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## Summary assessment of progress towards five-year goals

The five-year goals for 2017-2022 defined in the College of Engineering Strategic Plan for Diversity and Inclusion are shown, followed by a summary assessment of the current status after one year. Green shading indicates a target goal has been met. Appendix A defines the department and program acronyms.

| FIVE-YEAR GOALS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Demographics <br> for each department and <br> for the College as a whole | Disparities (racial, gender) <br> for the College as a whole | Climate |  |
| Faculty | $25 \%$ women <br> $10 \%$ URGs | - No disparities in retention rates <br> - Continuous improvement towards <br> no disparities in T/TT vs. CT, and <br> in distribution across ranks | Inclusive, <br> supportive |  |
| Graduate <br> students | Among incoming students: <br> $33 \%$ women <br> $25 \%$ URGs (among domestic) | No disparities in retention rates | Inclusive, <br> supportive |  |
| Undergraduate <br> students | Among incoming students: <br> $30 \%$ women <br> $15 \%$ URGs | No disparities in 6-year graduation <br> rates (70\% for all) | Inclusive, <br> supportive |  |
| Staff | $30 \%$ women on technical staff <br> $20 \%$ URGs on all staff <br> $20 \%$ men on administrative staff | Continuous improvement towards <br> no disparities in managerial vs. non- <br> managerial | Inclusive, <br> supportive |  |

*T/TT = Tenured/tenure-track. CT=Continuing track. URG=From underrepresented group (i.e., non-White, non-Asian)
Faculty

|  | Target | COE | BMEG | CHEG | CIEG | CISC | ELEG | MSEG | MEEG |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Women | $25 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| URG (domestic) | $10 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

Graduate students (incoming)

|  | Target | COE | BMEG | CHEG | CIEG | CISC | ELEG | MSEG | MEEG |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Women | $33 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| URG (domestic) | $25 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ |

Undergraduates (incoming)

|  | Target | COE | Biomed | Chemical | Civil | Comp eng | Comp sci | Electrical | Environ | Mechanical |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Women | $33 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| URG (domestic) | $25 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

Staff
Staff

|  | Target | COE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Women on tech. staff | $30 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Men on admin staff | $20 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| URG on all staff | $20 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

## Highlights

## Faculty

Gender

- 3 of 7 departments met the $25 \%$ target (BMEG, CIEG, CISC). (Fig. 4)
- College is close to the target at $22 \%$ and has shown strong trend over last 5 years. (Fig. 3, 4)
- The College faculty has increased by 30 in the last 5 years. $43 \%$ of that growth ( 13 faculty members) has been women faculty ( 24 to 37 ) (Fig. 2).
- The College is in the top $27^{\text {th }}$ percentile of all U.S. universities in terms of percentage of women faculty (Table 1).
- CISC is in the top $6^{\text {th }}$ percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women faculty. BMEG is in the top $20^{\text {th }}$ percentile (Table 1).
- Every department has at least 4 women faculty (including 2 tenured women*); two departments have 8 women faculty. (Fig. 5) [*except BMEG which has only 10 faculty]
- All but one department (ELEG) has at least one women full professor (Fig. 5)

URG

- 2 of 7 departments met the $10 \%$ target (CIEG, MSEG). (Fig. 7)
- The College is at 7\% URG faculty. The number of URG faculty increased from 8 to 12 (2 percentage points) last year. In addition, the new Dean is African-American (Fig. 3)
- BMEG has no URG domestic faculty*; CISC and MEEG have only one. [*Note BMEG has only 10 faculty.] (Fig. 8)
- ELEG is in the top $20^{\text {th }}$ percentile of all U.S. universities in terms of percentage of domestic URG faculty (Table 2).
- Of the 11 domestic URG faculty in the College, 8 are tenured (Fig. 8).


## Staff

- Little change so far in percentage of women in tech support ( $21 \%$ vs. $30 \%$ target).
- Little change so far in percentage of men in administrative support ( $11 \%$ vs. $20 \%$ target).
- No change in percentage of URG on staff ( $10 \%$ vs. $20 \%$ target )
- Percentage of women in managerial roles is down from $58 \%$ to $55 \%$ since 2017.
- Percentage of URG in managerial roles is up from $10 \%$ to $14 \%$ since 2017.


## Graduate students

Gender

- 2 of 7 departments (almost 3 ) met $33 \%$ target for incoming students (BMEG, CHEG, CIEG) (Fig. 16).
- College is at $26 \%$ women for incoming students. Percentage of all graduate students who are women has remained flat for last 10 years (Fig. 15, 16).
- The College is in the $62^{\text {nd }}$ percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women graduate students (Table 3).
- CISC is in the top $18^{\text {th }}$ percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women graduate students (Table 3).
- Over the last 10 years, BMEG, CHEG, CISC, and ELEG show increasing trends in number of women graduate students (Fig. 18).


## URG

- 2 of 7 departments met $25 \%$ target for incoming domestic students (BMEG, ELEG) (Fig. 19).
- College is at $17 \%$ URG for incoming domestic students (Fig. 19).
- Over the last 10 years, BMEG, CISC, and ELEG show increasing trends in number of URG domestic graduate students (Fig. 21).


## Undergraduate students

Gender

- 3 of 8 programs (almost 4 ) met $30 \%$ target for incoming students (Biomed, Chem, Civil, Environ). (Fig. 24)
- College as a whole met $30 \%$ target for incoming students.
- The College is in the top 25th percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women undergraduates. Biomedical and computer science are too. Electrical and chemical are in the bottom $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile (Table 5).
- Percentage of women undergraduates has shown steady positive trend in last 10 years ( $19 \%$ to 27\%) (Fig. 23).
- Computer eng. and electrical are still relatively low with $10 \%$ and $12 \%$ women undergraduates (Fig. 24). They each have only 5 incoming women as well (Fig. 25).
- Over the last 10 years, biomedical, civil, computer eng, computer sci., and mechanical show increasing trends in number of women undergraduate students (Fig. 26).
- The 6 -year graduation rate for women in the College is $55 \%$, compared to $60 \%$ for majority students. (Fig. 30)


## URG

- 5 of 8 programs met $15 \%$ target for incoming students (Biomed, Comp eng, Comp sci, Elec, Environ). (Fig. 27)
- College is close at $14 \%$ and has shown positive trend over last 10 years (up 4 percentage points) (Fig. 23).
- The College and every department (except computer eng.) are below the median among all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of undergraduate domestic URG students (Table 6).
- Over the last 10 years, biomedical, chemical, computer eng, computer sci., electrical, and mechanical show increasing trends in number of undergraduate domestic URG students (Fig. 29).
- The 6 -year graduation rate for URG undergraduates in the College is $49 \%$, compared to $60 \%$ for majority students. (Fig. 30)


## 1. Introduction

During 2017, an initiative was undertaken by groups of COE stakeholders to define quantifiable demographic targets for the COE in order to achieve inclusive excellence across four constituent groups-faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students. Five-year goals were identified and presented in the resulting College of Engineering Strategic Plan for Diversity and Inclusion available at https://www.engr.edu/initiatives/diversity-inclusion (Figure 1).

| FIVE-YEAR GOALS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Demographics <br> for each department and <br> for the College as a whole | Disparities (racial, gender) <br> for the College as a whole | Climate |  |
| Faculty | $25 \%$ women <br> $10 \%$ URGs | - No disparities in retention rates <br> Continuous improvement towards <br> no disparities in T/TT vs. CT, and <br> in distribution across ranks | Inclusive, <br> supportive |  |
| Graduate <br> students | Among incoming students: <br> $33 \%$ women <br> $25 \%$ URGs (among domestic) | No disparities in retention rates | Inclusive, <br> supportive |  |
| Undergraduate <br> students | Among incoming students: <br> $30 \%$ women <br> $15 \%$ URGs | No disparities in 6-year graduation <br> rates (70\% for all) | Inclusive, <br> supportive |  |
| Staff | $30 \%$ women on technical staff <br> $20 \%$ URGs on all staff <br> $20 \%$ men on administrative staff | Continuous improvement towards <br> no disparities in managerial vs. non- <br> managerial | Inclusive, <br> supportive |  |

*T/TT $=$ Tenured/tenure-track. $\mathrm{CT}=$ Continuing track. URG=From underrepresented group (i.e., non-White, non-Asian)
Figure 1. Five-year goals for College diversity and inclusion
In conjunction with the Strategic Plan, an addendum report of summarized metrics was prepared in September 2017 to measure the current state of the COE with respect to those five-year goals and provide historical context. This report is the first in a series of annual updates to those September 2017 figures, which ongoing will be produced each Fall to assess progress and provide insights on this initiative.

The report is comprised of both current measures for the College of Engineering, and historical comparative data for the COE and other U.S. Engineering schools. For each of the constituent groups, current data as of Fall 2018 was derived from UD internal sources. For the faculty and student populations, the historical comparative measures were based on data from the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE). For staff, comparative statistics were drawn from the U.S. Census Bureau. Similar to the Sept 2017 report, although the College values and seeks diversity in all respects, metrics here focus on diversity with respect to women and underrepresented groups (defined in engineering as non-White, non-Asian).

Owing to limitations in the ASEE data, comparative measures for faculty only consider tenured/tenuretrack (T/TT) faculty, not continuing track (CT) faculty. Comparative metrics include comparisons to all institutions in the ASEE database, as well as the 25 -school comparative set defined by the University (Appendix A).

## 2. Faculty Data

### 2.1 Overview

Notes for faculty data:

- Only faculty with primary appointments with COE are considered.
- Includes faculty with administrative appointments in their home departments, except the Dean who is not included as faculty (consistent with UD records).
- Does not include non-COE faculty with secondary appointments with COE, Non-Tenure Temporary Faculty (i.e., Research Faculty), or faculty on non-paid leave of absence.
- URG status (non-white, non-Asian) was determined from the faculty member's Primary Ethnicity
- In the comparison with other universities, for college-level data over time, for each school, we sum only students in the same departments/programs we have in UD COE.
- Department acronyms are defined in Appendix A.

Figure 2 presents the number of women, URG and total (T/TT and CT) faculty for the College of Engineering over the last 5 years.


Figure 2. No. of Women, URG and All Faculty, T/TT and CT, COE, prior 5 years (2014-2018)

Figure 3 presents the percentage of women and URG faculty for the College of Engineering over the last 5 years.


Figure 3. \% Women and URG faculty, COE, prior 5 years (2014-2018)

### 2.2 Gender

Figure 4 summarizes the percentage of women faculty in the College of Engineering as of Fall 2018 by job rank and title. Figure 5 presents the actual number of women faculty by job rank and title at the department level. In both cases T/TT and CT faculty are included, as this data is available within UD sources.


Figure 4. \% Women T/TT and CT faculty by department and for the COE, by job rank and type, Fall


Figure 5. No. of Women T/TT and CT faculty by department and for the COE, by job rank and type, Fall 2018

Figure 6 illustrates the change by department in the number of TT/T and CT women faculty at the College of Engineering over the last 5 years.


Figure 6. No. of Women TT/T and CT faculty, by COE department, prior 5 years (2014-2018)
Comparative data for women faculty over the last 10 years for the COE and other ASEE-tracked institutions can be found in Table 1. Faculty data in this case only includes T/TT faculty. Data is presented for both comparative sets, and detail on rankings including percentile have been provided.

Table 1. \% Women faculty for the COE, by department, T/TT only, prior 10 years (2008-2017)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 18\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% |
| Average of all schools | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 109/294 | 123/299 | 100/301 | 67/306 | 65/307 | 97/309 | 112/306 | 68/313 | 70/313 | 77/288 |
| Percentile | 63rd | 59th | 67th | 78th | 79th | 69th | 63rd | 78th | 78th | 73rd |
| Average of comparators | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 8/25 | 9/25 | 4/25 | 2/25 | 2/25 | 7/25 | 8/25 | 4/25 | 3/25 | 2/25 |
| Percentile | 68th | 64th | 84th | 92nd | 92nd | 72nd | 68th | 84th | 88th | 92nd |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | - | - | 33\% | 67\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% |
| Average of all schools | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 22\% | 23\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 17/106 | 3/107 | 19/109 | 17/114 | 20/120 | 23/117 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 84th | 97th | 83rd | 85th | 83rd | 80th |
| Average of comparators | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 21\% | 21\% | 20\% | 20\% | 19\% | 19\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 3/21 | 1/21 | 2/21 | 2/21 | 3/22 | 2/22 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 86th | 95th | 90th | 90th | 86th | 91st |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 16\% | 14\% | 16\% | 18\% | 15\% | 9\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 18\% |
| Average of all schools | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 50/148 | 67/149 | 65/154 | 67/150 | 79/150 | 123/150 | 105/151 | 101/149 | 99/149 | 78/149 |
| Percentile | 66th | 55th | 58th | 55th | 47th | 18th | 30th | 32nd | 34th | 47th |
| Average of comparators | 16\% | 16\% | 15\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 9/23 | 12/23 | 9/23 | 10/23 | 12/23 | 20/22 | 14/21 | 14/21 | 15/21 | 10/21 |
| Percentile | 61st | 48th | 61st | 57th | 48th | 9th | 33rd | 33rd | 29th | 52nd |
| Civil \& Environmental Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 17\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | 19\% | 20\% | 18\% |
| Average of all schools | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 109/227 | 118/224 | 122/227 | 90/232 | 91/236 | 111/233 | 109/232 | 98/236 | 100/237 | 125/225 |
| Percentile | 52nd | 47th | 46th | 61st | 61st | 52nd | 53rd | 58th | 58th | 44th |
| Average of comparators | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 15/23 | 17/23 | 16/22 | 12/22 | 12/22 | 15/22 | 17/22 | 16/23 | 15/24 | 20/24 |
| Percentile | 35th | 26th | 27th | 45th | 45th | 32nd | 23rd | 30th | 38th | 17th |
| Computer Science | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | 23\% | 22\% | 27\% | 26\% | 26\% | 27\% | 35\% | 32\% | 33\% |
| Average of all schools | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | 33/176 | 45/181 | 35/188 | 34/191 | 32/193 | 33/192 | 19/198 | 22/195 | 12/187 |
| Percentile | - | 81st | 75th | 81st | 82nd | 83rd | 83rd | 90th | 89th | 94th |
| Average of comparators | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | 2/21 | 1/21 | 1/21 | 1/21 | 1/20 | 1/21 | 1/20 | 1/20 | 1/20 |
| Percentile | - | 90th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th |
| Electrical \& Computer Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 4\% | 4\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 20\% | 19\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 206/271 | 217/276 | 124/280 | 103/283 | 105/284 | 168/288 | 170/284 | 166/288 | 54/287 | 73/270 |
| Percentile | 24th | 21st | 56th | 64th | 63rd | 42nd | 40th | 42nd | 81st | 73rd |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 13\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 24/24 | 24/24 | 8/24 | 5/24 | 6/24 | 14/24 | 14/24 | 15/24 | 3/24 | 3/24 |
| Percentile | 0 | 0 | 67th | 79th | 75th | 42nd | 42nd | 38th | 88th | 88th |
| Materials Science Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 20\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 21\% | 15\% | 14\% |
| Average of all schools | 14\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 19\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 14/54 | 19/54 | 21/55 | 21/55 | 22/56 | 20/57 | 24/58 | 19/64 | 34/64 | 38/63 |
| Percentile | 75th | 65th | 62nd | 62nd | 61st | 65th | 59th | 70th | 47th | 40th |
| Average of comparators | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 16\% | 16\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 3/18 | 5/18 | 7/18 | 6/18 | 9/18 | 7/19 | 9/19 | 7/20 | 13/20 | 14/20 |
| Percentile | 83rd | 72nd | 61st | 67th | 50th | 63rd | 53rd | 65th | 35th | 30th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 19\% | 15\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 11\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Average of all schools | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 33/255 | 64/258 | 89/262 | 66/267 | 71/265 | 76/267 | 149/269 | 152/272 | 165/275 | 167/262 |
| Percentile | 87th | 75th | 66th | 75th | 73rd | 72nd | 45th | 44rd | 40th | 36th |
| Average of comparators | 11\% | 10\% | 10\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 3/22 | 5/22 | 7/22 | 6/22 | 5/22 | 4/22 | 16/22 | 18/22 | 18/23 | 20/23 |
| Percentile | 86th | 77th | 68th | 73rd | 77th | 82nd | 27th | 18th | 22nd | 13th |

### 2.3 Underrepresented Status

Figure 7 summarizes the percentage of faculty from underrepresented groups (URG) in the College of Engineering as of Fall 2018 by job rank and title. Figure 8 presents the actual number of URG faculty by job rank and title at the department level. In both cases T/TT and CT faculty are included.


Figure 7. \% URG T/TT and CT faculty by department and for the COE, by job rank and type, Fall 2018

| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | BMEG | CHEG | CIEG | CISC | ELEG | MSEG | MEEG | COE |
| - Continuing Track | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| - TT / Assistant Professor | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| -TT / Associate Professor | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| -TT / Full Professor | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| - All | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 12 |

Figure 8. No. of URG T/TT and CT faculty by department and for the COE, by job rank and type, Fall 2018

Figure 9 illustrates the change by department in the number of URG TT/T and CT faculty at the College of Engineering over the last 5 years.


Figure 9. No. of URG TT/T and CT faculty, by COE department, prior 5 years (2014-2018)

Comparative URG faculty data over the last 10 years for the COE and other ASEE-tracked institutions can be found in Table 2. Faculty data in this case only includes T/TT faculty. Data is presented for both comparative sets, and detail on rankings including percentile have been provided.

Table 2. \% URG faculty for the COE, by department, T/TT only, over last 10 years (2008-2017)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 9\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| Average of all schools | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 61/294 | 81/294 | 101/301 | 131/306 | 131/307 | 102/309 | 131/306 | 75/313 | 112/313 | 112/288 |
| Percentile | 79th | 73rd | 66th | 57th | 57th | 67th | 57th | 76th | 64th | 61st |
| Average of comparators | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 2/25 | 5/25 | 7/25 | 11/25 | 13/25 | 7/25 | 12/25 | 2/25 | 6/25 | 10/25 |
| Percentile | 92nd | 80th | 72nd | 56th | 48th | 72nd | 52nd | 92nd | 76th | 60th |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | - | - | 0\% | 33\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Average of all schools | 4\% | 4\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 46/106 | 1/107 | 55/109 | 60/114 | 60/120 | 57/117 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 57th | 99th | 50th | 47th | 50th | 51st |
| Average of comparators | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 14/20 | 1/21 | 14/21 | 16/21 | 17/22 | 16/22 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 33rd | 95th | 33rd | 24th | 23rd | 27th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 12\% | 14\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 9\% | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Average of all schools | 7\% | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 37/148 | 21/149 | 40/154 | 46/150 | 44/150 | 56/150 | 55/151 | 56/149 | 57/149 | 56/148 |
| Percentile | 75th | 86th | 74th | 69th | 71st | 63rd | 64th | 62nd | 62nd | 62nd |
| Average of comparators | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% | 8\% | 7\% | 8\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 4/21 | 2/23 | 4/23 | 4/23 | 2/23 | 7/22 | 7/21 | 7/21 | 6/21 | 8/21 |
| Percentile | 81st | 91st | 83rd | 83rd | 91st | 68th | 67th | 67th | 71st | 62nd |
| Civil \& Environmental Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 8\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% |
| Average of all schools | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 100/227 | 104/224 | 110/227 | 122/232 | 122/236 | 90/233 | 87/232 | 83/236 | 75/237 | 83/225 |
| Percentile | 56th | 54th | 52nd | 47th | 48th | 61st | 63 rd | 65th | 68th | 63 rd |
| Average of comparators | 7\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 16/23 | 16/22 | 16/22 | 16/22 | 14/22 | 8/22 | 8/22 | 6/23 | 5/24 | 7/24 |
| Percentile | 30th | 27th | 27th | 27th | 36th | 64th | 64th | 74th | 79th | 71st |
| Computer Science | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | 5\% | 4\% | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% | 5\% | 4\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Average of all schools | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% | 4\% | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | 46/176 | 45/181 | 55/188 | 59/191 | 62/193 | 54/192 | 63/198 | 65/195 | 60/187 |
| Percentile | - | 74th | 75th | 71st | 69th | 68th | 72nd | 68th | 67th | 68th |
| Average of comparators | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | 5/21 | 5/21 | 5/21 | 6/21 | 5/20 | 4/21 | 9/20 | 7/20 | 9/20 |
| Percentile | - | 76th | 76th | 75th | 71st | 75th | 81st | 55th | 65th | 55th |
| Electrical \& Computer Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 13\% | 12\% | 12\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| Average of all schools | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 36/271 | 40/276 | 43/280 | 74/283 | 79/284 | 63/288 | 51/284 | 58/288 | 56/287 | 54/270 |
| Percentile | 87th | 86th | 85th | 74th | 72nd | 78th | 82nd | 80th | 80th | 80th |
| Average of comparators | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 4\% | 5\% | 4\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 1/24 | 2/24 | 2/24 | 3/24 | 5/24 | 1/24 | 2/24 | 1/24 | 1/24 | 2/24 |
| Percentile | 96th | 92nd | 92nd | 88th | 79th | 96th | 92nd | 96th | 96th | 92nd |
| Materials Science Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7\% | 8\% | 7\% |
| Average of all schools | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 28/56 | 26/54 | 31/55 | 33/55 | 32/56 | 35/57 | 39/58 | 22/64 | 21/64 | 25/63 |
| Percentile | 50th | 52nd | 44th | 40th | 43rd | 39th | 33rd | 66th | 67th | 60th |
| Average of comparators | 5\% | 5\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 12/18 | 11/18 | 12/18 | 14/18 | 13/18 | 14/19 | 15/19 | 8/20 | 7/20 | 8/20 |
| Percentile | 33rd | 39th | 33rd | 22nd | 28th | 26th | 21st | 60th | 65th | 60th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Average of all schools | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 127/255 | 132/258 | 138/262 | 141/267 | 141/265 | 149/267 | 145/269 | 33/272 | 156/275 | 157/262 |
| Percentile | 50th | 49th | 47th | 47th | 47th | 44th | 46th | 88th | 43rd | 40th |
| Average of comparators | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 6\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 18/22 | 17/22 | 16/22 | 17/22 | 18/22 | 18/22 | 19/23 | 1/23 | 19/23 | 19/23 |
| Percentile | 18th | 23rd | 27th | 23rd | 18th | 18th | 17th | 96th | 17th | 17th |

## 3. Staff Data

### 3.1 Gender

Figure 10 reflects the gender breakdown of COE staff by job type as of Fall 2017 and Fall 2018. Comparative data for New Castle County is as of July 2017. Figure 11 shows the gender breakdown by managerial role, and does not include research staff. The categorical definitions for each job type (admin, research and tech) can be found in the Appendix A.

| \# by Job Type |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2017 | 2018 |
| Admin Support | 94 | 94 |
| Tech Support | 35 | 39 |
| Research | $\underline{21}$ | $\underline{47}$ |
| All COE Staff | 150 | 180 |



Figure 10. College of Engineering administrative, technical and research support staff data by job type and gender, Fall 2017 and Fall 2018


Figure 11. College of Engineering administrative and technical support staff data by managerial role and gender, Fall 2017 and Fall 2018

### 3.2 Underrepresented Status

Figure 12 reflects the breakdown of COE staff by job type and underrepresented status as of Fall 2017 and Fall 2018. Comparative data for New Castle County is as of July 2017. Figure 13 shows the gender breakdown by managerial role, and does not include research staff. URG (non-white, non-Asian) status is determined from a staff member's Primary Ethnicity.

| \# by Job Type |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2017 | 2018 |
| Admin Support | 94 | 94 |
| Tech Support | 35 | 39 |
| Research | $\underline{21}$ | $\underline{47}$ |
| All COE Staff | 150 | 180 |



Figure 12. College of Engineering administrative, technical and research support staff data by job type and URG status, Fall 2017 and Fall 2018


Figure 13. College of Engineering administrative and technical support staff data by managerial role and URG status, Fall 2017 and Fall 2018

## 4. Graduate Student Data

### 4.1 Overview

Notes for graduate student data:

- $\quad \mathrm{URG}=$ all non-White, Non-Asian students $+1 / 2$ of students indicating two or more races; determined from IPEDS Ethnicity
- $\%$ URG = Num. URG / Num. domestic students
- In using ASEE data for other universities for comparison,
- All students in civil, environmental, or civil/environmental were aggregated into CIEG.
- All students in electrical, computer engineering, or electrical/computer engineering were aggregated into ELEG.
- Students in Metallurgical and Materials Engineering were counted as MSEG.
- All students in Computer Science, both inside and outside of engineering were aggregated as CISC.
- For college-level data over time, for each school, we sum only students in the same departments/programs we have in UD COE.

Figure 14 presents the number of women, URG and total Graduate students at the College of Engineering over the last 10 years


Figure 14. No. of Women, URG and All Graduate Students, COE, prior 10 years (2009-2018)

Figure 15 presents the percentage of women and URG Graduate students at the College of Engineering over the last 10 years


Figure 15. \% Women and URG Graduate Students, COE, prior 10 years (2009-2018)

### 4.2 Gender

Figure 16 summarizes the percentage of women among all Graduate students and all incoming Graduate students as of Fall 2018 at the department level for the College of Engineering, and the $\%$ of graduating Women Graduate students for Academic Year 2017-18. Figure 17 shows the same data in absolute numbers.


Figure 16. \% of Women Graduate Students, All and New, by COE department, Fall 2018 and \% of graduating Women Graduate Students by department, Academic Year 17-18


Figure 17. No. of Women Graduate Students, All and New, by COE department, Fall 2018 and No. of graduating Women Graduate Students by department, Academic Year 17-18

Figure 18 illustrates the change by department in the number of Women Graduate students at the College of Engineering over the last 10 years.


Figure 18. No. of Women Graduate students, by COE department, prior the last 10 years (2009-2018)
Comparative data for Women Graduate students over the last 10 years for the COE and other ASEEtracked institutions can be found in Table 3

Table 3. \% Women Graduate Students for the COE, by department, over last 10 years (2008-2017)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage Female, all Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 27\% | 27\% | 26\% | 25\% | 26\% | 27\% | 26\% | 27\% | 25\% | 26\% |
| Average of all schools | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 23\% | 23\% | 24\% | 24\% | 24\% | 26\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 33/244 | 33/247 | 46/250 | 58/252 | 58/255 | 56/255 | 67/250 | 59/253 | 92/245 | 90/235 |
| Percentile | 86th | 87th | 82nd | 77th | 77th | 78th | 73rd | 77th | 62nd | 62nd |
| Average of comparators | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 23\% | 26\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 2/25 | 2/25 | 2/25 | 4/25 | 3/25 | 4/25 | 6/25 | 6/25 | 9/25 | 10/25 |
| Percentile | 92nd | 92nd | 92nd | 84th | 88th | 84th | 76th | 76th | 64th | 60th |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage Female, all Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | - | - | 0\% | 33\% | 39\% | 37\% | 39\% | 41\% |
| Average of all schools | 37\% | 37\% | 37\% | 38\% | 39\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 41\% | 42\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 123/125 | 105/129 | 78/126 | 89/130 | 82/134 | 78/137 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 2nd | 19th | 38th | 32nd | 39th | 43rd |
| Average of comparators | 35\% | 36\% | 35\% | 37\% | 36\% | 39\% | 39\% | 39\% | 41\% | 41\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 20/20 | 19/21 | 13/21 | 16/21 | 14/22 | 14/22 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 0 | 10th | 38th | 24th | 36th | 36th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage Female, all Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 34\% | 31\% | 25\% | 30\% | 31\% | 37\% | 34\% | 37\% | 39\% | 33\% |
| Average of all schools | 31\% | 32\% | 32\% | 33\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 48/142 | 78/141 | 104/142 | 83/142 | 77/144 | 33/143 | 53/142 | 38/142 | 24/138 | 62/138 |
| Percentile | 66th | 45th | 27th | 42nd | 47th | 77th | 63rd | 73rd | 83rd | 55th |
| Average of comparators | 31\% | 32\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 32\% | 31\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 8/22 | 13/22 | 20/22 | 13/22 | 10/22 | 4/22 | 9/22 | 6/22 | 2/23 | 9/23 |
| Percentile | 64th | 41st | 9th | 41st | 55th | 82nd | 59th | 73rd | 91st | 61st |
| Civil \& Environmental Engineering | Percentage Female, all Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 26\% | 28\% | 31\% | 34\% | 35\% | 33\% | 32\% | 33\% | 27\% | 30\% |
| Average of all schools | 27\% | 28\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 31\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 92/196 | 92/200 | 68/201 | 45/200 | 43/201 | 55/199 | 56/198 | 50/195 | 112/193 | 91/190 |
| Percentile | 53rd | 54th | 66th | 78th | 79th | 72nd | 72nd | 74th | 42nd | 52nd |
| Average of comparators | 25\% | 26\% | 27\% | 28\% | 28\% | 29\% | 29\% | 30\% | 31\% | 32\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 7/23 | 9/23 | 9/23 | 5/23 | 5/23 | 6/23 | 8/23 | 9/23 | 18/24 | 14/24 |
| Percentile | 70th | 61st | 61st | 78th | 78th | 74th | 65th | 61st | 25th | 42nd |
| Computer Science | Percentage Female, all Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 24\% | 28\% | 25\% | 25\% | 24\% | 21\% | 23\% | 28\% | 29\% | 31\% |
| Average of all schools | 21\% | 21\% | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 22\% | 23\% | 24\% | 25\% | 28\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 57/166 | 27/173 | 38/175 | 47/185 | 59/184 | 102/183 | 83/177 | 52/185 | 47/176 | 32/174 |
| Percentile | 66th | 84th | 78th | 75th | 68th | 44th | 53rd | 72nd | 73rd | 82nd |
| Average of comparators | 19\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 30\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 3/22 | 1/22 | 1/21 | 1/22 | 5/22 | 9/21 | 7/22 | 2/21 | 2/21 | 2/21 |
| Percentile | 86th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 77th | 57th | 68th | 90th | 90th | 90th |
| Electrical \& Computer Engineering | Percentage Female, all Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 14\% | 19\% | 21\% | 18\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% |
| Average of all schools | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 168/228 | 150/229 | 141/233 | 159/232 | 83/234 | 82/234 | 129/229 | 173/231 | 166/223 | 153/216 |
| Percentile | 26th | 34th | 39th | 31st | 65th | 65th | 44th | 25th | 26th | 29th |
| Average of comparators | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 16/24 | 13/24 | 11/24 | 16/24 | 8/24 | 7/24 | 15/24 | 21/24 | 21/24 | 21/24 |
| Percentile | 33rd | 46th | 54th | 33rd | 67th | 71st | 38th | 13th | 13th | 13th |
| Materials Science Engineering | Percentage Female, all Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 35\% | 41\% | 43\% | 33\% | 28\% | 27\% | 34\% | 37\% | 33\% | 32\% |
| Average of all schools | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 28\% | 28\% | 28\% | 29\% | 29\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 17/86 | 8/88 | 6/87 | 21/90 | 37/94 | 50/97 | 18/98 | 8/96 | 18/98 | 33/97 |
| Percentile | 80th | 91st | 93rd | 77th | 61st | 48th | 82nd | 92nd | 82nd | 66th |
| Average of comparators | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 26\% | 27\% | 29\% | 29\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 4/20 | 2/20 | 1/19 | 5/20 | 8/20 | 11/22 | 4/22 | 2/23 | 4/23 | 7/23 |
| Percentile | 80th | 90th | 95th | 75th | 60th | 50th | 82nd | 91st | 83rd | 70th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage Female, all Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 33\% | 29\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 11\% | 12\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| Average of all schools | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 3/212 | 7/218 | 56/220 | 42/222 | 51/223 | 45/224 | 140/219 | 143/220 | 98/211 | 83/209 |
| Percentile | 99th | 97th | 75th | 81st | 77th | 80th | 36th | 35th | 54th | 60th |
| Average of comparators | 14\% | 14\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 1/24 | 1/24 | 3/24 | 3/24 | 5/24 | 3/24 | 23/24 | 20/24 | 13/24 | 11/24 |
| Percentile | 96th | 96th | 88th | 88th | 79th | 88th | 4th | 17th | 46th | 54th |

### 4.3 Underrepresented Status

Figure 19 summarizes the percentage of URG students among all Graduate students and all incoming Graduate students as of Fall 2018 at the department level for the College of Engineering, and the \% of graduating URG Graduate students for Academic Year 2017-18. Figure 20 shows the same data in absolute numbers.


Figure 19. \% of URG Graduate Students, All and New, by COE department, Fall 2018 and \% of graduating URG Graduate Students by department, Academic Year 17-18


Figure 20. No. of URG Graduate Students, All and New, by COE department, Fall 2018 and $\%$ of graduating URG Graduate Students by department, Academic Year 17-18

Figure 21 illustrates the change by department in the number of URG Graduate students at the College of Engineering over the last 10 years.


Figure 21. No. of URG Graduate students, by COE department, prior 10 years (2009-2018)

Comparative data for URG Graduate students over the last 10 years for the COE and other ASEE-tracked institutions can be found in Table 4.

Table 4. \% URG Graduate Students for the COE, by department, over last 10 years (2008-2017)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage URG, all Domestic Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 4\% | 5\% | 6\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 13\% | 12\% | 14\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 198/243 | 187/246 | 192/249 | 134/251 | 143/254 | 123/251 | 130/248 | 108/250 | 130/245 | 98/234 |
| Percentile | 19th | 24th | 23rd | 47th | 44th | 51st | 48th | 57th | 47th | 58th |
| Average of comparators | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 23/25 | 23/25 | 22/25 | 12/25 | 11/25 | 10/25 | 14/25 | 7/25 | 12/25 | 8/25 |
| Percentile | 8th | 8th | 12th | 52nd | 56th | 60th | 44th | 72nd | 52nd | 68th |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage URG, all Domestic Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | - | - | 25\% | 25\% | 27\% | 18\% | 14\% | 14\% |
| Average of all schools | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 12/124 | 22/128 | 13/125 | 34/129 | 74/134 | 71/137 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 90th | 83rd | 90th | 74th | 45th | 48th |
| Average of comparators | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 1/21 | 1/21 | 1/21 | 4/21 | 14/21 | 14/21 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 95th | 95th | 95th | 81st | 36th | 36th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage URG, all Domestic Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 5\% | 5\% | 7\% | 4\% | 6\% | 10\% | 11\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 91/139 | 98/140 | 91/141 | 110/110 | 93/144 | 66/143 | 73/140 | 80/138 | 88/136 | 96/138 |
| Percentile | 35th | 30th | 35th | 21st | 35th | 54th | 48th | 42nd | 35th | 30th |
| Average of comparators | 8\% | 10\% | 10\% | 8\% | 9\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 13/22 | 18/22 | 16/22 | 18/22 | 13/22 | 9/22 | 10/22 | 11/22 | 12/23 | 14/23 |
| Percentile | 41st | 18th | 27th | 18th | 41st | 59th | 55th | 50th | 48th | 39th |
| Civil \& Environmental Engineering | Percentage URG, all Domestic Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 2\% | 4\% | 6\% | 9\% | 9\% | 17\% | 15\% | 21\% | 18\% | 15\% |
| Average of all schools | 13\% | 13\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 19\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 152/194 | 150/199 | 143/201 | 112/199 | 117/200 | 65/199 | 75/197 | 53/194 | 62/192 | 84/189 |
| Percentile | 22nd | 25th | 29th | 44th | 42nd | 67th | 62nd | 73rd | 68th | 56th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 11\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 20/23 | 20/23 | 17/23 | 12/23 | 11/23 | 4/23 | 8/23 | 4/23 | 5/24 | 10/24 |
| Percentile | 13th | 13th | 26th | 48th | 52nd | 83rd | 65th | 83rd | 79th | 58th |
| Computer Science | Percentage URG, all Domestic Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 8\% | 7\% | 3\% | 11\% | 8\% | 3\% | 4\% | 18\% | 18\% | 20\% |
| Average of all schools | 9\% | 10\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 67/166 | 91/173 | 143/175 | 68/185 | 95/184 | 143/182 | 144/175 | 38/184 | 46/175 | 49/174 |
| Percentile | 60th | 47th | 18th | 63rd | 48th | 21st | 18th | 79th | 74th | 72nd |
| Average of comparators | 7\% | 8\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 10\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 7/23 | 11/22 | 20/21 | 6/22 | 8/22 | 18/21 | 18/22 | 3/21 | 4/21 | 3/21 |
| Percentile | 68th | 50th | 5th | 73rd | 64th | 14th | 18th | 86th | 81st | 86th |
| Electrical \& Computer Engineering | Percentage URG, all Domestic Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 5\% | 10\% | 8\% | 10\% | 10\% | 6\% | 10\% | 12\% | 10\% | 17\% |
| Average of all schools | 12\% | 12\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 168/227 | 107/227 | 145/231 | 138/231 | 141/232 | 182/232 | 146/227 | 129/229 | 131/219 | 75/215 |
| Percentile | 26th | 53rd | 37th | 40th | 39th | 22nd | 36th | 44th | 40th | 65th |
| Average of comparators | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 10\% | 13\% | 13\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 23/24 | 10/24 | 17/24 | 13/24 | 12/24 | 21/24 | 17/24 | 11/24 | 14/24 | 10/24 |
| Percentile | 4th | 58th | 29th | 46th | 50th | 13th | 29th | 54th | 42nd | 58th |
| Materials Science Engineering | Percentage URG, all Domestic Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 0\% | 3\% | 7\% | 21\% | 17\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| Average of all schools | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 61/85 | 53/86 | 46/87 | 14/90 | 18/94 | 36/96 | 35/98 | 38/95 | 40/96 | 40/96 |
| Percentile | 28th | 38th | 47th | 84th | 81st | 63rd | 64th | 60th | 58th | 58th |
| Average of comparators | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 8\% | 10\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 20/20 | 15/20 | 8/19 | 1/20 | 2/20 | 6/22 | 4/22 | 7/23 | 8/23 | 8/23 |
| Percentile | 0 | 25th | 58th | 95th | 90th | 73rd | 82nd | 70th | 65th | 65th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage URG, all Domestic Graduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 3\% | 4\% | 1\% | 11\% | 13\% | 12\% | 7\% | 3\% | 8\% | 4\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 153/212 | 155/217 | 190/219 | 94/221 | 87/221 | 98/222 | 151/217 | 184/219 | 140/210 | 183/209 |
| Percentile | 28th | 29th | 13th | 57th | 61st | 56th | 30th | 16th | 33rd | 12th |
| Average of comparators | 7\% | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 20/24 | 20/24 | 24/24 | 7/24 | 6/24 | 6/24 | 16/24 | 23/24 | 17/24 | 23/24 |
| Percentile | 17th | 17th | 0 | 71st | 75th | 75th | 33rd | 4th | 29th | 4th |

## 5. Undergraduate Student Data

### 5.1 Overview

Notes on undergraduate student data

- $\quad \mathrm{URG}=$ all non-White, Non-Asian students $+1 / 2$ of students indicating two or more races; determined from IPEDS Ethnicity
- $\%$ URG = Num. URG / All students
- Data for student was computed for each engineering program, not department: biomedical engineering, chemical engineering, civil engineering, computer science, computer engineering, electrical engineering, environmental engineering, mechanical engineering (see relationship between departments and programs in Appendix A).
- In using ASEE data for other universities for comparison,
- For Computer Science, all BA and BS programs were aggregated.
- For college-level data over time, for each school, we sum only students in the same departments/programs we have in UD COE.

Figure 22 presents the number of women, URG and total Undergraduate students at the College of Engineering over the last 10 years.


Figure 22. No. of Women, URG and All Undergraduate Students, COE, prior 10 years (2009-2018)

Figure 23 presents the number of women, URG and total Undergraduate students at the College of Engineering over the last 10 years.


Figure 23. \%. of Women, and URG Undergraduate Students, COE, prior 10 years (2009-2018)

### 5.2 Gender

Figure 24 summarizes the percentage of women among all Undergraduate students and all incoming Undergraduate students as of Fall 2018 at the program level for the College of Engineering, and the \% of graduating Women Undergraduate students for Academic Year 2017-18. Figure 25 shows the same data in absolute numbers.


Figure 24. \% of Women Undergraduate Students, All and New, by COE department, Fall 2018 and \% of graduating Women Undergraduate Students by department, Academic Year 17-18


Figure 25. No. of Women Undergraduate Students, All and New, by COE department, Fall 2018 and \% of graduating Women Undergraduate Students by department, Academic Year 17-18

Figure 26 illustrates the change by department in the number of Women Undergraduate students at the College of Engineering over the last 10 years.


Figure 26. No. of Women Undergraduate students, by COE department, prior 10 years (2009-2018)

Comparative data for Women Undergraduate students over the last 10 years for the COE and other ASEE-tracked institutions can be found in Table 5.

Table 5. \% Women Undergraduate Students for the COE, by program, over last 10 years (2008-2017)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 19\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 21\% | 22\% | 22\% | 24\% | 24\% | 25\% |
| Average of all schools | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 91/306 | 109/307 | 110/310 | 110/313 | 80/315 | 83/318 | 79/316 | 81/318 | 79/309 | 67/287 |
| Percentile | 70th | 64th | 65th | 65th | 75th | 74th | 75th | 75th | 74th | 77th |
| Average of comparators | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 22\% | 23\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 7/24 | 8/24 | 9/24 | 12/27 | 7/24 | 9/24 | 8/24 | 7/24 | 7/24 | 7/24 |
| Percentile | 71st | 67th | 63rd | 50th | 71st | 63rd | 67th | 71st | 71st | 71st |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | - | - | 43\% | 44\% | 49\% | 49\% | 53\% | 53\% |
| Average of all schools | 38\% | 38\% | 39\% | 40\% | 40\% | 41\% | 43\% | 44\% | 47\% | 48\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 33/118 | 41/115 | 23/120 | 31/125 | 26/130 | 33/132 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 72nd | 64th | 81st | 75th | 80th | 75th |
| Average of comparators | 38\% | 38\% | 39\% | 39\% | 40\% | 42\% | 43\% | 45\% | 47\% | 49\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 9/19 | 9/19 | 3/20 | 4/20 | 2/20 | 3/20 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 53rd | 53rd | 85th | 80th | 90th | 85th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 30\% | 28\% | 29\% | 27\% | 25\% | 26\% | 27\% | 28\% | 28\% | 27\% |
| Average of all schools | 33\% | 33\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 33\% | 33\% | 34\% | 35\% | 36\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 105/157 | 108/160 | 104/161 | 119/161 | 137/161 | 139/161 | 133/161 | 130/157 | 132/157 | 141/157 |
| Percentile | 33rd | 33rd | 35th | 26th | 15th | 14th | 17th | 17th | 16th | 10th |
| Average of comparators | 31\% | 30\% | 29\% | 30\% | 30\% | 31\% | 31\% | 32\% | 33\% | 35\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 12/23 | 17/23 | 14/23 | 17/23 | 18/23 | 20/23 | 19/23 | 18/23 | 21/23 | 23/23 |
| Percentile | 48th | 26th | 39th | 26th | 22nd | 13th | 17th | 22nd | 9th | 0 |
| Civil Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 19\% | 19\% | 18\% | 20\% | 19\% | 18\% | 19\% | 21\% | 24\% | 30\% |
| Average of all schools | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 23\% | 24\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 99/213 | 113/216 | 127/217 | 112/221 | 125/223 | 157/224 | 161/224 | 117/212 | 106/206 | 62/201 |
| Percentile | 54th | 48th | 41st | 49th | 44th | 30th | 28th | 45th | 49th | 69th |
| Average of comparators | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 23\% | 24\% | 25\% | 26\% | 27\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 9/21 | 11/21 | 11/21 | 9/21 | 14/21 | 17/22 | 18/22 | 14/22 | 12/22 | 8/22 |
| Percentile | 57th | 48th | 48th | 57th | 33rd | 23rd | 18th | 36th | 45th | 64th |
| Computer Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 6\% | 9\% | 7\% | 7\% | 9\% | 12\% | 6\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% |
| Average of all schools | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 141/174 | 102/177 | 124/179 | 139/181 | 110/183 | 73/188 | 160/183 | 137/187 | 130/181 | 158/184 |
| Percentile | 19th | 42nd | 31st | 23rd | 40th | 61st | 13th | 27th | 28th | 14th |
| Average of comparators | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 15/20 | 11/21 | 17/21 | 16/21 | 11/20 | 8/21 | 19/19 | 14/19 | 13/20 | 18/20 |
| Percentile | 25th | 48th | 19th | 24th | 45th | 62nd | 0 | 26th | 35th | 10th |
| Computer Science | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 7\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 10\% | 15\% | 18\% | 19\% | 22\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 168/206 | 147/215 | 133/213 | 150/224 | 140/221 | 169/222 | 73/219 | 62/224 | 66/224 | 53/218 |
| Percentile | 18th | 32nd | 38th | 33rd | 37th | 24th | 67th | 72nd | 71st | 76th |
| Average of comparators | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 16/21 | 14/23 | 10/22 | 18/23 | 14/22 | 21/22 | 9/23 | 6/22 | 5/23 | 5/23 |
| Percentile | 24th | 39th | 55th | 22nd | 36th | 5th | 61st | 73rd | 78th | 78th |
| Electrical Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 12\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 14\% | 14\% | 10\% | 13\% | 8\% | 8\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 90/252 | 131/250 | 130/252 | 110/257 | 67/261 | 74/262 | 158/257 | 102/247 | 224/243 | 215/234 |
| Percentile | 64th | 48th | 48th | 57th | 74th | 72nd | 39th | 59th | 8th | 8th |
| Average of comparators | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 5/22 | 13/22 | 11/22 | 11/22 | 5/22 | 9/22 | 18/22 | 13/21 | 21/21 | 20/21 |
| Percentile | 77th | 41st | 50th | 50th | 77th | 59th | 18th | 38th | 0 | 5th |
| Environmental Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 48\% | 45\% | 41\% | 50\% | 46\% | 46\% | 46\% | 50\% | 47\% | 50\% |
| Average of all schools | 41\% | 42\% | 42\% | 44\% | 43\% | 44\% | 47\% | 47\% | 49\% | 51\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 24/62 | 31/65 | 40/63 | 25/65 | 24/65 | 33/65 | 35/64 | 33/68 | 43/74 | 48/76 |
| Percentile | 61st | 52nd | 37th | 62nd | 63rd | 49th | 45th | 51st | 42nd | 37th |
| Average of comparators | 45\% | 44\% | 41\% | 46\% | 45\% | 48\% | 49\% | 52\% | 47\% | 50\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 2/5 | 3/6 | 3/6 | 2/7 | 2/7 | 5/8 | 5/8 | 5/9 | 7/12 | 7/12 |
| Percentile | 60th | 50th | 50th | 71st | 71st | 38th | 38th | 44th | 43rd | 42nd |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 15\% | 12\% | 12\% | 11\% | 13\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 21\% | 21\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 53/275 | 98/276 | 106/278 | 139/282 | 100/285 | 93/288 | 96/290 | 95/286 | 48/276 | 44/269 |
| Percentile | 81st | 64th | 62nd | 51st | 65th | 68th | 67th | 67th | 83rd | 80th |
| Average of comparators | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 5/24 | 8/24 | 9/24 | 14/24 | 13/24 | 8/24 | 7/24 | 11/24 | 6/24 | 5/24 |
| Percentile | 79th | 67th | 63rd | 42nd | 46th | 67th | 71st | 54th | 75th | 79th |

### 5.3 Underrepresented Status

Figure 27 summarizes the percentage of URG students among all Undergraduate students and all incoming Undergraduate students as of Fall 2018 at the department level for the College of Engineering, and the \% of graduating URG Undergraduate students for Academic Year 2017-18. Figure 28 shows the same data in absolute numbers.


Figure 27. \% of URG Undergraduate Students, All and New, by COE department, Fall 2018 and \% of graduating URG Undergraduate Students by department, Academic Year 17-18


Figure 28. No. of URG Undergraduate Students, All and New, by COE department, Fall 2018 and \% of graduating URG Undergraduate Students by department, Academic Year 17-18

Figure 29 illustrates the change by department in the number of URG Undergraduate students at the College of Engineering over the last 10 years.


Figure 29. No. of URG Undergraduate students, by COE department, prior 10 years (2009-2018)

Comparative data for URG Undergraduate students over the last 10 years for the COE and other ASEEtracked institutions can be found in Table 6.

Table 6. \% URG Undergraduate Students for the COE, by program, over last 10 years (2008-2017)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% |
| Average of all schools | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 163/306 | 165/307 | 182/310 | 224/313 | 187/315 | 176/318 | 169/316 | 178/318 | 192/309 | 179/287 |
| Percentile | 47th | 46th | 41st | 28th | 41st | 45th | 47th | 44th | 38th | 38th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 10/24 | 7/24 | 9/24 | 14/24 | 9/24 | 9/24 | 7/24 | 9/24 | 11/24 | 11/24 |
| Percentile | 58th | 71st | 63rd | 42nd | 63rd | 63rd | 71st | 63rd | 54th | 54th |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | - | - | 9\% | 9\% | 13\% | 9\% | 8\% | 9\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 80/116 | 87/115 | 62/120 | 103/126 | 113/130 | 109/132 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 31st | 24th | 48th | 18th | 13th | 17th |
| Average of comparators | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | 11/20 | 11/20 | 7/20 | 15/20 | 19/20 | 15/20 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | 45th | 45th | 65th | 25th | 5th | 25th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 4\% | 7\% | 6\% | 7\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 11\% |
| Average of all schools | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 128/157 | 112/160 | 121/161 | 119/161 | 89/161 | 87/161 | 92/160 | 107/157 | 107/157 | 97/157 |
| Percentile | 18th | 30th | 25th | 26th | 45th | 46th | 43rd | 32nd | 32nd | 38th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 8\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 23/23 | 14/23 | 17/23 | 17/23 | 6/23 | 7/23 | 10/23 | 13/23 | 13/23 | 11/23 |
| Percentile | 0 | 39th | 26th | 26th | 74th | 70th | 57th | 43rd | 43rd | 52nd |
| Civil Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 11\% | 11\% | 9\% | 7\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 11\% |
| Average of all schools | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 23\% | 22\% | 23\% | 24\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 91/213 | 101/216 | 126/217 | 166/222 | 135/223 | 137/224 | 133/224 | 133/212 | 125/206 | 143/201 |
| Percentile | 57th | 53rd | 42nd | 25th | 39th | 38th | 41st | 37th | 39th | 29th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 7/21 | 5/21 | 6/21 | 14/21 | 6/21 | 9/22 | 9/22 | 10/22 | 12/22 | 14/22 |
| Percentile | 67th | 76th | 71st | 33rd | 71st | 59th | 59th | 55th | 45th | 36th |
| Computer Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 9\% | 7\% | 9\% | 8\% | 16\% | 16\% | 18\% | 22\% | 22\% | 19\% |
| Average of all schools | 23\% | 24\% | 25\% | 25\% | 26\% | 23\% | 23\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 113/174 | 131/177 | 132/179 | 139/181 | 92/183 | 88/188 | 74/183 | 63/187 | 56/181 | 71/184 |
| Percentile | 35th | 26th | 26th | 23rd | 50th | 53rd | 60th | 66th | 69th | 61st |
| Average of comparators | 12\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 14/20 | 14/21 | 13/21 | 17/21 | 6/20 | 4/21 | 3/19 | 1/19 | 2/20 | 4/20 |
| Percentile | 30th | 33rd | 38th | 19th | 70th | 81st | 84th | 95th | 90th | 80th |
| Computer Science | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 7\% | 10\% | 12\% | 10\% | 12\% | 12\% | 14\% | 14\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| Average of all schools | 15\% | 15\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 18\% | 19\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 134/206 | 96/215 | 96/213 | 131/224 | 113/221 | 116/222 | 96/219 | 108/224 | 129/224 | 111/218 |
| Percentile | 35th | 55th | 55th | 42nd | 49th | 48th | 56th | 52nd | 42nd | 49th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 13/21 | 8/23 | 7/21 | 9/23 | 4/22 | 6/22 | 4/23 | 5/22 | 9/23 | 5/23 |
| Percentile | 38th | 65th | 67th | 61st | 82nd | 73rd | 83rd | 77th | 61st | 78th |
| Electrical Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 10\% | 13\% | 17\% | 14\% | 16\% | 15\% | 14\% |
| Average of all schools | 23\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 150/252 | 155/250 | 176/252 | 155/257 | 130/261 | 109/262 | 132/257 | 112/247 | 123/243 | 125/234 |
| Percentile | 40th | 38th | 30th | 40th | 50th | 58th | 49th | 55th | 49th | 47th |
| Average of comparators | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 11/22 | 13/22 | 17/22 | 13/22 | 6/22 | 4/22 | 8/22 | 7/21 | 6/21 | 7/21 |
| Percentile | 50th | 41st | 23rd | 41st | 73rd | 82nd | 64th | 67th | 71st | 67th |
| Environmental Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 12\% | 11\% | 11\% | 9\% | 8\% | 10\% | 9\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| Average of all schools | 16\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 21\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 24/62 | 25/65 | 27/63 | 42/65 | 43/65 | 41/65 | 46/64 | 40/68 | 45/74 | 50/76 |
| Percentile | 61st | 62nd | 57th | 35th | 34th | 37th | 28th | 41st | 39th | 34th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 10\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 2/5 | 2/6 | 2/6 | 3/7 | 3/7 | 5/8 | 6/8 | 4/9 | 6/12 | 6/12 |
| Percentile | 60th | 67th | 67th | 57th | 57th | 38th | 25th | 56th | 50th | 50th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage URG, all Domestic Grad Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 8\% | 8\% | 10\% | 11\% | 9\% | 9\% | 11\% |
| Average of all schools | 14\% | 14\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 119/275 | 127/276 | 129/278 | 179/282 | 195/285 | 176/288 | 171/290 | 194/286 | 198/276 | 171/269 |
| Percentile | 57th | 54th | 54th | 37th | 32nd | 39th | 41st | 32nd | 28th | 36th |
| Average of comparators | 7\% | 7\% | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 6/24 | 7/24 | 5/24 | 13/24 | 12/24 | 9/24 | 8/24 | 11/24 | 15/24 | 10/24 |
| Percentile | 75th | 71st | 79th | 46th | 50th | 63rd | 67th | 54th | 38th | 58th |

### 5.4 Retention

Figure 30 summarizes the 6-year graduation rates for Undergraduate students by program, for both majority and minority populations, in the Fall 2012 cohort. Graduation rates shown are for students who graduate in their original COE program (or who graduate within COE for the COE columns).


Figure 30. Retention rates, Fall 2012 cohort, quantified by 6-year graduation rates, for all COE undergraduate programs

## Appendix A - Definitions

## University of Delaware Comparator Institutions (as of September 2016)

1. Boston University
2. Case Western Reserve University
3. Georgia Institute of Technology - Main Campus
4. Indiana University - Bloomington
5. Iowa State University
6. Michigan State University
7. North Carolina State University at Raleigh
8. Ohio State University - Main Campus
9. Pennsylvania State University - Main Campus
10. Purdue University - Main Campus
11. Rutgers University - New Brunswick
12. Stony Brook University
13. Texas A\&M University - College Station
14. University of Arizona
15. University of Connecticut
16. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
17. University of Maryland - College Park
18. University of Massachusetts - Amherst
19. University of Michigan - Ann Arbor
20. University of Minnesota - Twin Cities
21. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
22. University of Pittsburgh
23. University of Utah
24. University of Virginia - Main Campus
25. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

## Departments and undergraduate programs

COE $=$ College of Engineering

|  | Department | Undergraduate program(s) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BMEG | Biomedical engineering | Biomedical engineering |
| CHEG | Chemical and biomolecular engineering | Chemical engineering |

[^0]Staff Job Types
Table A1. Job titles included in each job type

| Job type | Jobs included |
| :--- | :--- |
| Administrative support | Human resources staff, department support staff (administrative assistants, <br> academic advisors, business administrators), sponsored research and <br> procurement staff, outreach, Dean's support staff, financial services, <br> academic affairs, communications |
| Technical support | Facilities, lab coordinators, core facilities (machine shops, electronics), <br> information technology |
| Research staff | Lab and center researchers (Engineers), post-doctoral researchers, limited- <br> term researchers |

## Appendix B - Raw Data, Fall 2018, for Faculty, Staff \& Students

Table B1. Fall 2018 Faculty by department, type/rank and gender

|  | Continuing Track |  | TT/T Assistant Professor |  | TT/T Associate Professor |  | TT/T Full Professor |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dept | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Total |
| BMEG | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| CHEG | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 25 |
| CIEG | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 2 | 23 | 8 | 31 |
| CISC | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 19 | 8 | 27 |
| ELEG | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 22 | 4 | 26 |
| MSEG | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 19 |
| MEEG | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 23 | 4 | 27 |
| Total | 15 | 8 | 22 | 8 | 22 | 9 | 69 | 12 | 128 | 37 | 165 |

Table B2. Fall 2018 Faculty by department, type/rank and race

|  | Continuing Track |  |  |  | TT/T Assistant Professor |  |  |  | TT/T Associate Professor |  |  |  | TT/T Full Professor |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dept | White | Asian | N/A | URG | White | Asian | N/A | URG | White | Asian | N/A | URG | White | Asian | N/A | URG | White | Asian | N/A | URG | Total |
| BMEG | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| CHEG | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 25 |
| CIEG | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 31 |
| CISC | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 27 |
| ELEG | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 26 |
| MSEG | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 19 |
| MEEG | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 27 |
| Total | 18 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 18 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 49 | 26 | 1 | 5 | 99 | 44 | 10 | 12 | 165 |

Table B3. Fall 2018 COE Staff by job type, gender and race

|  |  | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ <br> Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'1 | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Admin Support | Total | 4 | 13 |  |  |  | 1 | 76 | 94 |
|  | Female | 3 | 11 |  |  |  | 1 | 69 | 84 |
|  | Male | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 10 |
| Tech Support | Total | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 30 | 39 |
|  | Female |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 6 | 8 |
|  | Male | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 24 | 31 |
| Research | Total | 20 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 25 | 47 |
|  | Female | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 7 |
|  | Male | 16 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 22 | 40 |
|  | Grand Total | 26 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 131 | 180 |

Table B4. Fall 2018 COE administrative and technical staff (no research staff) by managerial role, gender and race

|  |  | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ Latino | Multi Ethnic | Int'I | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Managerial | Total | 3 | 4 |  |  | 1 |  | 30 | 38 |
|  | Female | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 18 | 21 |
|  | Male | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  | 12 | 17 |
| Non managerial | Total | 3 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 76 | 95 |
|  | Female | 1 | 10 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 57 | 71 |
|  | Male | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 19 | 24 |
|  | Grand Total | 6 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 106 | 133 |

Table B5. All Fall 2018 COE Graduate Students by department, gender and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BMEG | Total | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 27 | 45 |
|  | Female | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 21 |
|  | Male | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 13 | 24 |
| CHEG | Total | 0 | 21 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 51 | 2 | 70 | 153 |
|  | Female | 0 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 26 | 53 |
|  | Male | 0 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 39 | 1 | 44 | 100 |
| CIEG | Total | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 38 | 109 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 14 | 41 |
|  | Male | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 24 | 68 |
| CISC | Total | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 114 | 0 | 28 | 155 |
|  | Female | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 9 | 48 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 81 | 0 | 19 | 107 |
| ELEG | Total | 1 | 11 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 118 | 4 | 85 | 242 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 1 | 8 | 38 |
|  | Male | 1 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 96 | 3 | 77 | 204 |
| MSEG | Total | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 52 | 1 | 36 | 102 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 30 |
|  | Male | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 33 | 1 | 26 | 72 |
| MEEG | Total | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 70 | 2 | 30 | 109 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 18 |
|  | Male | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 59 | 2 | 25 | 91 |
|  | Grand Total | 2 | 50 | 28 | 23 | 14 | 474 | 10 | 314 | 915 |

Table B6. New Fall 2018 COE Graduate Students by department, gender and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BMEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| CHEG | Total | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 31 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 |
|  | Male | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 21 |
| CIEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 23 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 10 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 13 |
| CISC | Total | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 6 | 28 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 4 | 24 |
| ELEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 9 | 35 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 9 | 31 |
| MSEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 6 | 22 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| MEEG | Total | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 12 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
|  | Grand Total | 0 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 76 | 0 | 61 | 158 |

Table B7. AY 2017-18 graduating COE Graduate Students by department, gender and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ <br> Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ <br> Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'1 | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BMEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | I | 1 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| CHEG | Total | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 21 | 41 |
|  | Female | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 14 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 14 | 27 |
| CIEG | Total | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 11 | 32 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 20 |
| CISC | Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 4 | 40 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 4 | 30 |
| ELEG | Total | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 54 | 0 | 25 | 83 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 14 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 42 | 0 | 23 | 69 |
| MSEG | Total | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 18 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 15 |
| MEEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 24 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 20 |
|  | Grand Total | 0 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 136 |  | 81 | 242 |

Table B8. All Fall 2018 COE Undergraduate Students by department, gender and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biomedical | Total | 2 | 28 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 170 | 240 |
|  | Female | 2 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 99 | 136 |
|  | Male | 0 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 71 | 104 |
| Chemical | Total | 0 | 41 | 11 | 22 | 16 | 50 | 9 | 254 | 403 |
|  | Female | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 63 | 100 |
|  | Male | 0 | 34 | 5 | 18 | 10 | 37 | 8 | 191 | 303 |
| Civil | Total | 1 | 11 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 212 | 263 |
|  | Female | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 66 | 84 |
|  | Male | 0 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 146 | 179 |
| Comp Eng | Total | 1 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 110 | 172 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 18 |
|  | Male | 1 | 14 | 9 | 11 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 102 | 154 |
| Comp Sci | Total | 0 | 58 | 19 | 27 | 11 | 48 | 5 | 190 | 358 |
|  | Female | 0 | 17 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 36 | 78 |
|  | Male | 0 | 41 | 13 | 23 | 8 | 36 | 5 | 154 | 280 |
| Electrical | Total | 1 | 19 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 19 | 3 | 103 | 172 |
|  | Female | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 20 |
|  | Male | 1 | 15 | 9 | 12 | 4 | 17 | 2 | 92 | 152 |
| Environmental | Total | 0 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 75 | 107 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 41 | 60 |
|  | Male | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 34 | 47 |
| Mechanical | Total | 0 | 35 | 20 | 38 | 12 | 28 | 14 | 395 | 542 |
|  | Female | 0 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 83 | 109 |
|  | Male | 0 | 29 | 12 | 33 | 10 | 23 | 14 | 312 | 433 |
|  | Grand Total | 5 | 212 | 89 | 153 | 65 | 176 | 48 | 1,509 | 2,257 |

Table B9. New Fall 2018 COE Undergraduate Students by department, gender and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ <br> Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biomedical | Total | 1 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 69 | 101 |
|  | Female | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 42 | 60 |
|  | Male | 0 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 41 |
| Chemical | Total | 0 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 17 | 5 | 69 | 122 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 36 |
|  | Male | 0 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 13 | 5 | 47 | 86 |
| Civil | Total | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 40 | 48 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 14 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 34 |
| Comp Eng | Total | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 24 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 19 |
| Comp Sci | Total | 0 | 16 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 53 | 94 |
|  | Female | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 22 |
|  | Male | 0 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 40 | 72 |
| Electrical | Total | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 26 | 39 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
|  | Male | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 34 |
| Environmental | Total | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 25 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 14 |
| Mechanical | Total | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 87 | 109 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 15 |
|  | Male | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 73 | 94 |
|  | Grand Total | 1 | 52 | 30 | 35 | 19 | 31 | 20 | 374 | 562 |

Table B10. AY 2017-18 graduating COE Undergraduate Students by department, gender and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biomedical | Total | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 37 | 53 |
|  | Female | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 22 |
|  | Male | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 20 | 31 |
| Chemical | Total | 0 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 63 | 90 |
|  | Female | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 31 |
|  | Male | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 45 | 59 |
| Civil | Total | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 56 | 68 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 22 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 46 |
| Comp Eng | Total | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 25 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Male | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 24 |
| Comp Sci | Total | 0 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 56 | 92 |
|  | Female | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 16 |
|  | Male | 0 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 51 | 76 |
| Electrical | Total | 0 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 34 | 56 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Male | 0 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 32 | 52 |
| Environmental | Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 21 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 11 |
| Mechanical | Total | 0 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 108 | 139 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 26 |
|  | Male | 0 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 90 | 113 |
|  | Grand Total | 0 | 45 | 19 | 35 | 22 | 35 | 3 | 385 | 544 |

## Appendix C - Raw Data, Historical, for Faculty, Staff \& Students

Table C1. 10 Year (2009-2018) COE Undergraduate Students by department, gender and URG status

|  |  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COE | Women | 285 | 304 | 329 | 443 | 491 | 500 | 542 | 550 | 581 | 605 |
|  | Men | 1,319 | 1,388 | 1,465 | 1,674 | 1,757 | 1,758 | 1,760 | 1,700 | 1,706 | 1,652 |
|  | URG | 146 | 160 | 146 | 217 | 251 | 270 | 271 | 258 | 278 | 294 |
|  | Non-URG | 1,458 | 1,532 | 1,648 | 1,900 | 1,997 | 1,988 | 2,031 | 1,993 | 2,009 | 1,963 |
|  | Total | 1,604 | 1,692 | 1,794 | 2,117 | 2,248 | 2,258 | 2,302 | 2,250 | 2,287 | 2,257 |
| Biomedical | Women |  |  |  | 65 | 90 | 103 | 108 | 105 | 109 | 136 |
|  | Men |  |  |  | 86 | 116 | 106 | 112 | 94 | 98 | 104 |
|  | URG |  |  |  | 14 | 19 | 27 | 20 | 16 | 19 | 29 |
|  | Non-URG |  |  |  | 137 | 187 | 182 | 200 | 183 | 188 | 211 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 151 | 206 | 209 | 220 | 199 | 207 | 240 |
| Chemical | Women | 87 | 104 | 106 | 105 | 115 | 125 | 119 | 115 | 117 | 100 |
|  | Men | 220 | 251 | 289 | 323 | 330 | 340 | 307 | 298 | 312 | 303 |
|  | URG | 20 | 22 | 27 | 44 | 46 | 47 | 39 | 38 | 48 | 39 |
|  | Non-URG | 287 | 333 | 368 | 384 | 399 | 418 | 387 | 375 | 381 | 364 |
|  | Total | 307 | 355 | 395 | 428 | 445 | 465 | 426 | 413 | 429 | 403 |
| Civil | Women | 59 | 60 | 71 | 74 | 71 | 71 | 79 | 75 | 86 | 84 |
|  | Men | 258 | 274 | 285 | 316 | 333 | 312 | 291 | 237 | 200 | 179 |
|  | URG | 34 | 32 | 26 | 42 | 45 | 45 | 44 | 40 | 32 | 30 |
|  | Non-URG | 283 | 302 | 330 | 348 | 359 | 338 | 326 | 272 | 254 | 233 |
|  | Total | 317 | 334 | 356 | 390 | 404 | 383 | 370 | 312 | 286 | 263 |
| Computer Engineering | Women | 8 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 7 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 18 |
|  | Men | 83 | 76 | 82 | 94 | 115 | 119 | 129 | 143 | 173 | 154 |
|  | URG | 6 | 7 | 7 | 16 | 21 | 23 | 31 | 34 | 35 | 30 |
|  | Non-URG | 85 | 75 | 81 | 87 | 109 | 103 | 110 | 124 | 153 | 142 |
|  | Total | 91 | 82 | 88 | 103 | 130 | 126 | 141 | 158 | 188 | 172 |
| Computer Science | Women | 18 | 18 | 22 | 27 | 24 | 42 | 50 | 52 | 68 | 78 |
|  | Men | 173 | 161 | 201 | 218 | 227 | 237 | 226 | 221 | 245 | 280 |
|  | URG | 20 | 22 | 22 | 29 | 30 | 38 | 38 | 32 | 42 | 55 |
|  | Non-URG | 171 | 157 | 201 | 216 | 221 | 241 | 238 | 241 | 271 | 303 |
|  | Total | 191 | 179 | 223 | 245 | 251 | 279 | 276 | 273 | 313 | 358 |
| Electrical | Women | 15 | 15 | 19 | 24 | 24 | 21 | 29 | 18 | 16 | 20 |
|  | Men | 130 | 124 | 144 | 145 | 150 | 184 | 190 | 215 | 182 | 152 |
|  | URG | 12 | 11 | 17 | 23 | 29 | 29 | 35 | 34 | 29 | 27 |
|  | Non-URG | 133 | 128 | 146 | 147 | 145 | 176 | 184 | 199 | 170 | 145 |
|  | Total | 145 | 139 | 163 | 169 | 174 | 205 | 219 | 233 | 198 | 172 |
| Environmenta I | Women | 41 | 38 | 54 | 77 | 87 | 65 | 65 | 56 | 54 | 60 |
|  | Men | 50 | 55 | 55 | 90 | 104 | 76 | 66 | 63 | 55 | 47 |
|  | URG | 10 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 19 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 17 |
|  | Non-URG | 81 | 83 | 99 | 154 | 172 | 128 | 114 | 105 | 96 | 90 |
|  | Total | 91 | 93 | 109 | 167 | 191 | 141 | 131 | 119 | 109 | 107 |
| Mechanical | Women | 57 | 63 | 51 | 62 | 65 | 66 | 80 | 114 | 116 | 109 |
|  | Men | 405 | 447 | 409 | 402 | 382 | 384 | 439 | 429 | 441 | 433 |
|  | URG | 44 | 58 | 39 | 38 | 45 | 49 | 49 | 48 | 62 | 67 |
|  | Non-URG | 418 | 452 | 421 | 426 | 402 | 401 | 470 | 495 | 495 | 475 |
|  | Total | 462 | 510 | 460 | 464 | 447 | 450 | 519 | 543 | 557 | 542 |

Table C2. 10 Year (2009-2018) COE Graduate Students by department, gender and URG status

|  |  |  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COE | Domestic | Women | 87 | 68 | 68 | 70 | 89 | 82 | 95 | 104 | 116 | 125 |
|  |  | Men | 230 | 219 | 256 | 272 | 271 | 264 | 255 | 305 | 334 | 318 |
|  |  | URG | 17 | 17 | 30 | 33 | 40 | 38 | 46 | 50 | 63 | 60 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 300 | 270 | 294 | 309 | 320 | 308 | 304 | 359 | 387 | 383 |
|  | Not domestic | Women | 102 | 114 | 112 | 131 | 127 | 117 | 126 | 123 | 125 | 124 |
|  |  | Men | 270 | 303 | 274 | 305 | 316 | 311 | 349 | 360 | 368 | 350 |
|  | All | Women | 189 | 182 | 180 | 201 | 216 | 199 | 221 | 227 | 241 | 249 |
|  |  | Men | 500 | 522 | 530 | 577 | 587 | 575 | 604 | 665 | 702 | 668 |
|  |  | Domestic | 317 | 287 | 324 | 342 | 360 | 346 | 350 | 409 | 450 | 443 |
|  |  | Not domestic | 372 | 417 | 386 | 436 | 443 | 428 | 475 | 483 | 493 | 474 |
|  |  | Total | 689 | 704 | 710 | 778 | 803 | 774 | 825 | 892 | 943 | 917 |
| Biomedical | Domestic | Women |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 15 | 17 | 20 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 4 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 18 | 21 | 19 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 33 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  | 3 | 9 | 11 | 18 | 28 | 33 | 6 |
|  | Not domestic | Women |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
|  | All | Women |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 15 | 18 | 21 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 6 | 10 | 11 | 17 | 23 | 26 | 24 |
|  |  | Domestic |  |  |  | 4 | 12 | 15 | 22 | 33 | 38 | 39 |
|  |  | Not domestic |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 6 | 15 | 18 | 27 | 38 | 44 | 45 |
| Chemical | Domestic | Women | 30 | 25 | 28 | 28 | 39 | 39 | 43 | 45 | 38 | 41 |
|  |  | Men | 55 | 59 | 73 | 75 | 71 | 76 | 78 | 63 | 62 | 61 |
|  |  | URG | 4 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 7 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 81 | 78 | 97 | 96 | 98 | 102 | 109 | 98 | 91 | 95 |
|  | Not domestic | Women | 8 | 5 | 15 | 18 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 12 |
|  |  | Men | 30 | 29 | 26 | 26 | 21 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 35 | 39 |
|  | All | Women | 38 | 30 | 43 | 46 | 55 | 51 | 59 | 55 | 48 | 53 |
|  |  | Men | 85 | 88 | 99 | 101 | 92 | 100 | 101 | 87 | 97 | 100 |
|  |  | Domestic | 85 | 84 | 101 | 103 | 110 | 115 | 121 | 108 | 100 | 102 |
|  |  | Not domestic | 38 | 34 | 41 | 44 | 37 | 36 | 39 | 34 | 45 | 51 |
|  |  | Total | 123 | 118 | 142 | 147 | 147 | 151 | 160 | 142 | 145 | 153 |
|  <br> Environ. | Domestic | Women | 13 | 17 | 17 | 23 | 22 | 16 | 17 | 9 | 10 | 15 |
|  |  | Men | 43 | 34 | 38 | 48 | 46 | 30 | 33 | 32 | 29 | 31 |
|  |  | URG | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 5 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 54 | 48 | 50 | 65 | 57 | 39 | 40 | 34 | 33 | 41 |
|  | Not domestic | Women | 18 | 32 | 22 | 30 | 31 | 22 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 26 |
|  |  | Men | 37 | 73 | 37 | 51 | 60 | 50 | 47 | 49 | 42 | 37 |
|  | All | Women | 31 | 49 | 39 | 53 | 53 | 38 | 40 | 30 | 31 | 41 |
|  |  | Men | 80 | 107 | 75 | 99 | 106 | 80 | 80 | 81 | 71 | 68 |
|  |  | Domestic | 56 | 51 | 55 | 71 | 68 | 46 | 50 | 41 | 39 | 46 |
|  |  | Not domestic | 55 | 105 | 59 | 81 | 91 | 72 | 70 | 70 | 63 | 63 |
|  |  | Total | 111 | 156 | 114 | 152 | 159 | 118 | 120 | 111 | 102 | 109 |
| Computer Science | Domestic | Women | 5 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 15 |
|  |  | Men | 22 | 29 | 34 | 31 | 29 | 26 | 25 | 27 | 25 | 26 |
|  |  | URG | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 25 | 32 | 37 | 33 | 30 | 27 | 27 | 31 | 33 | 31 |
|  | Not | Women | 28 | 26 | 26 | 27 | 27 | 32 | 35 | 32 | 35 | 33 |
|  | domestic | Men | 63 | 60 | 66 | 73 | 81 | 85 | 83 | 78 | 87 | 81 |
|  | All | Women | 33 | 30 | 33 | 32 | 29 | 34 | 43 | 43 | 51 | 48 |
|  |  | Men | 85 | 89 | 100 | 104 | 110 | 111 | 108 | 105 | 112 | 107 |
|  |  | Domestic | 27 | 33 | 41 | 36 | 31 | 28 | 33 | 38 | 41 | 41 |
|  |  | Not domestic | 91 | 86 | 92 | 100 | 108 | 117 | 118 | 110 | 122 | 114 |
|  |  | Total | 118 | 119 | 133 | 136 | 139 | 145 | 151 | 148 | 163 | 155 |

Table C2. 10 Year (2009-2018) COE Graduate Students by department, gender and URG status (cont.)

|  |  |  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electrical \& Computer | Domestic | Women | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 18 | 16 |
|  |  | Men | 45 | 48 | 59 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 60 | 107 | 133 | 109 |
|  |  | URG | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 26 | 24 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 46 | 49 | 57 | 55 | 64 | 66 | 58 | 104 | 125 | 101 |
|  | Not domestic | Women | 16 | 17 | 16 | 26 | 28 | 25 | 28 | 35 | 31 | 22 |
|  |  | Men | 73 | 67 | 60 | 75 | 73 | 77 | 124 | 131 | 116 | 96 |
|  | All | Women | 22 | 22 | 20 | 31 | 35 | 32 | 34 | 44 | 49 | 38 |
|  |  | Men | 118 | 115 | 119 | 131 | 134 | 143 | 184 | 238 | 249 | 205 |
|  |  | Domestic | 51 | 53 | 63 | 61 | 68 | 73 | 66 | 116 | 151 | 125 |
|  |  | Not domestic | 89 | 84 | 76 | 101 | 101 | 102 | 152 | 166 | 147 | 118 |
|  |  | Total | 140 | 137 | 139 | 162 | 169 | 175 | 218 | 282 | 298 | 243 |
| Materials Science | Domestic | Women | 12 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 11 |
|  |  | Men | 18 | 18 | 25 | 27 | 24 | 26 | 24 | 35 | 35 | 40 |
|  |  | URG | 1 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 6 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 29 | 27 | 25 | 27 | 26 | 28 | 25 | 37 | 39 | 45 |
|  | Not domestic | Women | 16 | 24 | 20 | 17 | 16 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 17 | 19 |
|  |  | Men | 23 | 28 | 27 | 29 | 33 | 26 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 33 |
|  | All | Women | 28 | 35 | 26 | 22 | 21 | 27 | 26 | 28 | 28 | 30 |
|  |  | Men | 41 | 46 | 52 | 56 | 57 | 52 | 45 | 56 | 59 | 73 |
|  |  | Domestic | 30 | 29 | 31 | 32 | 29 | 32 | 29 | 43 | 46 | 51 |
|  |  | Not domestic | 39 | 52 | 47 | 46 | 49 | 47 | 42 | 41 | 41 | 52 |
|  |  | Total | 69 | 81 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 71 | 84 | 87 | 103 |
| Mechanical | Domestic | Women | 21 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 |
|  |  | Men | 47 | 31 | 27 | 31 | 33 | 32 | 23 | 23 | 29 | 32 |
|  |  | URG | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 65 | 37 | 30 | 31 | 37 | 35 | 28 | 28 | 34 | 37 |
|  | Not domestic | Women | 16 | 10 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 11 |
|  |  | Men | 44 | 46 | 58 | 49 | 45 | 46 | 46 | 52 | 59 | 59 |
|  | All | Women | 37 | 16 | 19 | 17 | 18 | 10 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 18 |
|  |  | Men | 91 | 77 | 85 | 80 | 78 | 78 | 69 | 75 | 88 | 91 |
|  |  | Domestic | 68 | 37 | 33 | 35 | 42 | 37 | 29 | 30 | 35 | 39 |
|  |  | Not domestic | 60 | 56 | 71 | 62 | 54 | 51 | 49 | 57 | 69 | 70 |
|  |  | Total | 128 | 93 | 104 | 97 | 96 | 88 | 78 | 87 | 104 | 109 |

Table C3. 10 Year (2009-2018) COE Faculty by department, type, gender and URG status

|  |  |  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COE | CT | Women |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 15 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 22 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 17 | 20 | 23 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 26 | 28 | 29 |
|  |  | Men | 108 | 113 | 108 | 110 | 107 | 106 | 103 | 101 | 104 | 113 |
|  |  | URG | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 11 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 117 | 125 | 124 | 126 | 120 | 120 | 119 | 119 | 124 | 131 |
|  | All | Women | 17 | 20 | 23 | 23 | 21 | 24 | 28 | 32 | 36 | 37 |
|  |  | Men | 108 | 113 | 108 | 110 | 107 | 111 | 109 | 109 | 114 | 128 |
|  |  | URG | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 12 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 117 | 125 | 124 | 126 | 120 | 128 | 129 | 133 | 142 | 153 |
|  |  | Total | 125 | 133 | 131 | 133 | 128 | 135 | 137 | 141 | 150 | 165 |
| Biomedical | CT | Women |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
|  | T/TT | Women |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
|  | All | Women |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| Chemical | CT | Women |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | Men | 18 | 21 | 23 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 19 |
|  |  | URG | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 18 | 22 | 25 | 23 | 21 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 21 |
|  | All | Women | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 18 | 21 | 23 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 20 |
|  |  | URG | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 18 | 22 | 25 | 23 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 23 |
|  |  | Total | 21 | 25 | 28 | 26 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 25 |
|  <br> Environ. | CT | Women |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  |  | Men | 21 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 19 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 19 |
|  |  | URG | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 21 | 19 | 18 | 21 | 22 |
|  | All | Women | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
|  |  | Men | 21 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 20 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 23 |
|  |  | URG | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 28 |
|  |  | Total | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 27 | 31 |

[^1]Table C3. 10 Year (2009-2018) COE Faculty by department, type, gender and URG status (cont.)

|  |  |  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Computer science | CT | Women |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
|  |  | Men | 17 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 |
|  |  | URG | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 21 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 20 |
|  | All | Women | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 |
|  |  | Men | 17 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 19 |
|  |  | URG | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 21 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 26 |
|  |  | Total | 22 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 27 |
| Electrical \& Computer | CT | Women |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | Men | 24 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 16 | 16 | 19 |
|  |  | URG | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 22 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 21 |
|  | All | Women | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | Men | 24 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 22 |
|  |  | URG | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 22 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 24 |
|  |  | Total | 25 | 25 | 23 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 26 |
| Materials Science | CT | Women |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  | Men | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|  |  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
|  | All | Women | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  | Men | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 15 |
|  |  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|  |  | Total | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 19 |
| Mechanical | CT | Women |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Non-URG |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Men | 17 | 20 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 22 |
|  |  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 20 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 23 |
|  | All | Women | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
|  |  | Men | 17 | 20 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 23 |
|  |  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | Non-URG | 20 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 25 | 26 |
|  |  | Total | 20 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 25 | 27 |

Data are not available for shaded cells

Table C4. Fall 2017 \& Fall 2018 COE Staff by job type, managerial role, gender and URG status

|  |  | 2017 | 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COE | Women | 93 | 99 |
|  | Men | 57 | 81 |
|  | URG | 15 | 18 |
|  | Non-URG | 135 | 162 |
|  | Total | 150 | 180 |
| Admin support | Women | 82 | 84 |
|  | Men | 12 | 10 |
|  | URG | 12 | 13 |
|  | Non-URG | 82 | 81 |
|  | Total | 94 | 94 |
| Tech support | Women | 7 | 8 |
|  | Men | 28 | 31 |
|  | URG | 3 | 4 |
|  | Non-URG | 32 | 35 |
|  | Total | 35 | 39 |
| Research | Women | 4 | 7 |
|  | Men | 17 | 40 |
|  | URG | 0 | 1 |
|  | Non-URG | 21 | 46 |
|  | Total | 21 | 47 |
| Managerial | Women | 21 | 21 |
|  | Men | 15 | 17 |
|  | URG | 3 | 4 |
|  | Non-URG | 33 | 34 |
|  | Total | 36 | 38 |
| Nonmanagerial | Women | 68 | 71 |
|  | Men | 25 | 24 |
|  | URG | 12 | 13 |
|  | Non-URG | 81 | 82 |
|  | Total | 93 | 95 |


[^0]:    Note: Construction Management was added as new Undergraduate program in 2018 and is not reflected in the report metrics owing to low number of students initially enrolled. Figures for all undergraduate computer science programs (BA and BS) have been combined into one due to low numbers of students in two of the three programs.

[^1]:    Data are not available for shaded cells

