

The Collegiate Strength and Conditioning Coaches Association (CSCCa) 2023 Salary Survey

Survey Data

Clare Quebedeaux¹, Greg Adamson², Jeanne Rankin³, John E. Spurlock⁴, Gabriel J. Sanders⁵, Corey A. Peacock⁶, Sandy Abney⁷

¹Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

²University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA

³Coastal Carolina University, Conway, SC, USA

⁴University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, USA

⁵University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, USA

⁶Nova Southeastern University, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA

⁷College Strength and Conditioning Coaches Association, Austin, TX, USA

Open Access



Published: January 4, 2024



Copyright, 2024 by the authors. Published by Pinnacle Science and the work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Research Directs in Strength and Performance: 2024, Volume 4 (Issue 1): 1

ISSN: 2768-5187

Abstract

The Collegiate Strength and Conditioning Coaches Association (CSCCa) surveyed its members of collegiate strength and conditioning coaches to identify potential salary disparities in the field. The survey aimed to help coaches evaluate their roles and improve their competitive salary standing in across athletic departments nationwide. The findings are fundamental for athletic departments to assess their positioning and ensure legal compliance with compensation laws and to adequately pay employees that robustly contribute to student-athlete mental and physical wellbeing. The results highlight the evolving role of strength coaches, extending to nutrition and athlete wellbeing, and informs salary decisions, aligning with market trends. The survey underscores the need for equitable compensation standards and ongoing industry engagement to advance the profession.

Key Words: Pay, College, Wages, Athletics

Introduction

Factors affecting salary discrepancies have been a prominent and contentious issue in the field of strength, conditioning, and sports performance. As the profession has evolved, it is reasonable to suggest disparities in salaries across different sports, conferences, race and genders are prevalent. This gap is particularly noticeable in Power 5 conferences, most notably in football, which is driven by substantial television contracts and the intensifying pressure to succeed, suggesting that football salaries will likely continue to outpace those in other areas. Recognizing these changes, the Collegiate Strength and Conditioning Coaches Association (CSCCa) conducted a survey among its members, who are current or recent collegiate strength and conditioning coaches. Previously, a salary survey found the range of pay varies

widely based on factors such as market conditions, educational attainment, professional certifications or designations, gender, years of experience¹. However, these findings were not specific to collegiate strength and conditioning coaches. As a result, the primary aim was to identify how salaries vary by conference, sport assignment, age, gender, race and more.



The current survey data on strength and conditioning coach salaries provides athletic departments with a valuable tool for comparative analysis, enabling them to benchmark their compensation packages against other institutions or organizations in the field. By understanding the salary spectrum, departments can make strategic decisions to attract and retain skilled professionals to best support the betterment of student-athlete health and wellbeing. The role of strength and conditioning coaches at the collegiate level is evolving, encompassing not just physical training but also broader responsibilities like managing travel meals, overseeing recovery processes, sleep monitoring, collecting, and analyzing sport science data, and fostering a safe yet competitive environment. Research, such as that conducted by Poiss, Sullivan, Paup, and Westerman², highlights the significant impact these coaches have on athletes' attitudes and choices in training, which in turn contributes to an organization's success and competitive edge in both sports and life skills for student-athletes. Furthermore, these coaches often take on additional duties, including facility maintenance, staff management, and budgetary responsibilities, extending their influence beyond direct athlete care.

Athletic departments looking to protect their investments increasingly rely on survey data to develop compensation packages that are both competitive and in line with industry standards. This strategy is essential for attracting and retaining high-quality staff, reducing the risk of losing employees to better-paying opportunities elsewhere. The costs associated with employee turnover extend beyond just hiring replacements; they also encompass indirect expenses like reduced productivity, potential safety issues, and adverse effects on team morale. The financial implications can be substantial, often exceeding the replaced employee's annual salary. Thus, offering competitive salaries is key for athletic departments to sustain a stable, proficient workforce, which in turn boosts the overall performance and success of the organization.

Further, survey data plays a pivotal role in ensuring that athletic departments adhere to legal requirements concerning salary and compensation. By benchmarking their salary structures against industry norms, departments can verify compliance with employment laws and regulations, including Title IX and market value considerations. The CSCCa Position Stand of 2016 outlines key industry standards for strength and conditioning staff ratios: a maximum of 1:10 for incoming students, junior college transfers, and walk-ons, and a 1:15 ratio for veteran athletes³. These ratios are necessary for effective supervision and athlete safety. Additionally, departments should be aware of the upcoming ATHLETEALIVE2025 initiative, a collaborative student-athlete safety program aimed at reducing preventable injuries and deaths in conditioning and training, which emphasizes the importance of proper emergency management.

Finally, survey data offers valuable insights into current market trends and variations in compensation based on factors such as location, experience, and education. This information enables athletic departments to make informed decisions on salary levels for strength and conditioning coaches, ensuring alignment with market standards. Such data-driven approaches allow departments to efficiently allocate resources, helping them maintain a competitive edge. The survey data supports the CSCCa's purpose statements and guides departments in strategic planning and budget allocation for strength and conditioning coach salaries, ensuring they meet industry demands and optimize resource utilization.

1. Purpose Statement 1: The purpose of the survey data was to identify how salaries varied overall and by conference. Salaries by sport were not feasible as many coaches oversee multiple sports.
2. Purpose Statement 2: The purpose of the survey data was to ascertain whether there is a disparity in salary correlated with gender and race, considering other equal variables that influence compensation.

The CSCCa's final goal of the salary survey was to present additional data representing a variety of variables and data including age, experience, conference, and even Power 5 vs. Non-Power 5 coaches. These tables and summaries are found in Appendix 1

Methods

The CSCCa initiated a salary survey to evaluate compensation and salary trends in the collegiate strength and conditioning field across the United States. This survey was developed by a committee comprising seven professionals actively involved in the industry. To ensure a broad and inclusive data collection, the survey was made accessible to all full-time collegiate strength and conditioning coaches, as well as those who had held such a position in the last 12 months, irrespective of their affiliation with the CSCCa. The invitation to participate was distributed via email before the 2023 CSCCa National Conference in Orlando, Florida. Additionally, at the conference itself, QR codes were prominently displayed, allowing coaches the convenience of completing the survey through an online form.



Results

The primary goal of the salary survey was to discern salary disparities across all conferences in collegiate athletics at every level. However, the extensive range of conferences reported from all divisions led to complex and unclear data. Consequently, the survey's focus shifted to identifying general salary trends, categorized by factors such as division level, conference, gender, and race, to provide a clearer understanding of salary structures.

Purpose Statement 1: The purpose of the survey data was to identify the number of coaches who report being in predetermined salary ranges and then identify how salaries vary by division for collegiate strength and conditioning coaches.

Table 1. Salary range for collegiate strength coaches across all divisions and conferences in the United States.

Salary Range	Frequency	Percent
No Response	88	10.1
\$250,001 or more	23	2.6
\$200,001 - \$250,000	6	0.7
\$150,001 - \$200,000	16	1.8
\$100,001 - \$150,000	84	9.6
\$90,001 - \$100,000	22	2.5
\$80,001 - \$90,000	45	5.1
\$70,001 - \$80,000	76	8.7
\$60,001 - \$70,000	87	9.9
\$50,001 - \$60,000	162	18.5
\$40,001 - \$50,000	162	18.5
\$30,001 - \$40,000	76	8.7
\$30,000 or less	28	3.2
Total	875	100.0

The data in Table 1 reveals a comprehensive analysis of salary ranges among collegiate strength and conditioning coaches in the United States, with responses from 875 individuals across various divisions and conferences. The highest salary bracket, "more than \$250,000", is the least populated, indicating a small proportion of coaches in this top earning category. The middle salary range, particularly between "\$50,000 to 69,999", shows a higher frequency, suggesting that a significant number of coaches fall within this moderate-income bracket. Conversely, the lowest salary bracket, "less than \$30,000", also exhibits a notable frequency, highlighting a substantial segment of coaches at the lower end of the pay scale.

Table 2 shows distinct trends across Division I, II, and III. In Division I, the highest salary ranges (over \$150,000) are exclusively represented, indicating that top salaries are predominantly found in Division I. This trend continues even in the \$80,000-\$90,000 range and above. Middle salary ranges, especially between \$50,000 to \$80,000, are more evenly distributed across Division I and II, with Division I still leading in frequency. The lowest salary range, particularly below \$40,000, is more prevalent in Division II and III, highlighting a significant pay disparity between these divisions and Division I. Lastly, with the exception of three respondents, no respondents from Division II, Division III, National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), or Junior College makes \$80,001 or more.

Outside of NCAA DI, the highest salary range reported for each division were as follows:

1. Division II \$90,001-100,000
2. Division III \$100,001-150,000
3. NAIA \$70,001-80,0000
4. Junior College \$30,001-40,000

In DI, 251 strength & conditioning coaches indicated their salary range was between \$40,001-60,000. This represents 37% of the total DI responses. Note that there were limited responses from DII, DIII, NAIA and Junior College



strength and conditioning coaches. Out of the 787 responses, 653 indicated they worked in DI (83%), 77 in DII (9.8%), 32 in DIII (4.07%), 23 in NAIA (2.9%), 1 in Junior College (0.13%) and 1 not reported. Another part of the purpose was to identify how salaries varied based on the number of athletes a coach is responsible for and can be seen in Table 7 (See Appendix 1). In all 12 salary ranges, the highest percentage of strength coaches indicated that they worked with 100+ student-athletes. A total of 91.3% of the responses that indicated their base salary was \$250,001 or more also reported they worked with 100+ student-athletes.

Table 2. Salary range by division for collegiate strength coaches in the United States.

Salary Range	Division I		Division II		Division III		NAIA		Junior College	
	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%
\$250,001 or more	23	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$200,001 - \$250,000	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$150,001 - \$200,000	16	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$100,001 - \$150,000	83	98.8	0	0.0	1	1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$90,001 - \$100,000	21	95.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$80,001 - \$90,000	43	95.6	1	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$70,001 - \$80,000	67	88.2	3	3.9	4	5.3	2	2.6	0	0.0
\$60,001 - \$70,000	67	77.0	13	14.9	7	8.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$50,001 - \$60,000	124	76.5	19	11.7	9	5.6	10	6.2	0	0.0
\$40,001 - \$50,000	127	78.4	21	13.0	7	4.3	7	4.3	0	0.0
\$30,001 - \$40,000	57	75.0	12	15.8	3	3.9	3	3.9	1	1.3
\$30,000 or less	19	67.9	7	25.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0.0

*Frequency and percents indicates number of responses and the percentage within each salary range. For example, 23 Division I coaches reported salaries of \$250,001 or more and that made up 100 percent of all the responses at the \$250,001 or more level.

Purpose Statement 2: The purpose of the survey data was to ascertain whether there is a disparity in salary correlated with gender and race, considering other equal variables that influence compensation.

Base salary responses were segmented into various brackets for clearer analysis (Table 3). Among the primary respondents, 124 respondents were Black African American, 591 White Caucasian, 34 Hispanic Latino, and there were minimal respondents representing Native Hawaiian, American Indian, and Other. Relative to responding percentages, Black African American had a total of nine respondents earning greater than \$250,001 compared to a total of 12 White Caucasian respondents at the same pay level. Additional information regarding race and salary is shown in Table 3.

The data in Table 3 reveals the frequency of collegiate strength coaches within specific salary ranges, segmented by racial demographics. White Caucasian coaches are predominantly distributed across a broad range of salaries, with notable frequencies in both the higher and middle salary brackets. Black African American coaches, while also spread across various salary ranges, have a significant presence in the mid-range salaries, particularly in the \$50,001 - \$60,000 bracket. Hispanic Latino coaches are more frequently found in the lower to middle salary ranges, with a concentration in the \$40,001 - \$50,000 bracket. Comparatively, coaches from other racial groups, such as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, and American Indian, show varied but generally lower frequencies across all salary ranges due to their smaller numbers in the profession. Overall, this data indicates a noticeable disparity in salary distribution among strength coaches of different races, highlighting the need for further data collection and analysis and action towards salary equity in collegiate strength and conditioning coaching.



Table 3. Salary range by race for collegiate strength coaches in the United States.

Salary Range	Black African American		White Caucasian		Hispanic Latino		Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		American Indian		Asian		Other	
	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%	Frequency (N)	%
\$250,001 or more	9	7.3	12	2.0	0	0	2	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
\$200,001 - \$250,000	2	1.6	4	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$150,001 - \$200,000	4	3.2	11	1.9	1	2.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$100,001 - \$150,000	12	9.7	65	11.0	3	8.8	1	16.7	0.0	0.0	1	12.5	2	10.5
\$90,001 - \$100,000	2	1.6	18	3.0	2	5.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$80,001 - \$90,000	9	7.3	30	5.1	0	0.0	2	33.3	0.0	0.0	1	12.5	3	15.8
\$70,001 - \$80,000	13	10.5	57	9.6	4	11.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10.5
\$60,001 - \$70,000	13	10.5	62	10.5	2	5.9	1	16.7	2	40.0	2	25.0	5	26.3
\$50,001- \$60,000	34	27.4	118	20.0	7	20.6	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	2	10.5
\$40,001 - \$50,000	19	15.3	124	21.0	13	38.2	0	0	2	40.0	3	37.5	1	5.3
\$30,001 - \$40,000	3	2.4	68	11.5	2	5.9	0	0	1	20.0	0.0	0	3	15.8
\$30,000 or less	4	3.2	22	3.7	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.3
Total	124	100.0	591	100.0	34	100.0	6	100.0	5	100.0	8	100.0	19	100.0

When looking at the overall salaries for strength and conditioning coaches, a large majority of the data comes from the \$40,001-\$50,000 and \$50,001-\$60,000 ranges (18.5% each, for a total of 37.38% of the data). Using those ranges (\$40,001-\$50,000 and \$50,001-\$60,000) as a reference point, 41% of White Caucasian make in that range (15.2% below and 43.8% above); 42.7% of Black African American make in that range (5.6% below and 51.7% above); 58.8% of Hispanic Latino make in that range (5.9% below and 35.3% above); 15.8% of Other make in that range (21.1% below and 63.1% above); 50% of Asian make in that range (0% below and 50% above); 0% of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander make in that range (0% below and 100% above); and 40% of American Indian make in that range (20% below and 40% above). It should be noted that data from Other, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and American Indian may be misleading because there are so few coaches from these demographics. Another interesting note is that one-third of the Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander respondents make the highest category listed (\$250,001 or more); however, it should also be noted that only 6 of 787 respondents stated they were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.



Further, the only groups that fall outside the “norm” (\$40,001-\$50,000 and \$50,001-\$60,000) are Other, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, which all make above the norm. The sample size for these groups is low (2.41%, 1.02%, and 0.76% respectively) making conclusions not feasible. Additional research is essential to better understand the relationship between race, ethnicity, gender and salary in the field of strength and conditioning coaching.

Moreover, the gender distribution among the 787 respondents from the survey is noticeable. A total of 80.3% are male, 18.8% are female, and 0.9% preferred not to disclose their gender. In terms of salary, a significant portion of the data for strength and conditioning coaches falls within the \$40,001-\$50,000 and \$50,001-\$60,000 salary ranges, accounting for 18.5% each, or 37% collectively. Analyzing these salary range data further:

- Among male respondents, 39.7% earn within this combined salary range, with 13.6% earning below and 46.7% earning above it.
- For female respondents, 48.6% fall within this salary bracket, with 12.2% earning less and 39.3% earning more.
- Interestingly, none of the respondents who preferred not to disclose their gender fell within this salary range, as all of them reported earnings above it.

It is notable that only one female respondent, representing 0.68% of all female participants, reported a salary over \$150,001. This contrasts with 44 male respondents (7.00% of male participants) who reported salaries above this threshold. The data highlights potential gender disparities in the higher salary brackets within the field of strength and conditioning coaching. The authors highlight the need for additional research into the relationship between gender and salary in the field of strength and conditioning coaching, particularly in relation to the sport in which coaches are employed. While not supported in the data presented, higher salaries are often associated with sports like football and men’s basketball, where female strength and conditioning coaches are less common. To understand this disparity, it’s recommended to investigate various factors influencing hiring decisions, such as whether females are applying for these roles, the necessity of college playing experience, and the influence of head coaches in the hiring process.

The data shows 60.8% of female coaches earn \$60,000 or less, compared to 53.3% of male coaches in the same salary bracket. Furthermore, the earning potential for females appears markedly lower, with only one out of 148 female respondents (0.68%) earning over \$150,001, in stark contrast to 44 out of 632 male respondents (7.00%). This discrepancy is underscored by NCAA demographic data⁴, which has consistently shown a distribution of 85% male to 15% female strength and conditioning coaches over the past decade. Additional research is warranted to further assess any salary disparities to promote equity in the field.

The data in Table 4 provides a comparison of salary ranges between male and female collegiate strength coaches. Among the highest salary brackets, no female coaches are represented in the “\$250,001 or more” range, while male coaches do have a presence there, with 23 responses (3.6%). In contrast, the majority of female coaches are concentrated in the lower to middle salary ranges, particularly in the “\$50,001 - \$60,000” bracket where 41 female coaches (27.7%) are situated. Male coaches show a broader distribution across all salary ranges, with a significant presence in the higher brackets. This data highlights a notable gender disparity in salary, with female coaches less represented in the highest pay scales and more concentrated in the lower to middle salary ranges.

A primary focus for future research should be to examine salaries in relation to the specific sports the coaches are involved in. For instance, comparing the salaries of all strength and conditioning coaches in football, basketball, and other sports could yield insightful findings. Given the potentially higher salaries in sports like football and basketball, a salary survey must consider the differing representation of underrepresented minorities. Factors not considered in the survey were the amount of revenue generated from the sport that a coach is connected to, and this may be a primary influencing factor. The CSCCA’s final goal of the salary survey was to present additional data representing a variety of variables and data including age, experience, conference, and even Power 5 vs. Non-Power 5 coaches. The tables and summaries are found in Appendix 1 and basic overviews are provided for each table. The goal was to present the data and to avoid over generalizations as multiple factors influence salary.



Table 4. Salary range by gender for collegiate strength coaches in the United States.

Salary Range	Female		Male	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
\$250,001 or more	0	0.0	23	3.6
\$200,001 - \$250,000	1	0.7	5	0.8
\$150,001 - \$200,000	0	0.0	16	2.5
\$100,001 - \$150,000	14	9.5	70	11.1
\$90,001 - \$100,000	4	2.7	17	2.7
\$80,001 - \$90,000	6	4.1	37	5.9
\$70,001 - \$80,000	12	8.1	63	10.0
\$60,001 - \$70,000	21	14.2	64	10.1
\$50,001- \$60,000	41	27.7	120	19.0
\$40,001 - \$50,000	31	20.9	131	20.7
\$30,001 - \$40,000	13	8.8	63	10.0
\$30,000 or less	5	3.4	23	3.6
Total	148	100.0	632	100.0

Prefer Not to Answer	Frequency	Percent
\$90,001 - \$100,000	1	14.3
\$80,001 - \$90,000	2	28.6
\$70,001 - \$80,000	1	14.3
\$60,001 - \$70,000	2	28.6
\$50,001- \$60,000	1	14.3
Total	7	100.0

Conclusions

The survey conducted by the CSCCa offers a thorough examination of salary distributions within the profession, revealing striking differences across various divisions, conferences, and demographics. While the majority of coaches earn within a moderate salary range of \$40,000 to \$60,000, there's a stark contrast with a smaller group earning over \$200,000, highlighting a significant income disparity in the field. The survey also sheds light on the average demographic profile of these coaches, revealing an average age of 35.3 years and an average of 9.6 years in full-time collegiate strength and conditioning roles. Factors such as bonuses and external income, where half of the respondents do not receive bonuses and most do not have external income, add layers to the financial landscape of these professionals. The employment status of these coaches varies, with nearly half being at-will employees, suggesting a difference in job security compared to those on contracts, some of which are tied to team performance or tenure.

The data underscores the need to address the evident disparities in compensation, particularly those related to race, gender, divisional differences, and the overall income gap within the field. This information can serve as a starting point for further discussions and initiatives aimed at fostering equitable compensation and creating a more stable, inclusive working environment for collegiate strength and conditioning coaches. However, more detailed research is necessary to fully understand the current landscape, and coaches are encouraged to actively engage in research and discussions within their field. The findings are intended to inform coaches by understanding salary ranges and factors that can influence salary. The aim is to progress and shape the strength and conditioning industry and advance the profession for all people.

Specifically, the survey reveals that the highest paid coaches within Power 5 conferences are predominantly found in the ACC and Big 10, with a notable absence of high earners among Independent institutions. This disparity in pay is



also evident in gender discrepancies, where female coaches are significantly underrepresented in the highest salary brackets. The survey results advocate for greater attention to these disparities, highlighting the need for a more equitable approach in the collegiate strength and conditioning coaching profession. In summary, the CSCCa survey provides critical insights into the varied and complex financial landscape of collegiate strength and conditioning coaches, emphasizing the necessity for continued research and active involvement from professionals within the field to address these disparities.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the Collegiate Strength and Conditioning Coaches Association members and support team for developing the survey and helping to collect responses to move the profession forward.

Survey Appendices

Table 5. Comparison between Power 5 and Non-Power 5 coaches at each salary level.

Salary Range	Power 5	Non-Power 5	Chi-Squared	P-value
\$30,000 or less	3	25	8.793	0.003
\$31,001 - \$40,000	4	72	39.471	0.000
\$40,001 - \$50,000	44	118	12.142	0.000
\$50,001 - \$60,000	53	109	3.462	0.063
\$60,001 - \$70,000	36	51	0.082	0.775
\$70,001 - \$80,000	38	38	3.490	0.062
\$80,001 - \$90,000	22	23	1.406	0.236
\$90,001 - \$100,000	13	9	2.879	0.090
\$100,001 - \$150,000	63	21	48.291	0.001
\$150,001 - \$200,000	9	7	1.291	0.256
\$200,001 - \$250,000	5	1	3.211	0.073
\$250,001 or more	20	3	20.448	0.000

Values indicate the number of responses at a salary range for each Power 5 and Non-Power 5 conference. A chi-squared analysis was utilized to assess if a difference exists between Power 5 vs. Non-Power 5 in any given salary range. $P \leq 0.05$ indicates statistical significance.

The data in Table 5 compares the salary ranges of collegiate strength and conditioning coaches from Power 5 and Non-Power 5 conferences, using a chi-squared analysis to determine statistical significance. Significant differences are observed in the lower salary brackets, particularly in the \$30,000 or less and \$31,001 - \$40,000 ranges, where Non-Power 5 coaches are more prevalent. In the higher salary brackets, especially above \$100,000, Power 5 coaches are significantly more represented, with a notable disparity in the highest bracket (\$250,001 or more). The middle salary ranges (\$50,001 - \$100,000) show less pronounced differences between the two groups. Overall, this data highlights a clear and statistically significant disparity in salary distribution, with Power 5 coaches generally occupying the higher salary brackets and Non-Power 5 coaches more common in the lower brackets.



Table 6. Age and coaching experience by gender for collegiate strength coaches in the United States of America.

(Years)	Female						Male						Prefer Not to Answer					
	(N)	Mean	SD	Quartiles			(N)	Mean	SD	Quartiles			(N)	Mean	SD	Quartiles		
				25	50	75				25	50	75				25	50	75
Age	148.0	33.0	± 7.3	28.0	31.0	36.0	632.0	35.7	± 8.7	30.0	33.0	40.0	7.0	44.6	± 10.7	35.0	41.0	57.0
Full-Time Collegiate Strength Coach Experience	141.0	8.7	± 6.9	3.0	7.0	11.0	607.0	9.7	± 7.9	4.0	7.0	13.0	7.0	17.4	± 10.3	9.0	16.0	27.0
Collegiate Strength Coach Experience	144.0	10.0	± 6.7	5.0	8.0	13.0	615.0	11.5	± 7.6	6.0	10.0	15.0	7.0	19.3	± 10.7	12.0	18.0	30.0

Data is shown as mean ± standard deviation for age and coaching experience for females, males, and prefer not to answer. Then quartiles are provided for each.

The data in Table 6 provides insights into the age and coaching experience differences between male and female collegiate strength coaches in the United States. On average, female coaches are younger, with a mean age of 33 years, compared to male coaches who have a mean age of 35.7 years. In terms of full-time collegiate strength coaching experience, females average 8.7 years, while males average slightly more at 9.7 years. When considering overall collegiate strength coaching experience, female coaches have an average of 10 years, whereas male coaches have a slightly higher average of 11.5 years. This data suggests that while there are small differences in age and experience between male and female coaches, they are relatively close in terms of their professional tenure.



Table 7. Collegiate strength coach salary range by number of athletes a coach is responsible for in the United States of America.

Athlete Number	\$250,001 or more		\$200,001 - 250,000		\$150,001 - 200,000		\$100,001 - 150,000		\$90,001 - 100,000		\$80,001 - 90,000	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
100+	21	91.3	3	50.0	10	62.5	33	39.3	8	36.4	14	31.1
76-100	1	4.3	0	0	2	12.5	6	7.1	2	9.1	3	6.7
51-75	0	0	0	0	1	6.3	10	11.9	2	9.1	7	15.6
36-50	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	4	4.8	4	18.2	6	13.3
26-35	0	0	1	16.7	0	0.0	9	10.7	2	9.1	4	8.9
0-25	1	4.3	2	33.3	3	18.8	22	26.2	4	18.2	11	24.4
Total	23	100	6	100	16	100	84	100	22	100	45	100

Athlete Number	\$70,001 - 80,000		\$60,001 - 70,000		\$50,001- 60,000		\$40,001 - 50,000		\$31,001 - 40,000		\$30,000 or less	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
100+	30	39.5	45	51.7	72	44.4	65	40.1	34	44.7	9	32.1
76-100	13	17.1	12	13.8	26	16.0	29	17.9	9	11.8	4	14.3
51-75	8	10.5	13	14.9	23	14.2	20	12.3	13	17.1	3	10.7
36-50	8	10.5	4	4.6	19	11.7	21	13.0	10	13.2	3	10.7
26-35	4	5.3	9	10.3	10	6.2	9	5.6	5	6.6	3	10.7
0-25	13	17.1	4	4.6	12	7.4	18	11.1	5	6.6	6	21.4
Total	76	100	87	100	162	100	162	100	76	100	28	100

Athlete distribution was created based on practitioner recommended break points prior to the survey being conducted. Data shows the frequency and percent of respondents within each salary bracket.

The data presented in Table 7 offers a detailed look at how the number of athletes coached by collegiate strength and conditioning coaches in the United States influences their salary ranges. Coaches handling a larger group of athletes, particularly over 100, are more frequently represented in the highest salary brackets, notably above \$200,000, reflecting a trend towards higher compensation for managing larger teams. However, a considerable number of these coaches also fall into the lower-middle salary range, particularly between \$40,000 and \$60,000, indicating a wide salary distribution even among those coaching many athletes. Conversely, coaches responsible for smaller groups of athletes, especially those managing 0-25 athletes, are predominantly found in the lower salary brackets, with most earning below \$60,000. This data underscores a clear relationship between the number of athletes coached and salary potential, with those coaching larger groups generally having access to higher salaries, though there remains significant variability within this trend.



Table 8. Salary ranges by Power 5 conferences and Independents.

Salary	ACC	Big 10	Big 12	PAC 12	SEC	Independent
\$30,000 or less	0	1	2	0	0	0
\$31,001 - \$40,000	1	0	3	0	0	0
\$40,001 - \$50,000	11	6	10	5	7	0
\$50,001 - \$60,000	14	15	9	4	6	2
\$60,001 - \$70,000	4	12	8	4	7	0
\$70,001 - \$80,000	8	10	4	5	8	0
\$80,001 - \$90,000	6	3	5	5	2	0
\$90,001 - \$100,000	3	3	1	1	3	0
\$100,001 - \$150,000	12	18	11	7	11	1
\$150,001 - \$200,000	2	3	2	2	0	0
\$200,001 - \$250,000	0	2	0	1	0	1
\$250,001 or more	6	4	4	4	2	0

Values indicate the number of responses at a salary range for each Power 5 conference including the Power 5 level and independent schools.

Table 8 provides data on the salary ranges of collegiate strength and conditioning coaches within Power 5 conferences (ACC, Big 10, Big 12, PAC 12, and SEC) and Independent schools. The highest paid coaches, those earning \$250,001 or more, are most notably represented in the ACC and Big 10 conferences, each having a significant number of coaches in this top salary bracket. In contrast, the Independent schools show no representation in this highest salary range. Middle salary ranges, particularly between \$100,001 and \$150,000, are more evenly distributed across all Power 5 conferences. Overall, based on the responses within the data set, this data highlights the ACC and Big 10 stand out for having the highest proportion of top-earning coaches.

References

1. Cormier T. Salary Review of Strength and Conditioning Coaches: 2022 Survey Results. *Strength & Conditioning Journal*. 2023;45(3):367-370.
2. Poiss CC, Sullivan PA, Paup DC, Westerman BJ. Perceived importance of weight training to selected NCAA Division III men and women student-athletes. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*. 2004;18(1):108-114.
3. Coaches CSC, association. CSCCa Position Statement Regarding Strength and Conditioning Staff/ Athlete Ratio. 2016.
4. National Collegiate Athletic Association. NCAA Demographic Database [Data visualization dashboard]. Retrieve from <https://www.ncaa.org/sports/2018/12/13/ncaa-demographics-database.aspx>