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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. 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 | $25 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| URG | $10 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $3 \%$ |

Graduate students (incoming)

|  | Target | COE | BMEG | CHEG | CIEG | CISC | ELEG | MSEG | MEEG |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Women | $33 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| URG (domestic) | $25 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

Undergraduate students (incoming)

|  | Target | COE | Biomed | Chem | Civil | Comp Eng | Comp Sci | Const Mgmt | Elec | Env | Mat Sci | Mech | Undecl |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Women | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| URG | $15 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $21 \%$ |

Staff

|  | Target | COE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Women on technical staff | $30 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Men on administrative staff | $20 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| URG on all staff | $20 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

## Highlights

## Faculty

Gender

- College is just short of target at $24 \%$, unchanged from prior year. (Fig. 3)
- 3 of 7 departments are meeting the $25 \%$ target while 2 others are at $24 \%$. (Fig. 4)
- The College is in the top $24^{\text {th }}$ percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women T/TT faculty, up from a year earlier (Table 1)
- Two departments (BMEG and CISC) are in the top $20^{\text {th }}$ percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women T/TT faculty. (Table 1)
- ELEG is the only department without a women full professor (Fig. 5)
- All departments have at least four women faculty (Fig. 6)

URG

- The College has remained at 7\% URG faculty over the last 3 years. (Fig. 3)
- 2 of 7 departments met the $10 \%$ target (CHEG and MSEG). (Fig. 7)
- BMEG and CISC have no URG faculty. (Fig. 8)
- The College is in the top $26^{\text {th }}$ percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of URG TT/T faculty. (Table 2)
- Four departments (CHEG, CIEG, ELEG and MSEG) are in the top $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile of all U.S colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of URG TT/T faculty. (Table 2)
- All but one URG faculty in the College are tenured or tenure-track. (Fig. 8)


## Staff

- The percentage of men in administrative support is trending downward. (Fig. 10)
- The percentage of women on the College staff increased ( $52 \%$ to $55 \%$ ) from last year; the percentage of women in managerial roles stayed flat (Fig. 10,11)
- The percentage of URG College staff is at $11 \%$, up slightly from prior year but still short of 20\% target. (Fig.12)


## Graduate students

## Gender

- The percentage of all graduate students who are women grew 2 points ( $27 \%$ to $29 \%$ ) from last year. (Fig. 15)
- Women comprised $35 \%$ of incoming graduate students, exceeding the $33 \%$ target. (Fig. 16)
- 3 of 7 departments met the $33 \%$ target for incoming students (BMEG, CIEG, and MSEG) while 3 others fell just short. (Fig. 16)
- The College is in the 61st percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women graduate students, down 5 points from prior year (Table 3).
- MEEG and MSEG are in the top third percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women graduate students (Table 3).


## Graduate students (cont.)

URG

- The \% of URG domestic graduate students in the College has declined over the last 3 years (Fig. 15).
- The \% of incoming URG domestic graduate students for the College (12\%) was less than half of the $25 \%$ target (Fig. 19)
- 3 of 7 departments had no incoming URG domestic graduate students (BMEG, CHEG and MEEG) (Fig. 19).
- The College is in now in the bottom half of all U.S. engineering colleges in terms of $\%$ of URG domestic graduate students (Table 4)


## Undergraduate students

Gender

- The \% of women undergraduate students in the College reached a 10 -year high of $28 \%$ (Fig. 23)
- The College met the $30 \%$ target for incoming women undergraduate students in 2020 (Fig. 24)
- 5 of 11 programs met or exceeded the $30 \%$ target for incoming women undergraduate students (Fig. 24)
- The College is in the top quarter percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women undergraduates (Table 5)
- 4 departments (BMEG, CIEG, CISC, and MSEG) are in the top third percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women undergraduate students (Table 5)
- Chemical Engineering again finished in the bottom $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile of all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of women undergraduate students (Table 5)
- The most recent six-year graduation rate within original major for women in the College is $65 \%$, compared to $58 \%$ for majority students (Fig. 30)

URG

- The percentage of undergraduate URG students in the College grew 2 points ( $13 \%$ to $15 \%$ ) from the prior year, the highest percentage seen over the last 10 years. (Fig. 23)
- The College exceeded the $15 \%$ target for incoming undergraduate URG students in 2020 (Fig. 27)
- 8 of 11 programs met or exceeded the $15 \%$ target for incoming URG undergraduate students, compared to only 4 programs last year. (Fig. 27)
- The College remains below the median among all U.S. colleges of engineering in terms of percentage of undergraduate URG students. (Table 6)
- The most recent six-year graduation rate within original major for undergraduate URG students in the College is $59 \%$, compared to $58 \%$ 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 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 for each department and for the College as a whole | Disparities (racial, gender) for the College as a whole | Climate |
| Faculty | 25\% women 10\% URGs | - No disparities in retention rates <br> - Continuous improvement towards no disparities in T/TT vs. CT, and in distribution across ranks | Inclusive, supportive |
| Graduate students | Among incoming students: <br> 33\% women <br> 25\% URGs (among domestic) | No disparities in retention rates | Inclusive, supportive |
| Undergraduate students | Among incoming students: 30\% women 15\% URGs | No disparities in 6-year graduation rates ( $70 \%$ for all) | Inclusive, supportive |
| Staff | $30 \%$ women on technical staff $20 \%$ URGs on all staff 20\% men on administrative staff | Continuous improvement towards no disparities in managerial vs. nonmanagerial | Inclusive, supportive |

*T/TT = Tenured/tenure-track. 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 third 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 2020 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 (2016-2020)

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


Figure 3. \% of women and URG faculty, COE, prior 5 years (2016-2020)

### 2.2 Gender

Figure 4 summarizes the percentage of women faculty in the College of Engineering as of Fall 2020 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. \% of Women T/TT and CT faculty by department and for the COE, by job rank and type, Fall 2020


Figure 5. No. of women T/TT and CT faculty by department and for the COE, by job rank and type, Fall 2020

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 (2016-2020)

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. \% of women faculty for the COE, by department, T/TT only, prior 10 years (2010-2019)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 15\% | 18\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 23\% |
| Average of all schools | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 100/301 | 67/306 | 65/307 | 97/309 | 112/306 | 68/313 | 70/313 | 77/288 | 84/288 | 61/259 |
| Percentile | 67th | 78th | 79th | 69th | 63rd | 78th | 78th | 73rd | 70th | 76th |
| Average of comparators | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 4/25 | 2/25 | 2/25 | 7/25 | 8/25 | 4/25 | 3/25 | 2/25 | 3/25 | 2/24 |
| Percentile | 84th | 92nd | 92nd | 72nd | 68th | 84th | 88th | 92nd | 88th | 92nd |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | 33\% | 67\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 40\% |
| Average of all schools | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 22\% | 23\% | 23\% | 25\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | 17/106 | 3/107 | 19/109 | 17/114 | 20/120 | 23/117 | 25/124 | 18/112 |
| Percentile | - | - | 84th | 97th | 83rd | 85th | 83rd | 80th | 80th | 84th |
| Average of comparators | 18\% | 19\% | 21\% | 21\% | 20\% | 20\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | 3/21 | 1/21 | 2/21 | 2/21 | 3/22 | 2/22 | 4/23 | 2/22 |
| Percentile | - | - | 86th | 95th | 90th | 90th | 86th | 91st | 83rd | 91st |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 16\% | 18\% | 15\% | 9\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 18\% | 15\% | 19\% |
| Average of all schools | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 65/154 | 67/150 | 79/150 | 123/150 | 105/151 | 101/149 | 99/149 | 78/149 | 92/141 | 75/130 |
| Percentile | 58th | 55th | 47th | 18th | 30th | 32nd | 34th | 47th | 35th | 42nd |
| Average of comparators | 15\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 9/23 | 10/23 | 12/23 | 20/22 | 14/21 | 14/21 | 15/21 | 10/21 | 14/21 | 10/21 |
| Percentile | 61st | 57th | 48th | 9th | 33rd | 33rd | 29th | 52nd | 33rd | 52nd |
| Civil \& Environmental Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 13\% | 17\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | 19\% | 20\% | 18\% | 24\% | 25\% |
| Average of all schools | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 122/227 | 90/232 | 91/236 | 111/233 | 109/232 | 98/236 | 100/237 | 125/225 | 71/215 | 62/179 |
| Percentile | 46th | 61st | 61st | 52nd | 53rd | 58th | 58th | 44th | 67th | 65th |
| Average of comparators | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 23\% | 24\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 16/22 | 12/22 | 12/22 | 15/22 | 17/22 | 16/23 | 15/24 | 20/24 | 10/21 | 12/22 |
| Percentile | 27th | 45th | 45th | 32nd | 23rd | 30th | 38th | 17th | 55th | 45th |
| Computer Science | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 22\% | 27\% | 26\% | 26\% | 27\% | 35\% | 32\% | 33\% | 29\% | 33\% |
| Average of all schools | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 45/181 | 35/188 | 34/191 | 32/193 | 33/192 | 19/198 | 22/195 | 12/187 | 35/191 | 16/162 |
| Percentile | 75th | 81st | 82nd | 83rd | 83rd | 90th | 89th | 94th | 82nd | 90th |
| Average of comparators | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 1/21 | 1/21 | 1/21 | 1/20 | 1/21 | 1/20 | 1/20 | 1/20 | 2/21 | 1/20 |
| Percentile | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 95th | 90th | 95th |
| Electrical \& Computer Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 20\% | 19\% | 17\% | 16\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 124/280 | 103/283 | 105/284 | 168/288 | 170/284 | 166/288 | 54/287 | 73/270 | 86/264 | 88/213 |
| Percentile | 56th | 64th | 63rd | 42nd | 40th | 42nd | 81st | 73rd | 67th | 59th |
| Average of comparators | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 8/24 | 5/24 | 6/24 | 14/24 | 14/24 | 15/24 | 3/24 | 3/24 | 3/24 | 6/22 |
| Percentile | 67th | 79th | 75th | 42nd | 42nd | 38th | 88th | 88th | 88th | 73rd |
| Materials Science Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 21\% | 15\% | 14\% | 24\% | 28\% |
| Average of all schools | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 19\% | 20\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 21/55 | 21/55 | 22/56 | 20/57 | 24/58 | 19/64 | 34/64 | 38/63 | 23/64 | 12/52 |
| Percentile | 62nd | 62nd | 61st | 65th | 59th | 70th | 47th | 40th | 64th | 77th |
| Average of comparators | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 16\% | 16\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 7/18 | 6/18 | 9/18 | 7/19 | 9/19 | 7/20 | 13/20 | 14/20 | 7/20 | 3/17 |
| Percentile | 61st | 67th | 50th | 63rd | 53rd | 65th | 35th | 30th | 65th | 82nd |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage Female, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 11\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% | 11\% |
| Average of all schools | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 89/262 | 66/267 | 71/265 | 76/267 | 149/269 | 152/272 | 165/275 | 167/262 | 177/248 | 128/203 |
| Percentile | 66th | 75th | 73rd | 72nd | 45th | 44rd | 40th | 36th | 29th | 37th |
| Average of comparators | 10\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 7/22 | 6/22 | 5/22 | 4/22 | 16/22 | 18/22 | 18/23 | 20/23 | 22/23 | 20/23 |
| Percentile | 68th | 73rd | 77th | 82nd | 27th | 18th | 22nd | 13th | 4th | 13th |

### 2.3 Underrepresented Status

Figure 7 summarizes the percentage of faculty from underrepresented groups (URG) in the College of Engineering as of Fall 2020 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. \% of URG T/TT and CT faculty by department and for the COE, by job rank and type, Fall 2020

| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| - TT / Associate Professor | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| - TT / Full Professor | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| - All | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 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 2020

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 (2016-2020)

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. \% of URG faculty for the COE, by department, T/TT only, over last 10 years (2010-2019)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 6\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 9\% | 6\% | 6\% | 8\% | 8\% |
| Average of all schools | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 101/301 | 131/306 | 131/307 | 102/309 | 131/306 | 75/313 | 112/313 | 112/288 | 64/282 | 68/259 |
| Percentile | 66th | 57th | 57th | 67th | 57th | 76th | 64th | 61st | 77th | 74th |
| Average of comparators | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 7/25 | 11/25 | 13/25 | 7/25 | 12/25 | 2/25 | 6/25 | 10/25 | 2/24 | 4/24 |
| Percentile | 72nd | 56th | 48th | 72nd | 52nd | 92nd | 76th | 60th | 92nd | 83rd |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | 0\% | 33\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Average of all schools | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | 46/106 | 1/107 | 55/109 | 60/114 | 60/120 | 57/117 | 66/124 | 79/112 |
| Percentile | - | - | 57th | 99th | 50th | 47th | 50th | 51st | 47th | 29th |
| Average of comparators | 5\% | 4\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | 14/20 | 1/21 | 14/21 | 16/21 | 17/22 | 16/22 | 17/23 | 19/22 |
| Percentile | - | - | 33rd | 95th | 33rd | 24th | 23rd | 27th | 26th | 14th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 9\% | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 15\% | 15\% |
| Average of all schools | 8\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 40/154 | 46/150 | 44/150 | 56/150 | 55/151 | 56/149 | 57/149 | 56/148 | 22/141 | 23/130 |
| Percentile | 74th | 69th | 71st | 63rd | 64th | 62nd | 62nd | 62nd | 84th | 82nd |
| Average of comparators | 7\% | 7\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% | 8\% | 7\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 4/23 | 4/23 | 2/23 | 7/22 | 7/21 | 7/21 | 6/21 | 8/21 | 2/21 | 2/21 |
| Percentile | 83rd | 83rd | 91st | 68th | 67th | 67th | 71st | 62nd | 90th | 90th |
| Civil \& Environmental Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 8\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| Average of all schools | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 110/227 | 122/232 | 122/236 | 90/233 | 87/232 | 83/236 | 75/237 | 83/225 | 55/215 | 44/179 |
| Percentile | 52nd | 47th | 48th | 61st | 63rd | 65th | 68th | 63rd | 74th | 75th |
| Average of comparators | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 16/22 | 16/22 | 14/22 | 8/22 | 8/22 | 6/23 | 5/24 | 7/24 | 5/22 | 4/22 |
| Percentile | 27th | 27th | 36th | 64th | 64th | 74th | 79th | 71st | 77th | 82nd |
| Computer Science | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 4\% | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% | 5\% | 4\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| Average of all schools | 3\% | 4\% | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 45/181 | 55/188 | 59/191 | 62/193 | 54/192 | 63/198 | 65/195 | 60/187 | 60/186 | 145/162 |
| Percentile | 75th | 71st | 69th | 68th | 72nd | 68th | 67th | 68th | 68th | 10th |
| Average of comparators | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 5/21 | 5/21 | 6/21 | 5/20 | 4/21 | 9/20 | 7/20 | 9/20 | 8/21 | 17/20 |
| Percentile | 76th | 75th | 71st | 75th | 81st | 55th | 65th | 55th | 62nd | 15th |
| Electrical \& Computer Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 12\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 8\% |
| Average of all schools | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 43/280 | 74/283 | 79/284 | 63/288 | 51/284 | 58/288 | 56/287 | 54/270 | 60/264 | 48/213 |
| Percentile | 85th | 74th | 72nd | 78th | 82nd | 80th | 80th | 80th | 77th | 77th |
| Average of comparators | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 4\% | 5\% | 4\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 2/24 | 3/24 | 5/24 | 1/24 | 2/24 | 1/24 | 1/24 | 2/24 | 3/24 | 3/22 |
| Percentile | 92nd | 88th | 79th | 96th | 92nd | 96th | 96th | 92nd | 88th | 86th |
| Materials Science Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7\% | 8\% | 7\% | 12\% | 11\% |
| Average of all schools | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 9\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 31/55 | 33/55 | 32/56 | 35/57 | 39/58 | 22/64 | 21/64 | 25/63 | 14/64 | 12/52 |
| Percentile | 44th | 40th | 43rd | 39th | 33rd | 66th | 67th | 60th | 78th | 77th |
| Average of comparators | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 12/18 | 14/18 | 13/18 | 14/19 | 15/19 | 8/20 | 7/20 | 8/20 | 4/20 | 4/17 |
| Percentile | 33rd | 22nd | 28th | 26th | 21st | 60th | 65th | 60th | 80th | 76th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage URG, all ranks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Average of all schools | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 138/262 | 141/267 | 141/265 | 149/267 | 145/269 | 33/272 | 156/275 | 157/262 | 149/248 | 116/203 |
| Percentile | 47th | 47th | 47th | 44th | 46th | 88th | 43rd | 40th | 40th | 43rd |
| Average of comparators | 4\% | 6\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 16/22 | 17/22 | 18/22 | 18/22 | 19/23 | 1/23 | 19/23 | 19/23 | 19/23 | 20/23 |
| Percentile | 27th | 23rd | 18th | 18th | 17th | 96th | 17th | 17th | 17th | 13th |

## 3. Staff Data

### 3.1 Gender

Figure 10 reflects the \% of female COE staff by job type over the last four years. Comparative data for New Castle County is as of July 2019. Figure 11 shows the \% of female COE staff 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.


Figure 10. \% of women College of Engineering administrative, technical and research support staff data by job type, Fall 2017 to Fall 2020


Figure 11. \% of women College of Engineering administrative and technical support staff data by managerial role, Fall 2017 to Fall 2020

### 3.2 Underrepresented Status

Figure 12 reflects the breakdown of COE staff by job type and underrepresented status over the last three years. Comparative data for New Castle County is as of July 2019. 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.


Figure 12. \% of URG College of Engineering administrative, technical and research support staff data by job type and URG status, Fall 2017 to Fall 2020


Figure 13. College of Engineering administrative and technical support staff data by managerial role and URG status, Fall 2017 to Fall 2020

## 4. Graduate Student Data

### 4.1 Overview

Notes for graduate student data:

- URG = all non-White, non-Asian students $+1 / 2$ of students indicating two or more races; determined from IPEDS ethnicity
- \% URG = Num. domestic URG / Num. domestic students
- In using ASEE data for other universities for comparison,
o All students in civil, environmental, or civil/environmental were aggregated into CIEG.
o All students in electrical, computer engineering, or electrical/computer engineering were aggregated into ELEG.
o Students in Metallurgical and Materials Engineering were counted as MSEG.
o All students in Computer Science, both inside and outside of engineering were aggregated as CISC.
o 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, domestic URG and total graduate students at the College of Engineering over the last 10 years

| 1,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 900 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 800 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 700 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 600 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| -Women | 180 | 201 | 216 | 199 | 221 | 227 | 241 | 249 | 246 | 256 |
| $=\mathrm{URG}$ | 30 | 33 | 40 | 38 | 46 | 50 | 63 | 60 | 56 | 53 |
| -All | 710 | 778 | 803 | 774 | 825 | 892 | 943 | 917 | 915 | 891 |

Figure 14. No. of women, domestic URG and all graduate students, COE, prior 10 years (2011-2020)

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


Figure 15. \% of women and domestic URG graduate students, COE, prior 10 years (2011-2020)

### 4.2 Gender

Figure 16 summarizes the percentage of women among all graduate students and all incoming raduate students as of Fall 2020 at the department level for the College of Engineering, and the \% of graduating women graduate students for Academic Year 2019-20. Figure 17 shows the same data in absolute numbers.


Figure 16. \% of women graduate students, all and new, by COE department, Fall 2020 and $\%$ of graduating women graduate students by department, Academic Year 19-20


Figure 17. No. of women graduate students, all and new, by COE department, Fall 2020 and No. of graduating women graduate students by department, Academic Year 19-20

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 (2011-2020)

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. \% of women graduate students for the COE, by department, over last 10 years (2010-2019)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage Female, All Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 26\% | 25\% | 26\% | 27\% | 26\% | 27\% | 25\% | 26\% | 27\% | 27\% |
| Average of all schools | 22\% | 22\% | 23\% | 23\% | 24\% | 24\% | 24\% | 26\% | 26\% | 26\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 46/250 | 58/252 | 58/255 | 56/255 | 67/250 | 59/253 | 92/245 | 90/235 | 80/233 | 92/238 |
| Percentile | 82nd | 77th | 77th | 78th | 73rd | 77th | 62nd | 62nd | 66th | 61st |
| Average of comparators | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 23\% | 26\% | 24\% | 25\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 2/25 | 4/25 | 3/25 | 4/25 | 6/25 | 6/25 | 9/25 | 10/25 | 5/25 | 5/25 |
| Percentile | 92nd | 84th | 88th | 84th | 76th | 76th | 64th | 60th | 80th | 80th |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage Female, All Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | 0\% | 33\% | 39\% | 37\% | 39\% | 41\% | 47\% | 46\% |
| Average of all schools | 37\% | 38\% | 39\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 41\% | 42\% | 43\% | 43\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | 123/125 | 105/129 | 78/126 | 89/130 | 82/134 | 78/137 | 46/142 | 51/133 |
| Percentile | - | - | 2nd | 19th | 38th | 32nd | 39th | 43rd | 68th | 62nd |
| Average of comparators | 35\% | 37\% | 36\% | 39\% | 39\% | 39\% | 41\% | 41\% | 42\% | 41\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | 20/20 | 19/21 | 13/21 | 16/21 | 14/22 | 14/22 | 6/23 | 5/23 |
| Percentile | - | - | 0 | 10th | 38th | 24th | 36th | 36th | 74th | 78th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage Female, All Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 25\% | 30\% | 31\% | 37\% | 34\% | 37\% | 39\% | 33\% | 34\% | 35\% |
| Average of all schools | 32\% | 33\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 33\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 104/142 | 83/142 | 77/144 | 33/143 | 53/142 | 38/142 | 24/138 | 62/138 | 51/134 | 50/133 |
| Percentile | 27th | 42nd | 47th | 77th | 63rd | 73rd | 83rd | 55th | 62nd | 62nd |
| Average of comparators | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 32\% | 31\% | 32\% | 33\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 20/22 | 13/22 | 10/22 | 4/22 | 9/22 | 6/22 | 2/23 | 9/23 | 7/23 | 8/22 |
| Percentile | 9th | 41st | 55th | 82nd | 59th | 73rd | 91st | 61st | 70th | 64th |
| Civil \& Environmental Engineering | Percentage Female, All Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 31\% | 34\% | 35\% | 33\% | 32\% | 33\% | 27\% | 30\% | 37\% | 34\% |
| Average of all schools | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 31\% | 32\% | 33\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 68/201 | 45/200 | 43/201 | 55/199 | 56/198 | 50/195 | 112/193 | 91/190 | 45/188 | 69/190 |
| Percentile | 66th | 78th | 79th | 72nd | 72nd | 74th | 42nd | 52nd | 76th | 64th |
| Average of comparators | 27\% | 28\% | 28\% | 29\% | 29\% | 30\% | 31\% | 32\% | 31\% | 31\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 9/23 | 5/23 | 5/23 | 6/23 | 8/23 | 9/23 | 18/24 | 14/24 | 5/24 | 10/24 |
| Percentile | 61st | 78th | 78th | 74th | 65th | 61st | 25th | 42nd | 79th | 58th |
| Computer Science | Percentage Female, All Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 25\% | 25\% | 24\% | 21\% | 23\% | 28\% | 29\% | 31\% | 31\% | 23\% |
| Average of all schools | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 22\% | 23\% | 24\% | 25\% | 28\% | 27\% | 27\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 38/175 | 47/185 | 59/184 | 102/183 | 83/177 | 52/185 | 47/176 | 32/174 | 40/176 | 125/184 |
| Percentile | 78th | 75th | 68th | 44th | 53rd | 72nd | 73rd | 82nd | 77th | 32nd |
| Average of comparators | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 30\% | 23\% | 24\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 1/21 | 1/22 | 5/22 | 9/21 | 7/22 | 2/21 | 2/21 | 2/21 | 2/22 | 14/23 |
| Percentile | 95th | 95th | 77th | 57th | 68th | 90th | 90th | 90th | 91st | 39th |
| Electrical \& Computer Engineering | Percentage Female, All Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 16\% | 14\% | 19\% | 21\% | 18\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% |
| Average of all schools | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 22\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 141/233 | 159/232 | 83/234 | 82/234 | 129/229 | 173/231 | 166/223 | 153/216 | 156/215 | 162/217 |
| Percentile | 39th | 31st | 65th | 65th | 44th | 25th | 26th | 29th | 27th | 25th |
| Average of comparators | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 19\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 11/24 | 16/24 | 8/24 | 7/24 | 15/24 | 21/24 | 21/24 | 21/24 | 23/25 | 19/25 |
| Percentile | 54th | 33rd | 67th | 71st | 38th | 13th | 13th | 13th | 8th | 24th |
| Materials Science Engineering | Percentage Female, All Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 43\% | 33\% | 28\% | 27\% | 34\% | 37\% | 33\% | 32\% | 30\% | 33\% |
| Average of all schools | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 28\% | 28\% | 28\% | 29\% | 29\% | 30\% | 30\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 6/87 | 21/90 | 37/94 | 50/97 | 18/98 | 8/96 | 18/98 | 33/97 | 44/99 | 26/82 |
| Percentile | 93rd | 77th | 61st | 48th | 82nd | 92nd | 82nd | 66th | 56th | 68th |
| Average of comparators | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 26\% | 27\% | 29\% | 29\% | 30\% | 30\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 1/19 | 5/20 | 8/20 | 11/22 | 4/22 | 2/23 | 4/23 | 7/23 | 13/23 | 7/22 |
| Percentile | 95th | 75th | 60th | 50th | 82nd | 91st | 83rd | 70th | 43rd | 68th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage Female, All Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 11\% | 12\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 21\% |
| Average of all schools | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 56/220 | 42/222 | 51/223 | 45/224 | 140/219 | 143/220 | 98/211 | 83/209 | 113/209 | 47/204 |
| Percentile | 75th | 81st | 77th | 80th | 36th | 35th | 54th | 60th | 46th | 77th |
| Average of comparators | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 3/24 | 3/24 | 5/24 | 3/24 | 23/24 | 20/24 | 13/24 | 11/24 | 16/25 | 5/25 |
| Percentile | 88th | 88th | 79th | 88th | 4th | 17th | 46th | 54th | 36th | 80th |

### 4.3 Underrepresented Status

Figure 19 summarizes the percentage of URG students among all graduate students and all incoming graduate students as of Fall 2020 at the department level for the College of Engineering, and the \% of graduating URG graduate students for Academic Year 2019-20. Figure 20 shows the same data in absolute numbers.


Figure 19. \% of URG graduate students, all and new, by COE department, Fall 2020 and $\%$ of graduating URG graduate students by department, Academic Year 19-20


Figure 20. No. of URG graduate students, all and new, by COE department, Fall 2020 and No. of graduating URG graduate students by department, Academic Year 19-20

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 (2011-2020)

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. \% of URG graduate students for the COE, by department, over last 10 years (2010-2019)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage URG, All Domestic Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 6\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 13\% | 12\% | 14\% | 14\% | 13\% |
| Average of all schools | 12\% | 11\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 192/249 | 134/251 | 143/254 | 123/251 | 130/248 | 108/250 | 130/245 | 98/234 | 110/233 | 134/238 |
| Percentile | 23rd | 47th | 44th | 51st | 48th | 57th | 47th | 58th | 53rd | 44th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 22/25 | 12/25 | 11/25 | 10/25 | 14/25 | 7/25 | 12/25 | 8/25 | 10/25 | 15/25 |
| Percentile | 12th | 52nd | 56th | 60th | 44th | 72nd | 52nd | 68th | 60th | 40th |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage URG, All Domestic Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | 25\% | 25\% | 27\% | 18\% | 14\% | 14\% | 12\% | 11\% |
| Average of all schools | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | 12/124 | 22/128 | 13/125 | 34/129 | 74/134 | 71/137 | 94/141 | 99/131 |
| Percentile | - | - | 90th | 83rd | 90th | 74th | 45th | 48th | 33rd | 26th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | 1/21 | 1/21 | 1/21 | 4/21 | 14/21 | 14/21 | 17/23 | 21/23 |
| Percentile | - | - | 95th | 95th | 95th | 81st | 36th | 36th | 26th | 9th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage URG, All Domestic Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 7\% | 4\% | 6\% | 10\% | 11\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% |
| Average of all schools | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 91/141 | 110/110 | 93/144 | 66/143 | 73/140 | 80/138 | 88/136 | 96/138 | 93/133 | 96/132 |
| Percentile | 35th | 21st | 35th | 54th | 48th | 42nd | 35th | 30th | 30th | 27th |
| Average of comparators | 10\% | 8\% | 9\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 16/22 | 18/22 | 13/22 | 9/22 | 10/22 | 11/22 | 12/23 | 14/23 | 16/23 | 16/22 |
| Percentile | 27th | 18th | 41st | 59th | 55th | 50th | 48th | 39th | 30th | 27th |
| Civil \& Environmental Engineering | Percentage URG, All Domestic Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 6\% | 9\% | 9\% | 17\% | 15\% | 21\% | 18\% | 15\% | 14\% | 11\% |
| Average of all schools | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 19\% | 20\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 143/201 | 112/199 | 117/200 | 65/199 | 75/197 | 53/194 | 62/192 | 84/189 | 104/187 | 134/189 |
| Percentile | 29th | 44th | 42nd | 67th | 62nd | 73rd | 68th | 56th | 44th | 29th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 11\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 17/23 | 12/23 | 11/23 | 4/23 | 8/23 | 4/23 | 5/24 | 10/24 | 12/24 | 18/24 |
| Percentile | 26th | 48th | 52nd | 83rd | 65th | 83rd | 79th | 58th | 50th | 25th |
| Computer Science | Percentage URG, All Domestic Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 3\% | 11\% | 8\% | 3\% | 4\% | 18\% | 18\% | 20\% | 27\% | 22\% |
| Average of all schools | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 16\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 143/175 | 68/185 | 95/184 | 143/182 | 144/175 | 38/184 | 46/175 | 49/174 | 24/175 | 48/184 |
| Percentile | 18th | 63rd | 48th | 21st | 18th | 79th | 74th | 72nd | 86th | 74th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 10\% | 12\% | 10\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 20/21 | 6/22 | 8/22 | 18/21 | 18/22 | 3/21 | 4/21 | 3/21 | 1/22 | 1/23 |
| Percentile | 5th | 73rd | 64th | 14th | 18th | 86th | 81st | 86th | 95th | 96th |
| Electrical \& Computer Engineering | Percentage URG, All Domestic Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 8\% | 10\% | 10\% | 6\% | 10\% | 12\% | 10\% | 17\% | 19\% | 17\% |
| Average of all schools | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 145/231 | 138/231 | 141/232 | 182/232 | 146/227 | 129/229 | 131/219 | 75/215 | 66/214 | 78/216 |
| Percentile | 37th | 40th | 39th | 22nd | 36th | 44th | 40th | 65th | 69th | 64th |
| Average of comparators | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 10\% | 13\% | 13\% | 15\% | 14\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 17/24 | 13/24 | 12/24 | 21/24 | 17/24 | 11/24 | 14/24 | 10/24 | 6/25 | 8/25 |
| Percentile | 29th | 46th | 50th | 13th | 29th | 54th | 42nd | 58th | 76th | 68th |
| Materials Science Engineering | Percentage URG, All Domestic Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 7\% | 21\% | 17\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 13\% | 13\% |
| Average of all schools | 10\% | 10\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 46/87 | 14/90 | 18/94 | 36/96 | 35/98 | 38/95 | 40/96 | 40/96 | 52/98 | 43/82 |
| Percentile | 47th | 84th | 81st | 63rd | 64th | 60th | 58th | 58th | 47th | 48th |
| Average of comparators | 7\% | 8\% | 10\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 8/19 | 1/20 | 2/20 | 6/22 | 4/22 | 7/23 | 8/23 | 8/23 | 11/23 | 12/22 |
| Percentile | 58th | 95th | 90th | 73rd | 82nd | 70th | 65th | 65th | 52nd | 45th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage URG, All Domestic Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 1\% | 11\% | 13\% | 12\% | 7\% | 3\% | 8\% | 4\% | 7\% | 8\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 190/219 | 94/221 | 87/221 | 98/222 | 151/217 | 184/219 | 140/210 | 183/209 | 163/209 | 156/204 |
| Percentile | 13th | 57th | 61st | 56th | 30th | 16th | 33rd | 12th | 22nd | 24th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 24/24 | 7/24 | 6/24 | 6/24 | 16/24 | 23/24 | 17/24 | 23/24 | 20/25 | 21/25 |
| Percentile | 0 | 71st | 75th | 75th | 33rd | 4th | 29th | 4th | 20th | 16th |

## 5. Undergraduate Student Data

### 5.1 Overview

Notes on undergraduate student data

- 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 students was computed for each engineering program, not department: biomedical engineering, chemical engineering, civil engineering, computer science, computer engineering, construction management, electrical engineering, environmental engineering, material sciences, mechanical engineering and engineering undeclared (see relationship between departments and programs in Appendix A).
- In using ASEE data for other universities for comparison,
o For Computer Science, all BA and BS programs were aggregated.
o For college-level data over time, for each school, we sum only students in the same departments/programs we have in UD COE.
o Comparative metrics are not available for engineering undeclared programs. Figures are not shown for construction management and materials science programs owing to small numbers of students in these recently added UD COE offerings.

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 (2011-2020)

Figure 23 presents the \% 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 (2011-2020)

### 5.2 Gender

Figure 24 summarizes the percentage of women among all undergraduate students and all incoming undergraduate students as of Fall 2020 at the program level for the College of Engineering, and the \% of graduating women undergraduate students for Academic Year 2019-20. Figure 25 shows the same data in absolute numbers. Note - Students cannot graduate from engineering undeclared program; construction management and materials science programs are less than 4 years old.


Figure 24. \% of women undergraduate students, all and new, by COE department, Fall 2020 and \% of graduating women undergraduate students by program, Academic Year 19-20


Figure 25. No. of women undergraduate students, all and new, by COE department, Fall 2020 and No. of graduating women undergraduate students by program, Academic Year 19-20

Figure 26 illustrates the change by program 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 program, prior 10 years (2011-2020)

Comparative data for women undergraduate students over the last 10 years for the COE and other ASEEtracked institutions can be found in Table 5.

Table 5. \% of women undergraduate students for the COE, by program, last 10 years (2010-2019)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 18\% | 18\% | 21\% | 22\% | 22\% | 24\% | 24\% | 25\% | 27\% | 26\% |
| Average of all schools | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 23\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 110/310 | 110/313 | 80/315 | 83/318 | 79/316 | 81/318 | 79/309 | 67/287 | 58/284 | 70/281 |
| Percentile | 65th | 65th | 75th | 74th | 75th | 75th | 74th | 77th | 80th | 75th |
| Average of comparators | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 22\% | 23\% | 24\% | 24\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 9/24 | 12/27 | 7/24 | 9/24 | 8/24 | 7/24 | 7/24 | 7/24 | 5/23 | 7/24 |
| Percentile | 63rd | 50th | 71st | 63rd | 67th | 71st | 71st | 71st | 80th | 71st |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | 43\% | 44\% | 49\% | 49\% | 53\% | 53\% | 57\% | 58\% |
| Average of all schools | 39\% | 40\% | 40\% | 41\% | 43\% | 44\% | 47\% | 48\% | 50\% | 51\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions |  | - | 33/118 | 41/115 | 23/120 | 31/125 | 26/130 | 33/132 | 18/135 | 21/135 |
| Percentile | - | - | 72nd | 64th | 81st | 75th | 80th | 75th | 87th | 84th |
| Average of comparators | 39\% | 39\% | 40\% | 42\% | 43\% | 45\% | 47\% | 49\% | 50\% | 50\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | 9/19 | 9/19 | 3/20 | 4/20 | 2/20 | 3/20 | 1/21 | 5/22 |
| Percentile | - | - | 53rd | 53rd | 85th | 80th | 90th | 85th | 95th | 77th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 29\% | 27\% | 25\% | 26\% | 27\% | 28\% | 28\% | 27\% | 25\% | 28\% |
| Average of all schools | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 33\% | 33\% | 34\% | 35\% | 36\% | 37\% | 38\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 104/161 | 119/161 | 137/161 | 139/161 | 133/161 | 130/157 | 132/157 | 141/157 | 143/152 | 137/149 |
| Percentile | 35th | 26th | 15th | 14th | 17th | 17th | 16th | 10th | 6th | 8th |
| Average of comparators | 29\% | 30\% | 30\% | 31\% | 31\% | 32\% | 33\% | 35\% | 36\% | 36\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 14/23 | 17/23 | 18/23 | 20/23 | 19/23 | 18/23 | 21/23 | 23/23 | 23/23 | 21/22 |
| Percentile | 39th | 26th | 22nd | 13th | 17th | 22nd | 9th | 0 | 0 | 5th |
| Civil Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 18\% | 20\% | 19\% | 18\% | 19\% | 21\% | 24\% | 30\% | 31\% | 32\% |
| Average of all schools | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 23\% | 24\% | 25\% | 25\% | 26\% | 26\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 127/217 | 112/221 | 125/223 | 157/224 | 161/224 | 117/212 | 106/206 | 62/201 | 53/197 | 53/201 |
| Percentile | 41st | 49th | 44th | 30th | 28th | 45th | 49th | 69th | 73rd | 74th |
| Average of comparators | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 23\% | 24\% | 25\% | 26\% | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 11/21 | 9/21 | 14/21 | 17/22 | 18/22 | 14/22 | 12/22 | 8/22 | 5/22 | 6/22 |
| Percentile | 48th | 57th | 33rd | 23rd | 18th | 36th | 45th | 64th | 77th | 73rd |
| Computer Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 7\% | 7\% | 9\% | 12\% | 6\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| Average of all schools | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 124/179 | 139/181 | 110/183 | 73/188 | 160/183 | 137/187 | 130/181 | 158/184 | 133/186 | 129/175 |
| Percentile | 31st | 23rd | 40th | 61st | 13th | 27th | 28th | 14th | 28th | 26th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 14\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 17/21 | 16/21 | 11/20 | 8/21 | 19/19 | 14/19 | 13/20 | 18/20 | 19/21 | 19/19 |
| Percentile | 19th | 24th | 45th | 62nd | 0 | 26th | 35th | 10th | 10th | 0 |
| Computer Science | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 10\% | 15\% | 18\% | 19\% | 22\% | 22\% | 20\% |
| Average of all schools | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 133/213 | 150/224 | 140/221 | 169/222 | 73/219 | 62/224 | 66/224 | 53/218 | 53/216 | 62/203 |
| Percentile | 38th | 33rd | 37th | 24th | 67th | 72nd | 71st | 76th | 75th | 69th |
| Average of comparators | 10\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 10/22 | 18/23 | 14/22 | 21/22 | 9/23 | 6/22 | 5/23 | 5/23 | 5/24 | 6/22 |
| Percentile | 55th | 22nd | 36th | 5th | 61st | 73rd | 78th | 78th | 79th | 73rd |

Table 5. \% of women undergraduate students for the COE, by program, last 10 years (2010-2019) (cont.)

|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electrical Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 11\% | 12\% | 14\% | 14\% | 10\% | 13\% | 8\% | 8\% | 12\% | 11\% |
| Average of all schools | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 130/252 | 110/257 | 67/261 | 74/262 | 158/257 | 102/247 | 224/243 | 215/234 | 164/233 | 187/236 |
| Percentile | 48th | 57th | 74th | 72nd | 39th | 59th | 8th | 8th | 30th | 21st |
| Average of comparators | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 11/22 | 11/22 | 5/22 | 9/22 | 18/22 | 13/21 | 21/21 | 20/21 | 18/22 | 18/20 |
| Percentile | 50th | 50th | 77th | 59th | 18th | 38th | 0 | 5th | 18th | 10th |
| Environmental Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 41\% | 50\% | 46\% | 46\% | 46\% | 50\% | 47\% | 50\% | 56\% | 59\% |
| Average of all schools | 42\% | 44\% | 43\% | 44\% | 47\% | 47\% | 49\% | 51\% | 53\% | 55\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 40/63 | 25/65 | 24/65 | 33/65 | 35/64 | 33/68 | 43/74 | 48/76 | 33/77 | 28/69 |
| Percentile | 37th | 62nd | 63rd | 49th | 45th | 51st | 42nd | 37th | 57th | 59th |
| Average of comparators | 41\% | 46\% | 45\% | 48\% | 49\% | 52\% | 47\% | 50\% | 52\% | 58\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 3/6 | 2/7 | 2/7 | 5/8 | 5/8 | 5/9 | 7/12 | 7/12 | 5/12 | 3/10 |
| Percentile | 50th | 71st | 71st | 38th | 38th | 44th | 43rd | 42nd | 58th | 70th |
| Materials Science \& Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36\% |
| Average of all schools | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 27\% | 28\% | 29\% | 30\% | 31\% | 32\% | 32\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20/61 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 67th |
| Average of comparators | 24\% | 25\% | 26\% | 25\% | 27\% | 27\% | 28\% | 29\% | 30\% | 30\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7/20 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 65th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage Female, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 12\% | 11\% | 13\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 21\% | 21\% | 20\% | 17\% |
| Average of all schools | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 106/278 | 139/282 | 100/285 | 93/288 | 96/290 | 95/286 | 48/276 | 44/269 | 63/266 | 110/259 |
| Percentile | 62nd | 51st | 65th | 68th | 67th | 67th | 83rd | 80th | 76th | 58th |
| Average of comparators | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 9/24 | 14/24 | 13/24 | 8/24 | 7/24 | 11/24 | 6/24 | 5/24 | 7/25 | 15/23 |
| Percentile | 63rd | 42nd | 46th | 67th | 71st | 54th | 75th | 79th | 72nd | 35th |

### 5.3 Underrepresented Status

Figure 27 summarizes the percentage of URG students among all undergraduate students and all incoming undergraduate students as of Fall 2020 at the program level for the College of Engineering, and the \% of graduating URG undergraduate students for Academic Year 2019-20. Figure 28 shows the same data in absolute numbers. Note - Students cannot graduate from engineering undeclared program; construction management and materials science programs are less than 4 years old.


Figure 27. \% of URG sndergraduate Students, all and new, by COE department, Fall 2020 and \% of graduating URG undergraduate students by program, Academic Year 19-20


Figure 28. No. of URG undergraduate students, all and new, by COE department, Fall 2020 and No. of graduating URG undergraduate students by program, Academic Year 19-20

Figure 29 illustrates the change by program 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 program, prior 10 years (2011-2020

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, last 10 years (2010-2019)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| College of Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 9\% | 8\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| Average of all schools | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 182/310 | 224/313 | 187/315 | 176/318 | 169/316 | 178/318 | 192/309 | 179/287 | 180/284 | 176/281 |
| Percentile | 41st | 28th | 41st | 45th | 47th | 44th | 38th | 38th | 37th | 37th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 9/24 | 14/24 | 9/24 | 9/24 | 7/24 | 9/24 | 11/24 | 11/24 | 11/25 | 10/24 |
| Percentile | 63rd | 42nd | 63rd | 63rd | 71st | 63rd | 54th | 54th | 56th | 58th |
| Biomedical Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | 9\% | 9\% | 13\% | 9\% | 8\% | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% |
| Average of all schools | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions |  |  | 80/116 | 87/115 | 62/120 | 103/126 | 113/130 | 109/132 | 111/139 | 107/135 |
| Percentile | - | - | 31st | 24th | 48th | 18th | 13th | 17th | 20th | 21st |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions |  |  | 11/20 | 11/20 | 7/20 | 15/20 | 19/20 | 15/20 | 15/21 | 16/22 |
| Percentile | - | - | 45th | 45th | 65th | 25th | 5th | 25th | 29th | 27th |
| Chemical Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 6\% | 7\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 11\% | 10\% | 9\% |
| Average of all schools | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 121/161 | 119/161 | 89/161 | 87/161 | 92/160 | 107/157 | 107/157 | 97/157 | 111/152 | 120/149 |
| Percentile | 25th | 26th | 45th | 46th | 43rd | 32nd | 32nd | 38th | 27th | 19th |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 14\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 17/23 | 17/23 | 6/23 | 7/23 | 10/23 | 13/23 | 13/23 | 11/23 | 14/23 | 17/22 |
| Percentile | 26th | 26th | 74th | 70th | 57th | 43rd | 43rd | 52nd | 39th | 23rd |
| Civil Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 9\% | 7\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 11\% | 11\% | 13\% |
| Average of all schools | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | 23\% | 22\% | 23\% | 24\% | 25\% | 27\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 126/217 | 166/222 | 135/223 | 137/224 | 133/224 | 133/212 | 125/206 | 143/201 | 144/197 | 135/201 |
| Percentile | 42nd | 25th | 39th | 38th | 41st | 37th | 39th | 29th | 27th | 33rd |
| Average of comparators | 9\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 6/21 | 14/21 | 6/21 | 9/22 | 9/22 | 10/22 | 12/22 | 14/22 | 16/22 | 11/22 |
| Percentile | 71st | 33rd | 71st | 59th | 59th | 55th | 45th | 36th | 27th | 50th |
| Computer Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 9\% | 8\% | 16\% | 16\% | 18\% | 22\% | 22\% | 19\% | 16\% | 20\% |
| Average of all schools | 25\% | 25\% | 26\% | 23\% | 23\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 23\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 132/179 | 139/181 | 92/183 | 88/188 | 74/183 | 63/187 | 56/181 | 71/184 | 99/186 | 75/175 |
| Percentile | 26th | 23rd | 50th | 53rd | 60th | 66th | 69th | 61st | 47th | 57th |
| Average of comparators | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 13/21 | 17/21 | 6/20 | 4/21 | 3/19 | 1/19 | 2/20 | 4/20 | 7/21 | 2/19 |
| Percentile | 38th | 19th | 70th | 81st | 84th | 95th | 90th | 80th | 67th | 89th |
| Computer Science | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 12\% | 10\% | 12\% | 12\% | 14\% | 14\% | 12\% | 13\% | 14\% | 13\% |
| Average of all schools | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 96/213 | 131/224 | 113/221 | 116/222 | 96/219 | 108/224 | 129/224 | 111/218 | 112/216 | 127/207 |
| Percentile | 55th | 42nd | 49th | 48th | 56th | 52nd | 42nd | 49th | 48th | 39th |
| Average of comparators | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 7/21 | 9/23 | 4/22 | 6/22 | 4/23 | 5/22 | 9/23 | 5/23 | 6/24 | 8/22 |
| Percentile | 67th | 61st | 82nd | 73rd | 83rd | 77th | 61st | 78th | 75th | 64th |

Table 6. \% URG undergraduate students for the COE, by program, last 10 years (2010-2019) (cont.)

|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electrical Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 8\% | 10\% | 13\% | 17\% | 14\% | 16\% | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% |
| Average of all schools | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 22\% | 23\% | 24\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 176/252 | 155/257 | 130/261 | 109/262 | 132/257 | 112/247 | 123/243 | 125/234 | 129/233 | 142/236 |
| Percentile | 30th | 40th | 50th | 58th | 49th | 55th | 49th | 47th | 45th | 40th |
| Average of comparators | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 12\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 17/22 | 13/22 | 6/22 | 4/22 | 8/22 | 7/21 | 6/21 | 7/21 | 8/22 | 9/20 |
| Percentile | 23rd | 41st | 73rd | 82nd | 64th | 67th | 71st | 67th | 64th | 55th |
| Environmental Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 11\% | 9\% | 8\% | 10\% | 9\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 15\% | 13\% |
| Average of all schools | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 21\% | 21\% | 19\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 27/63 | 42/65 | 43/65 | 41/65 | 46/64 | 40/68 | 45/74 | 50/76 | 41/77 | 45/69 |
| Percentile | 57th | 35th | 34th | 37th | 28th | 41st | 39th | 34th | 47th | 35th |
| Average of comparators | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 10\% | 12\% | 12\% | 15\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 2/6 | 3/7 | 3/7 | 5/8 | 6/8 | 4/9 | 6/12 | 6/12 | 5/12 | 6/10 |
| Percentile | 67th | 57th | 57th | 38th | 25th | 56th | 50th | 50th | 58th | 40th |
| Materials Science \& Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 23\% |
| Average of all schools | 9\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 16\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 14/61 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 77th |
| Average of comparators | 6\% | 7\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3/20 |
| Percentile | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 85th |
| Mechanical Engineering | Percentage URG, all UGRAD Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Delaware | 11\% | 8\% | 8\% | 10\% | 11\% | 9\% | 9\% | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| Average of all schools | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 21\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 129/278 | 179/282 | 195/285 | 176/288 | 171/290 | 194/286 | 198/276 | 171/269 | 170/266 | 155/259 |
| Percentile | 54th | 37th | 32nd | 39th | 41st | 32nd | 28th | 36th | 36th | 40th |
| Average of comparators | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| UD Rank / \# of Institutions | 5/24 | 13/24 | 12/24 | 9/24 | 8/24 | 11/24 | 15/24 | 10/24 | 12/25 | 10/23 |
| Percentile | 79th | 46th | 50th | 63rd | 67th | 54th | 38th | 58th | 52nd | 57th |

### 5.4 Retention

Figure 30 summarizes the 6-year graduation rates for undergraduate students by program, for majority, minority and female populations, in the Fall 2014 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 2014 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 |
| CIEG | Civil and environmental engineering | Civil engineering Construction engineering and management Environmental engineering |
| CISC | Computer science | Computer science Information systems |
| ELEG | Electrical and computer engineering | Computer engineering Electrical engineering |
| MSEG | Materials science and engineering | Materials science and engineering |
| MEEG | Mechanical engineering | Mechanical engineering |

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.

## 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 2020, for Faculty, Staff \& Students

Table B1. Fall 2020 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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| CHEG | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 19 | 6 | 25 |
| CIEG | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 2 | 23 | 8 | 31 |
| CISC | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 9 | 29 |
| ELEG | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 24 | 5 | 29 |
| MSEG | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 16 | 5 | 21 |
| MEEG | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 24 | 5 | 29 |
| Total | 19 | 10 | 22 | 10 | 27 | 7 | 66 | 16 | 134 | 43 | 177 |

Table B2. Fall 2020 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 | Other | URG | White | Asian | Other | URG | White | Asian | Other | URG | White | Asian | Other | URG | White | Asian | Other | URG | Total |
| BMEG | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 |
| CHEG | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 25 |
| CIEG | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 31 |
| CISC | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 29 |
| ELEG | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 29 |
| MSEG | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 21 |
| MEEG | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 29 |
| Total | 22 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 48 | 27 | 0 | 8 | 105 | 47 | 13 | 12 | 177 |

Table B3. Fall 2020 COE staff by job type, gender, and race

|  |  | Asian | Black/African <br> American | Hispanic/ <br> Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Admin Support | Total | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 74 | 88 |
|  | Female | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 67 | 79 |
|  | Male | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 |
| Tech Support | Total | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 29 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
|  | Male | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 26 |
| Research | Total | 14 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 52 |
|  | Female | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 |
|  | Male | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 41 |
|  | Grand Total | 19 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 126 | 169 |

Table B4. Fall 2020 COE administrative and technical staff (no research staff) by managerial role, gender, and race

|  |  | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ Latino | Multi Ethnic | Int'\| | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Managerial | Total | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 31 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 18 |
|  | Male | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 |
| Non managerial | Total | 2 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 72 | 86 |
|  | Female | 1 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 53 | 64 |
|  | Male | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 22 |
|  | Grand Total | 5 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 96 | 117 |

Table B5. All Fall 2020 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 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 38 | 61 |
|  | Female | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 31 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 18 | 30 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEEP | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CHEG | Total | 1 | 22 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 62 | 1 | 70 | 164 |
|  | Female | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 21 | 52 |
|  | Male | 1 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 42 | 1 | 49 | 112 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CIEG | Total | 0 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 42 | 113 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 19 | 43 |
|  | Male | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 23 | 70 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CISC | Total | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 87 | 2 | 29 | 132 |
|  | Female | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 2 | 4 | 37 |
|  | Male | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 25 | 95 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EG | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ELEG | Total | 0 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 96 | 6 | 72 | 211 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 13 | 33 |
|  | Male | 0 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 82 | 5 | 59 | 178 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MEEG | Total | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 74 | 0 | 33 | 114 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 24 |
|  | Male | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 60 | 0 | 25 | 90 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MSEG | Total | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 55 | 3 | 28 | 96 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 1 | 11 | 36 |
|  | Male | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 16 | 59 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Grand Total | 2 | 60 | 20 | 25 | 14 | 446 | 13 | 312 | 894 |

Table B6. New Fall 2020 COE graduate students by department, gender, and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ <br> Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BMEG | Total | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 14 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEEP | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CHEG | Total | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 17 | 29 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 9 |
|  | Male | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 20 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CIEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 21 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 12 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 9 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CISC | Total | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 11 | 28 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 19 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ELEG | Total | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 15 | 34 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Male | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 13 | 30 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MEEG | Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 22 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 15 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MSEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Grand Total | 0 | 13 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 54 | 1 | 73 | 154 |

Table B7. AY 19-20 graduating COE graduate students by department, gender, and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ <br> Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BMEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEEP | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CHEG | Total | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 13 | 26 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
|  | Male | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CIEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 18 | 34 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 13 | 13 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CISC | Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 6 | 31 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 4 | 21 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ELEG | Total | 2 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 39 | 0 | 34 | 96 |
|  | Female | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 16 |
|  | Male | 2 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 80 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MEEG | Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 10 | 25 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 20 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MSEG | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 17 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 11 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Grand Total | 2 | 17 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 107 | 3 | 93 | 238 |

Table B8. All Fall 2020 COE undergraduate students by program, gender, and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ <br> Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biomedical | Total | 1 | 25 | 14 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 172 | 244 |
|  | Female | 1 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 105 | 146 |
|  | Male | 0 | 13 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 67 | 98 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chemical | Total | 0 | 53 | 6 | 28 | 14 | 65 | 11 | 224 | 401 |
|  | Female | 0 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 71 | 122 |
|  | Male | 0 | 40 | 1 | 20 | 9 | 45 | 11 | 153 | 279 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civil | Total | 0 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 151 | 211 |
|  | Female | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 42 | 60 |
|  | Male | 0 | 5 | 4 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 109 | 151 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Computer <br> Engineering | Total | 1 | 17 | 14 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 95 | 162 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 20 |
|  | Male | 1 | 16 | 13 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 85 | 142 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Computer <br> Science | Total | 0 | 79 | 22 | 33 | 14 | 73 | 12 | 245 | 478 |
|  | Female | 0 | 25 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 3 | 55 | 112 |
|  | Male | 0 | 54 | 16 | 26 | 12 | 59 | 9 | 190 | 366 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Construction Mgmt | Total | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 60 | 73 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 51 | 58 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electrical | Total | 1 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 74 | 126 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 11 |
|  | Male | 1 | 7 | 5 | 13 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 68 | 115 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Engineering Undeclared | Total | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 59 | 83 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 24 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 45 | 59 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Environmental | Total | 0 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 67 | 96 |
|  | Female | 0 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 41 | 60 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 26 | 36 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Materials | Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 20 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 11 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mechanical | Total | 0 | 36 | 25 | 53 | 16 | 14 | 23 | 406 | 573 |
|  | Female | 0 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 75 | 104 |
|  | Male | 0 | 29 | 18 | 45 | 13 | 13 | 20 | 331 | 469 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Grand Total | 3 | 236 | 102 | 206 | 84 | 189 | 80 | 1,567 | 2,467 |

Table B9. New Fall 2020 COE undergraduate students by program, gender, and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/ <br> Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biomedical | Total | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 52 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 31 |
|  | Male | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 21 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chemical | Total | 0 | 18 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 15 | 2 | 71 | 122 |
|  | Female | 0 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 29 | 48 |
|  | Male | 0 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 42 | 74 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civil | Total | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 41 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 24 | 34 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Computer <br> Engineering | Total | 1 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 21 | 41 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
|  | Male | 1 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 36 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Computer <br> Science | Total | 0 | 18 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 52 | 94 |
|  | Female | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 16 | 32 |
|  | Male | 0 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 36 | 62 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Construction Mgmt | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electrical | Total | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 26 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Male | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 25 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Engineering Undeclared | Total | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 58 | 81 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 24 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 44 | 57 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Environmental | Total | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 26 |
|  | Female | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 17 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Materials | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mechanical | Total | 0 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 93 | 130 |
|  | Female | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 21 |
|  | Male | 0 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 79 | 109 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Grand Total | 2 | 57 | 35 | 61 | 24 | 24 | 17 | 409 | 629 |

Table B10. AY 2019-20 graduating COE undergraduate students by program, gender, and race

|  |  | Amer Ind/ <br> Pacif Island | Asian | Black/African <br> American | Hispanic/ <br> Latino | Multi <br> Ethnic | Int'l | Not Specified | White | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biomedical | Total | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 43 | 53 |
|  | Female | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 30 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 23 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chemical | Total | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 64 | 84 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 18 |
|  | Male | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 53 | 66 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civil | Total | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 64 | 76 |
|  | Female | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 19 |
|  | Male | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 57 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Comp Eng | Total | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 28 | 44 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Male | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 41 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Comp Sci | Total | 0 | 17 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 48 | 85 |
|  | Female | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 21 |
|  | Male | 0 | 12 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 64 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electrical | Total | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 30 | 52 |
|  | Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 |
|  | Male | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 24 | 44 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Environmental | Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 29 |
|  | Female | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 16 |
|  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 13 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mechanical | Total | 0 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 120 | 159 |
|  | Female | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 45 |
|  | Male | 0 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 88 | 114 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Grand Total | 3 | 56 | 19 | 26 | 12 | 45 | 2 | 419 | 582 |

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

Table C1. 10-Year (2011-2020) COE undergraduate students by program, gender and URG status

|  |  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COE | Women | 412 | 467 | 510 | 549 | 586 | 576 | 606 | 644 | 635 | 683 |
|  | Men | 1,648 | 1,759 | 1,838 | 1,877 | 1,855 | 1,763 | 1,778 | 1,761 | 1,774 | 1,784 |
|  | URG | 199 | 244 | 278 | 297 | 298 | 269 | 301 | 309 | 325 | 364 |
|  | Total | 2,060 | 2,226 | 2,348 | 2,434 | 2,443 | 2,339 | 2,384 | 2,405 | 2,410 | 2,467 |
| Biomedical | Women | 38 | 65 | 90 | 102 | 108 | 105 | 109 | 136 | 138 | 146 |
|  | Men | 66 | 86 | 116 | 106 | 112 | 94 | 98 | 104 | 101 | 98 |
|  | URG | 9 | 17 | 23 | 29 | 21 | 17 | 21 | 29 | 31 | 33 |
|  | Total | 104 | 151 | 206 | 208 | 220 | 199 | 207 | 240 | 239 | 244 |
| Chemical | Women | 106 | 105 | 115 | 125 | 119 | 115 | 117 | 100 | 106 | 122 |
|  | Men | 289 | 323 | 330 | 340 | 307 | 298 | 312 | 303 | 279 | 279 |
|  | URG | 37 | 47 | 46 | 49 | 40 | 38 | 48 | 39 | 35 | 38 |
|  | Total | 395 | 428 | 445 | 463 | 426 | 413 | 429 | 403 | 385 | 401 |
| Civil | Women | 71 | 74 | 71 | 71 | 79 | 75 | 86 | 84 | 89 | 60 |
|  | Men | 285 | 316 | 333 | 312 | 290 | 237 | 200 | 179 | 162 | 151 |
|  | URG | 33 | 43 | 45 | 45 | 48 | 41 | 33 | 30 | 34 | 37 |
|  | Total | 356 | 390 | 404 | 383 | 370 | 312 | 286 | 263 | 251 | 211 |
| Computer <br> Engineering | Women | 6 | 9 | 15 | 7 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|  | Men | 82 | 94 | 115 | 119 | 129 | 143 | 173 | 154 | 164 | 142 |
|  | URG | 8 | 18 | 23 | 23 | 30 | 33 | 35 | 30 | 40 | 34 |
|  | Total | 88 | 103 | 130 | 126 | 141 | 158 | 188 | 172 | 183 | 162 |
| Computer Science | Women | 22 | 27 | 24 | 40 | 50 | 52 | 68 | 78 | 86 | 112 |
|  | Men | 201 | 218 | 227 | 229 | 226 | 221 | 245 | 280 | 337 | 366 |
|  | URG | 24 | 30 | 30 | 36 | 40 | 31 | 42 | 55 | 59 | 68 |
|  | Total | 223 | 245 | 251 | 279 | 276 | 273 | 313 | 358 | 423 | 478 |
| Construction Mgmt | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 15 |
|  | Men | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 47 | 58 |
|  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 56 | 73 |
| Electrical | Women | 19 | 24 | 24 | 21 | 29 | 18 | 16 | 20 | 16 | 11 |
|  | Men | 144 | 145 | 150 | 184 | 189 | 215 | 182 | 152 | 132 | 115 |
|  | URG | 20 | 25 | 30 | 32 | 38 | 36 | 29 | 27 | 24 | 27 |
|  | Total | 163 | 169 | 174 | 205 | 219 | 233 | 198 | 172 | 148 | 126 |
| Energy \& Env Policy | Women | 14 | 16 | 17 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Men | 14 | 21 | 19 | 18 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 28 | 37 | 36 | 33 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Engineering Undeclared | Women | 30 | 24 | 19 | 33 | 37 | 25 | 25 | 32 | 22 | 24 |
|  | Men | 100 | 85 | 81 | 103 | 86 | 58 | 72 | 84 | 65 | 59 |
|  | URG | 12 | 11 | 14 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 17 |
|  | Total | 130 | 109 | 100 | 136 | 123 | 83 | 97 | 116 | 87 | 83 |
| Environmental Eng | Women | 54 | 60 | 66 | 63 | 65 | 56 | 54 | 60 | 57 | 60 |
|  | Men | 55 | 69 | 79 | 76 | 66 | 63 | 55 | 47 | 40 | 36 |
|  | URG | 10 | 11 | 16 | 14 | 18 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 13 | 13 |
|  | Total | 109 | 129 | 145 | 139 | 131 | 119 | 109 | 107 | 97 | 96 |
| Environmental Science | Women | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Men | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 4 | 1 | 10 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Materials Science | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
|  | Men | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 |
|  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 20 |
| Mechanical | Women | 51 | 62 | 65 | 66 | 80 | 114 | 116 | 109 | 89 | 104 |
|  | Men | 409 | 402 | 382 | 384 | 439 | 429 | 441 | 433 | 440 | 469 |
|  | URG | 44 | 39 | 47 | 55 | 52 | 51 | 65 | 67 | 72 | 86 |
|  | Total | 460 | 464 | 447 | 450 | 519 | 543 | 557 | 542 | 530 | 573 |

Table C2. 10-Year (2011-2020) COE graduate students by department, gender and URG status

|  |  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COE | Women | 208 | 216 | 232 | 221 | 233 | 237 | 245 | 251 | 248 | 258 |
|  | Men | 607 | 641 | 649 | 640 | 644 | 690 | 718 | 672 | 670 | 635 |
|  | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | URG | 72 | 73 | 75 | 78 | 79 | 83 | 101 | 94 | 100 | 92 |
|  | International | 420 | 448 | 455 | 453 | 493 | 492 | 499 | 478 | 477 | 446 |
|  | Total | 823 | 865 | 887 | 867 | 881 | 931 | 966 | 925 | 920 | 894 |
| Biomedical | Women |  | 0 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 31 |
|  | Men |  | 6 | 10 | 11 | 17 | 23 | 26 | 24 | 28 | 30 |
|  | Other |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG |  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
|  | International |  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 11 |
|  | Total |  | 6 | 15 | 18 | 27 | 38 | 44 | 45 | 52 | 61 |
| Chemical | Women | 43 | 46 | 55 | 52 | 59 | 55 | 49 | 53 | 57 | 52 |
|  | Men | 99 | 101 | 92 | 102 | 101 | 87 | 98 | 100 | 105 | 112 |
|  | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG | 7 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 10 |
|  | International | 41 | 44 | 37 | 39 | 39 | 34 | 45 | 51 | 65 | 62 |
|  | Total | 142 | 147 | 147 | 154 | 160 | 142 | 147 | 153 | 162 | 164 |
|  <br> Environ. | Women | 38 | 36 | 36 | 31 | 40 | 30 | 31 | 41 | 37 | 43 |
|  | Men | 75 | 80 | 81 | 73 | 79 | 81 | 71 | 68 | 73 | 70 |
|  | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG | 10 | 9 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 17 | 19 |
|  | International | 58 | 58 | 64 | 63 | 70 | 70 | 63 | 63 | 67 | 60 |
|  | Total | 113 | 116 | 117 | 104 | 119 | 111 | 102 | 109 | 110 | 113 |
| Computer Science | Women | 33 | 32 | 32 | 39 | 43 | 43 | 51 | 48 | 31 | 37 |
|  | Men | 100 | 106 | 112 | 114 | 108 | 105 | 112 | 107 | 105 | 95 |
|  | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG | 10 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 10 |
|  | International | 92 | 101 | 109 | 120 | 118 | 110 | 122 | 114 | 95 | 87 |
|  | Total | 133 | 138 | 144 | 153 | 151 | 148 | 163 | 155 | 136 | 132 |
| Electrical \& Computer | Women | 20 | 31 | 35 | 32 | 34 | 44 | 49 | 38 | 37 | 33 |
|  | Men | 119 | 131 | 134 | 142 | 183 | 235 | 247 | 205 | 191 | 178 |
|  | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG | 19 | 24 | 19 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 44 | 39 | 36 | 31 |
|  | International | 76 | 101 | 101 | 101 | 151 | 164 | 146 | 118 | 104 | 96 |
|  | Total | 139 | 162 | 169 | 174 | 217 | 279 | 297 | 243 | 229 | 211 |
| Energy \& Env. Policy | Women | 23 | 25 | 25 | 17 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
|  | Men | 34 | 33 | 34 | 30 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
|  | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG | 5 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | International | 28 | 27 | 34 | 28 | 17 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|  | Total | 57 | 58 | 60 | 47 | 24 | 14 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 1 |
| Materials Science | Women | 26 | 22 | 21 | 27 | 26 | 28 | 28 | 30 | 35 | 36 |
|  | Men | 52 | 56 | 57 | 52 | 44 | 55 | 58 | 72 | 70 | 59 |
|  | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | URG | 9 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 |
|  | International | 47 | 46 | 49 | 47 | 42 | 41 | 41 | 52 | 62 | 55 |
|  | Total | 78 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 71 | 84 | 87 | 103 | 106 | 96 |
| Mechanical | Women | 17 | 17 | 17 | 9 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 18 | 25 | 24 |
|  | Men | 84 | 80 | 77 | 73 | 68 | 72 | 87 | 91 | 95 | 90 |
|  | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
|  | International | 70 | 62 | 54 | 48 | 49 | 56 | 69 | 70 | 74 | 74 |
|  | Total | 101 | 97 | 94 | 83 | 77 | 84 | 103 | 109 | 120 | 114 |
| Office of the Dean | Women | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Men | 44 | 48 | 52 | 43 | 28 | 22 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | URG | 8 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | International | 8 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 60 | 63 | 63 | 55 | 35 | 31 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 2 |

Table C3. 10-Year (2011-2020) COE faculty by department, type, gender and URG status

|  |  |  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COE | CT | Women |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 10 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 21 | 19 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 8 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 23 | 28 | 29 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 23 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 26 | 28 | 29 | 34 | 33 |
|  |  | Men | 108 | 110 | 107 | 106 | 103 | 101 | 104 | 113 | 117 | 115 |
|  |  | URG | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
|  |  | Total | 131 | 133 | 128 | 127 | 127 | 127 | 132 | 142 | 151 | 148 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { СТ \& } \\ & \text { T/TT } \end{aligned}$ | Women | 23 | 23 | 21 | 24 | 28 | 32 | 36 | 37 | 41 | 43 |
|  |  | Men | 108 | 110 | 107 | 111 | 109 | 109 | 114 | 128 | 138 | 134 |
|  |  | URG | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
|  |  | Total | 131 | 133 | 128 | 135 | 137 | 141 | 150 | 165 | 179 | 177 |
| Biomedical | CT | Women |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
|  | T/TT | Women |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
|  |  | Men |  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
|  |  | URG |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  | 3 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CT \& } \\ & \text { T/TT } \end{aligned}$ | Women |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 |
|  |  | Men |  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|  |  | URG |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  | 3 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 13 |
| Chemical | CT | Women |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 23 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 18 |
|  |  | URG | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  | Total | 28 | 26 | 23 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 26 | 23 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CT \& } \\ & \text { T/TT } \end{aligned}$ | Women | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
|  |  | Men | 23 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 19 |
|  |  | URG | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  | Total | 28 | 26 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 28 | 25 |
|  <br> Environ. | CT | Women |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 20 | 20 | 21 | 19 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 18 | 18 |
|  |  | URG | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
|  |  | Total | 24 | 24 | 25 | 23 | 21 | 20 | 23 | 25 | 24 | 23 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CT \& } \\ & \text { T/TT } \end{aligned}$ | Women | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
|  |  | Men | 20 | 20 | 21 | 20 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
|  |  | URG | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
|  |  | Total | 24 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 27 | 31 | 31 | 31 |
| Computer Science | CT | Women |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
|  |  | Men | 16 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 16 |
|  |  | URG | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 22 | 23 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 23 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CT \& } \\ & \text { T/TT } \end{aligned}$ | Women | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 |
|  |  | Men | 16 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 19 | 18 | 20 |
|  |  | URG | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 22 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 27 | 27 | 29 |

Data are not available for shaded cells

Table C3. 10-Year (2011-2020) COE faculty by department, type, gender and URG status (cont.)

|  |  |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electrical \& Computer | CT | Women |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 20 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 16 | 16 | 19 | 21 | 20 |
|  |  | URG | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Total | 23 | 23 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 23 | 25 | 25 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CT \& } \\ & \text { T/TT } \end{aligned}$ | Women | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 20 | 20 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 22 | 25 | 24 |
|  |  | URG | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Total | 23 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 26 | 29 | 29 |
| Materials Science | CT | Women |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
|  |  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | Total | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 18 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CT \& } \\ & \text { T/TT } \end{aligned}$ | Women | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 16 |
|  |  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  | Total | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 19 | 21 | 21 |
| Mechanical | CT | Women |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  | Men |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
|  |  | URG |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  | T/TT | Women | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  | Men | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 23 |
|  |  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Total | 21 | 21 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 27 | 26 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CT \& } \\ & \text { T/TT } \end{aligned}$ | Women | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 23 | 27 | 24 |
|  |  | URG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Total | 21 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 25 | 27 | 30 | 29 |

Data are not available for shaded cells

Table C4. 4-Year (2017-2020) COE staff by job type, managerial role, gender and URG status

|  |  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COE | Women | 93 | 99 | 91 | 93 |
|  | Men | 57 | 81 | 83 | 76 |
|  | URG | 15 | 18 | 17 | 18 |
|  | Total | 150 | 180 | 174 | 169 |
| Admin support | Women | 82 | 84 | 78 | 79 |
|  | Men | 12 | 10 | 10 | 9 |
|  | URG | 12 | 13 | 10 | 11 |
|  | Total | 94 | 94 | 88 | 88 |
| Tech support | Women | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
|  | Men | 26 | 29 | 29 | 26 |
|  | URG | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
|  | Total | 30 | 33 | 32 | 29 |
| Research | Women | 7 | 11 | 10 | 11 |
|  | Men | 19 | 42 | 44 | 41 |
|  | URG | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
|  | Total | 26 | 53 | 54 | 52 |
| Managerial <br>  <br> Tech only) | Women | 21 | 21 | 19 | 18 |
|  | Men | 15 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
|  | URG | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
|  | Total | 36 | 38 | 33 | 31 |
| Nonmanagerial (Admin \& Tech only) | Women | 65 | 67 | 62 | 64 |
|  | Men | 23 | 22 | 25 | 22 |
|  | URG | 12 | 13 | 10 | 10 |
|  | Total | 88 | 89 | 87 | 86 |

