OXIDE 2013 Falculty Demographics Survey: Under-represented Minority Results for AY2013-14

	African American, AY 2013 - 2014		Asia-Pacific, AY 2013 - 2014		Hispanic / Latino / Latina, AY 2013 - 2014		Native American, AY 2013 - 2014		Multi-Race, AY 2013 - 2014		White, Non-Hispanic, AY 2013 - 2014		Total Faculty in Department, AY 2013 - 2014		% URM AY2013-14		
Institution	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	% URM All	% URM Female	% URM Male
Akron, U of	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	3	12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Alabama, U of, Tuscaloosa	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	3	23	7.7%	0.0%	8.7%
Arizona State U	0	0	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	30	8	36	9.1%	25.0%	5.6%
Arizona, U of	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	32	9	33	4.8%	11.1%	3.0%
Arkansas, U of, Fayetteville[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Binghamton U	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	2	13	6.7%	50.0%	0.0%
Boston College	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	2	17	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Boston U	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	5	18	4.3%	0.0%	5.6%
Bowling Green State U	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	2	8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Brandeis U	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Brigham Young U.[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Brown U	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	3	15	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Buffalo, U at	0	0	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	5	24	6.9%	0.0%	8.3%
California Inst. of Tech.	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	7	32	2.6%	0.0%	3.1%
California, U of, Berkeley	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	33	9	37	2.2%	0.0%	2.7%
California, U of, Davis[a]	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	24	9	30	2.6%	0.0%	3.3%
California, U of, Irvine[a]	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	28	8	32	2.5%	0.0%	3.1%
California, U of, Los Angeles	0	1	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	30	11	37	6.3%	0.0%	8.1%
California, U of, Riverside[a]	0	0	4	5	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	16	6	23	6.9%	0.0%	8.7%
California, U of, San Diego	0	0	1	8	2	3	0	0	0	0	4	27	7	38	11.1%	28.6%	7.9%
California, U of, San Francisco[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California, U of, Santa Barbara	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	6	26	3.1%	0.0%	3.8%
California, U of, Santa Cruz	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	3	17	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Carnegie Mellon U	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4	19	4.3%	0.0%	5.3%
Case Western Reserve U	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	5	15	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Central Florida, U of, Orlando	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	14	3	17	25.0%	66.7%	17.6%
Chicago, U of	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	2	23	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cincinnati, U of (Cincinnati)	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	5	19	8.3%	0.0%	10.5%
Clemson U	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	2	20	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Colorado State U, Fort Collins	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	9	19	3.6%	11.1%	0.0%
Colorado, U of, Boulder	0	0	1	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	31	7	40	4.3%	0.0%	5.0%
Columbia U	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4	21	8.0%	0.0%	9.5%
Connecticut, U	0	0	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	5	23	7.1%	0.0%	8.7%
Cornell U (Ithaca)	0	1	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4	25	6.9%	0.0%	8.0%
Dartmouth Colleged	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	2	15	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Delaware, U of, Newark	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	6	26	3.1%	16.7%	0.0%
Duke U	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4	17	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Duquesne U	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	3	12	6.7%	0.0%	8.3%
Emory U	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	2	20	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Florida State U (Tallahassee)	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4	31	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Florida, U of[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	24	—	—	—
Georgia Inst. of Tech. (Atlanta)	0	2	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	5	32	16.2%	20.0%	15.6%
Georgia State U	1	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	5	22	11.1%	20.0%	9.1%
Georgia, U of, Athens	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	2	25	7.4%	0.0%	8.0%
Harvard U	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	6	22	7.1%	0.0%	9.1%
Houston, U of, Downtown	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	1	21	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hunter College	1	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	9	25.0%	28.6%	22.2%
Illinois, U of, Chicago	0	0	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	3	21	4.2%	0.0%	4.8%
Illinois, U of, Urbana-Champaignd,*	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	7	26	3.0%	0.0%	3.8%
Indiana U, Bloomington	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	7	29	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Iowa State U	1	0	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	5	22	7.4%	20.0%	4.5%
Iowa, U of[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jackson State U	1	3	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	26.7%	50.0%	23.1%
Johns Hopkins U[f]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	2	16	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Kansas, U of	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	6	21	3.7%	0.0%	4.8%
Kent State U[f]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kentucky, U of (Lexington)	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	6	19	12.0%	0.0%	15.8%
Louisiana State U (Baton Rouge)	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	6	22	7.1%	0.0%	9.1%
Maryland, U of, College Parkh	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	7	30	5.4%	0.0%	6.7%
Massachusetts Inst. of Tech.	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	5	22	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Massachusetts, U of, Amherst	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	5	21	7.7%	20.0%	4.8%
Michigan State U	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	36	3	42	4.4%	0.0%	4.8%
Michigan, U of, Ann Arbor	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	26	10	30	7.5%	0.0%	10.0%
Minnesota, U of, Twin Cities	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	28	8	31	2.6%	0.0%	3.2%
Mississippi State U (Starkville)[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Montana State U, Bozeman	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4	12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Nebraska, U of, Lincoln	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	3	21	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Nevada, U of, Las Vegas	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	2	15	5.9%	0.0%	6.7%
New Mexico State U (Las Cruces)	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	3	15	11.1%	0.0%	13.3%
New Orleans, U of	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
New York U	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	3	19	9.1%	33.3%	5.3%
North Carolina State U	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	5	23	7.1%	20.0%	4.3%
North Carolina, U of, Chapel Hill	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	28	8	30	2.6%	12.5%	0.0%
North Dakota State U (Fargo)[i]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Texas, U of	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	2	16	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Northeastern U	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	15	4	19	8.7%	50.0%	0.0%
Northwestern U	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4	26	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Notre Dame, U of	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	26	6	32	2.6%	0.0%	3.1%
Ohio State U (Columbus)	0	1	2	10	1	1	0	1	0	0	9	22	12	35	8.5%	8.3%	8.6%
Oklahoma, U of (Norman)	0	1	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	13	5	19	8.3%	20.0%	5.3%
Old Dominion U	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	11	6.7%	0.0%	9.1%
Oregon State U (Corvallis)	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	5	18	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Oregon, U of	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	6	22	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pennsylvania State U (Univ. Park)	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	4	30	2.9%	0.0%	3.3%
Pennsylvania, U of	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4	24	3.6%	0.0%	4.2%
Pittsburgh, U of, Pittsburgh	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	5	27	3.1%	20.0%	0.0%
Portland State U	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4	12	6.3%	0.0%	8.3%
Princeton U	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	18	4	21	4.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Puerto Rico, U of, Río Piedras	0	0	0	1	7	14	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	18	92.0%	100.0%	88.9%
Purdue U, West Lafayette	0	1	3	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	18	12	29	7.3%	8.3%	6.9%
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	5	17	9.1%	0.0%	11.8%
Rice U	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	3	22	8.0%	0.0%	9.1%
Rochester, U of	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	2	17	5.3%	0.0%	5.9%
Rockefeller U[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rutgers U, New Brunswick	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	27	10	33	4.7%	0.0%	6.1%
South Carolina, U of, Columbia	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	23	8	27	2.9%	12.5%	0.0%
South Dakota, U of[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Florida, U of[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Southern California, U of	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	18	3	24	3.7%	0.0%	4.2%
Southern Mississippi, U of	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	9	8.3%	0.0%	11.1%
Stanford U	0	0	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4	21	4.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Stony Brook U	0	1	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	6	27	6.1%	0.0%	7.4%
Temple U[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee, U of, Knoxville	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	2	24	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Texas A&M U, College Station	0	1	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	6	30	5.6%	0.0%	6.7%
Texas Tech U	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	2	25	7.4%	0.0%	8.0%
Texas, U of, Arlington	1	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	18	10.5%	100.0%	5.6%
Texas, U of, Austin	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	3	32	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Texas, U of, El Paso	0	0	2	3	0	8	0	5	0	0	1	1	3	17	65.0%	0.0%	76.5%
Texas, U of, MD Anderson Cancer Center[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tufts U	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4	11	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
U. MD, Baltimore County	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	2	13	6.7%	0.0%	7.7%
U. WI, Milwaukee	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4	13	5.9%	0.0%	7.7%
Utah, U of	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	7	25	3.1%	14.3%	0.0%
Vanderbilt U[c]	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	3	17	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Virginia Commonwealth U	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	14	10	16	7.7%	10.0%	6.3%
Virginia Polytech. Inst. & State U (Blacksburg)	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	21	6	25	3.2%	0.0%	4.0%
Virginia, U of (Charlottesville)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	3	18	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington State U[f]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington U in St. Louis[f]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	21	2	21	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington, U of, Seattle	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	5	30	8.6%	0.0%	10.0%
Wayne State U[f]	0	0	1	5	0	2	0	0	1	0	7	13	9	20	6.9%	0.0%	10.0%
Wisconsin, U of, Madison	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	6	32	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Yale U	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	2	21	4.3%	0.0%	4.8%
Cumulative total (109 departments)[j]	10	42	85	340	23	90	3	12	5	7	397	1940	534	2456	183	38	145
% of rank by gender within race-ethnicity	19.2%	80.8%	19.8%	80.2%	20.4%	79.6%	21.4%	78.6%	41.7%	58.3%	16.9%	83.1%	17.9%	82.1%	6.1%	7.1%	5.9%
% of all faculty by gender within race-ethnicity & rank	0.3%	1.4%	2.8%	11.5%	0.8%	3.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	13.4%	65.8%	17.9%	82.1%		100%	
% of all faculty by rank within race-ethnicity	1.8%		14.3%		3.9%		0.5%		0.4%		79.2%		100.0%			100.0%	

NOTE: This data reflects the numbers of research-active tenured and tenure-track faculty with at least a 50% appointment in the department most closely identified as chemistry. Institutions were identified by the National Science Foundation as having spent the most on chemistry research in fiscal year 2011. For schools whose NSF ranking is based on multiple campuses, faculty numbers are for campus listed in parentheses. Under-represented minority (URM) includes African-American, Hispanic / Latino / Latina, Native American, and multi-race (if at least one of the multiple races-ethnicities is part of the preceding list).

[a] Did not reply to requests for information

[b] Did not provide race-ethnicity data. Totals are based on gender data provided so as to allow for cumulative calculations

[c] URM calculations do not include multi-race individuals listed as White/Asian, because these race-ethnicities are not considered under-represented

[d] URM calculations do not include multi-race individuals where race-ethnicities were not specified

[e] Race-ethnicities of 3 female assistant professors, 1 male assistant professor, 1 female full professor are unknown. These individuals are not reflected in any race-ethnicity category but are counted in Total Faculty in Department

[f] Rank is based on including the Applied Physics Laboratory

[g] Declined to participate

[h] Race-ethnicity of 1 female assistant professor is unknown. This individual is not reflected in any race-ethnicity category but is counted in Total Faculty in Department

[i] Totals across all race-ethnicities are less than the corresponding Total Faculty in Department cells because Total Faculty in Department values include faculty totals by rank and gender for departments that did not provide race-ethnicity data

[j] Of the 12 faculty listed as multi-race, 8 individuals are not included in URM calculations because their races-ethnicities were either unspecified (footnote d) or specified as White/Asian (footnote c), which is not considered under-represented. Thus, 2 female associate professors, 1 male associate professor, and 1 male full professor were included in URM calculations.