e., win/loss record, postseason play, NCAA qualifiers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget adherence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of administrative work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance adherence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media appearances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete academic outcomes (i.e., GPA, graduation rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>Slightly important</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recruiting classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with student-athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of team culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you were to design the performance evaluation process in your athletic department, what criteria should be used to evaluate their performance? (check all that apply)

- [ ] Athlete behavioral outcomes (i.e., confidence, connection, character, etc.)
- [ ] Athletic performance outcomes (i.e., win/loss record, postseason play, NCAA qualifiers)
- [ ] Budget adherence
- [ ] Community involvement
- [ ] Completion of administrative work
- [ ] Compliance adherence
- [ ] Fan attendance
- [ ] Media appearances
- [ ] Revenue generation
- [ ] Student-athlete satisfaction
- [ ] Student-athlete academic outcomes (i.e., GPA, graduation rate)
- [ ] Quality of recruiting classes
- [ ] Quality of interpersonal relationships with support staff
- [ ] Quality of interpersonal relationships with student-athletes
- [ ] Quality of team culture
- [ ] Other
Of the items you selected in the previous question, rate their level of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete behavioral outcomes (i.e., confidence, connection, character, etc.)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic performance outcomes (i.e., win/loss record, postseason play, NCAA qualifiers)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget adherence</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of administrative work</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance adherence</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan attendance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media appearances</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue generation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete satisfaction</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete academic outcomes (i.e., GPA, graduation rate)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recruiting classes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with support staff</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interpersonal relationships with student-athletes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of team culture</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are all coaches in the athletic department evaluated using the same system?

○ Yes
What concerns and/or challenges do you have regarding the performance evaluation process for coaches under your supervision?

What criteria should be used to evaluate coaches?

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I set clear expectations for the coaches I oversee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coaches in my athletic department have a clear understanding of the criteria used to evaluate their performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collaborate with the coaches I oversee in the process of setting performance goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expectations I have for coaches are clearly aligned with the goals of the athletic department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I collect data about a coaches’ performance to inform my evaluation of their performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data is collected from various groups (i.e., student-athletes, support staff, etc.) to provide a more holistic view of a coaches’ performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide the coaches in my oversight with a written document outlining their performance review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I meet with the coaches I oversee to go over the performance evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide ongoing feedback and coaching to the coaches I oversee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide the coaches I oversee with consistent feedback to fill the gap between their current performance and their performance expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a department, we provide adequate support for coaches to continue to develop their skills as coaches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The performance evaluation process (for coaches) in my athletic department is well organized.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The athletic department provides me with a systematic approach to evaluating the performance of coaches.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The athletic department values the development of our coaches.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance evaluation process is used as a way to inspire professional development.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance evaluation process is strictly administrative/compliance driven.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are the performance evaluations of coaches in your athletic department tied to specific benefits/rewards (i.e., bonus, pay increase, etc.)?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ I don’t know
- ○ Other

Please indicate the strategies you use to oversee the teams you supervise by rating each strategy from never to always.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Never (Infrequently (a couple times a year))</th>
<th>Somewhat frequently (about once a month)</th>
<th>Frequently (about once a week)</th>
<th>Constantly (daily)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication with coaching staff</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with student-athletes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with support staff</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice oversight</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Infrequently (a couple times a year)</td>
<td>Somewhat frequently (about once a month)</td>
<td>Frequently (about once a week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition/game/meet oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there were instances of improper conduct (i.e., verbal, emotional, physical, or sexual abuse) within the program, what are the systems in place to report this within the athletic department?

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the below statements. Select NA if the statement does not apply to you or you prefer not to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This athletic department has sound systems in place for me to effectively monitor the programs under my direct supervision.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of what happens within the programs I oversee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If coaches were abusing athletes within a program I oversee, I would know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographics**

Below are demographic questions that will be used to explore group differences in experiences. You can skip any question you do not feel comfortable answering or choose the answer "prefer not to say."
What is your gender identity?

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary / third gender
- Prefer not to say

How many complete seasons/years have you worked at your current institution?

- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-9
- 10-12
- 13-15
- 16+
- I don't know

How many complete seasons/years have you worked in collegiate athletics (any division) throughout your career?

- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-9
- 10-12
- 13-15
- 16+
- I don't know

In which conference is your athletic department? All Division I conferences are listed in alphabetic order. If your athletic department is affiliated with multiple conferences, select the conference in which your athletic department is primarily affiliated.

- America East
- American Athletic
ASUN
Atlantic 10
Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC)
Atlantic Hockey Association
Big 12
Big East
Big Sky
Big South
Big 10
Big West
Coastal Collegiate Sports Association
Colonial Athletic Association
Conference USA
Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference
Golden Coast Conference
Horizon League
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Mid-American Conference
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conf.
Missouri Valley Conference
Mountain Pacific Sports Federation
Mountain West Conference
Northeast Conference
Ohio Valley Conference
Pac-12 Conference
Patriot League
Southeastern Conference (SEC)
Southern Conference
Southland Conference
Southwestern Athletic Conf.
Sun Belt Conference
The Ivy League
The Summit League
West Coast Conference  
Western Athletic Conference  
Other  
Prefer not to say

What is your position title?

Volunteer coach  
Assistant coach  
Assistant head coach  
Associate head coach  
Head coach  
Assistant athletic director  
Associate athletic director  
Deputy athletic director  
Athletic director  
Prefer not to say  
Other

What sport(s) do you coach or oversee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Choose gender here.</th>
<th>Select your role.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport 1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport 2</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport 3</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport 4</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport 5</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would you be willing to share documents with the research team from the performance evaluation process within your athletic department (i.e., rubric used, quantitative assessment used, report created, etc.)?

- Yes
- No
- Other

May we contact you via email to collect these documents?

- Yes
- No
- Other

Is there anything you would like to add that we did not ask?

---
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Would you be interested in being contacted via email to set up a follow up interview to discuss this topic in further detail one-on-one with the research team?

- Yes
- No
- Other

Would you like to be entered into a drawing for a $25 gift card?

- Yes
- No

What email address should we use to contact you and/or enter you into the drawing for a $25 gift card?

Drawing Entry
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