
FROM THE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

The following report updates progress in improving the presence and experiences of minority faculty at Penn since the publication of the comprehensive *Minority Equity Report* in May 2005.

Amy Gutmann, President

Ronald Daniels, Provost

Progress Report on Minority Equity

Background

In May of 2005, a joint faculty-administration Minority Equity Committee published a comprehensive analysis of the status of minority faculty across the University (www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v51/n31/acrobat.html). A frank self-examination based on a two and a half-year review of faculty administrative and survey data, the *Minority Equity Report* addressed four areas: (1) the diversity of the faculty by rank and comparison to our peer institutions; (2) the professional status of Penn minority faculty, including allocation of space, University-funded research grants, administrative positions, endowed and term chairs, and teaching awards; (3) promotion and salary analysis; and (4) quality of life of Penn minority faculty using qualitative and quantitative approaches.

On the whole, the *Report's* results were encouraging, finding "substantial equity" in compensation, the awarding of University research grants, the recognition of teaching excellence, and the allocation of research space. On the other hand, responding to survey results suggesting that members of underrepresented groups on the faculty were more likely than their peers to report experiencing bias or exclusion, the Committee recommended that the University "find ways to foster an academic culture in which minority faculty do not perceive themselves to be at a disadvantage."

On November 1, 2005, shortly after publication of the *Minority Equity Report*, we offered a response to the Committee's findings and recommendations (www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v52/n10/minorityequity.html). The response committed the University to:

- Examine Penn's policies and their implementation related to recruitment, retention and promotion to ensure that they are consistent with best practices; and confirm during departmental and school reviews, that their recruitment, retention, and promotion processes support the University's objectives.
- Launch broader and more effective outreach efforts to recruit minority faculty; including identifying "rising stars" in the academy who enhance the strength and diversity of our senior faculty ranks.
- Identify and disseminate information about departments or schools with successful track records in recruiting and retaining minority faculty.
- Increase our efforts to expand the pipeline of minority candidates for junior faculty positions by encouraging minority undergraduate, graduate and professional students to pursue careers in the professoriate.
- Strengthen our efforts to mentor all junior faculty and graduate students, with appreciation of the particular challenges faced by minority faculty and graduate students.
- Strive to produce complete and consistent administrative data across schools to enable appropriate analyses of faculty recruitment, promotions and departures.
- Publish periodic reports on our progress in improving the presence and experiences of Penn's minority faculty.

Summary

To monitor progress in improving the presence and experiences of minority faculty at Penn, this report examines: (a) the state of the standing faculty and changes since publication of the *Minority Equity Report*; (b) our efforts to improve recruitment and retention of minority faculty; (c) our progress in strengthening information systems to produce more useful administrative data across schools; and (d) our efforts to expand minority access to careers in the professoriate.

The following trends in the composition of the faculty are outlined in detail below:

1. In the three years from 2003 to 2006, the proportion of the standing faculty who are members of minority groups rose by roughly two percentage points, to 16.6%. In fall 2006, Asians represented 10.8% of the standing faculty, Blacks 3.2% and Hispanics 2.5%. These proportions are relatively similar to those at Penn's peer institutions.

2. Well over a quarter of new faculty hires over the 2003-2006 period were minorities, with Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians representing 4.5%, 4.3%, and 17.9% respectively, of new hires over this time.

3. Minority representation on the faculty varies considerably across schools and, especially, departments. While many have sizeable proportions of their faculties drawn from underrepresented groups, a large number of Penn's departments still contain no minority faculty members.

These trends suggest progress in recruiting a distinguished and diverse faculty, but also the need for continued, effective recruitment efforts and a strengthening of our mentorship and retention programs for junior faculty and graduate students. This report describes our many ongoing initiatives in these arenas, along with our efforts to construct improved data-management and analytic reporting systems that will enable better monitoring and policy support. Finally, we describe below a series of key student-access, pipeline, and retention initiatives for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students at Penn. Moving forward, the new Associate Vice Provost, and a new Faculty Council, for Access and Academic Support Initiatives will play key leadership roles in guiding these efforts.

The State of Penn's Standing Faculty

Faculty data published at regular intervals are central to reflection on our progress toward reaching the goal of minority equity. Nevertheless, we are mindful that such data will not tell the entire story of minority equity at Penn. Certainly they are not refined enough to capture our progress on a variety of fronts, including our efforts to create a welcoming climate for members of minority groups. Nor should we expect dramatic shifts in the composition of our faculty from year to year. Rather, we envision slow but steady progress as a result of our faculty recruitment and retention practices, coupled with concerted efforts to increase student access to higher education, a necessary precursor to full participation of minorities in academia.

FROM THE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

While published in May of 2005, the *Minority Equity Report* relied primarily on data from December 2003. The month of December was selected because personnel activity continues well into the fall semester. In examining overtime patterns, the *Report* examined the composition of the faculty in December of 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2003. In this update, we extend the timeline to reflect December of 2004, 2005, and 2006. The data are presented in Table 1.¹

In the three years from 2003 to 2006, we have achieved a meaningful increase, by roughly two percentage points, in the overall minority composition of our standing faculty (both tenure-track faculty and clinician-educators). In 2003, members of minority groups constituted 14.3% of our standing faculty, as compared to 16.6% in 2006. While modest, this gain compares favorably with historical experience; for example, the 2005 *Minority Equity Report* found that the three-year increase from 2001 to 2003 was slightly less than one percentage point. And over the 12-year period from 1991 to 2003, the average three-year increase was 1.8 percentage points. These small gains do accumulate, such that over the 15 years since 1991, Penn has increased the percentage of minorities on its standing faculty from under 9% to over 16% at present.

Minority representation, owing in part to the pipeline of graduate students and faculty applicants, varies by race and discipline. Table 2 (page 4) contains detailed information on percentages of Asian, Black, and Hispanic faculty across different schools. Asians as a proportion of the total faculty grew from 9.3% of our standing faculty in 2003 to 10.8% in 2006. Hispanic faculty increased from 1.8% to 2.5%. The percentage of Black faculty, meanwhile, stayed virtually level (however, because the overall size of the standing faculty grew, the number of Black faculty members grew slightly, from 74 to 80).

¹ The same classification methods used in the 2005 *Minority Equity Report* are used here, and are standard in institutional reporting across most US universities and colleges. Each faculty member is classified into one of five racial/ethnic categories as follows: (1) *White* (not of Hispanic origin), all persons having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East; (2) *Black* (not of Hispanic origin), all persons having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa; (3) *Hispanic*, all persons of Central and South American countries who are of Spanish origin, descent, or culture (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin), regardless of race; (4) *Asian or Pacific Islanders*, all persons having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands; (5) *American Indian or Alaskan Native*, all persons having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition. Following practices of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), a person may be included in the group to which he or she appears to belong, identifies with, or is regarded in the community as belonging. *Minority* faculty members include only persons in categories 2-5 above.

Variability in changes to the makeup of faculty across schools is also apparent in Table 2, though it should be kept in mind that on smaller faculties such as those in Annenberg, Social Policy and Practice, Design, Law, and Education, small absolute numbers of faculty can produce large changes in percentages. The schools with the highest percentage of minority faculty are Engineering and Applied Science, Social Policy and Practice, Dental Medicine, and Education; while those with the lowest percentage are Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, Law, and Annenberg. This pattern remains generally consistent with that observed by the Minority Equity Committee in 2005. The largest three-year gains were registered by the Graduate School of Education, School of Social Policy and Practice, and the School of Arts and Sciences.

Table 2 further breaks down the present composition of the faculty by rank, for each group classification. As noted in the 2005 *Minority Equity Report*, minority representation at lower ranks is significantly higher than at senior ranks, although gains have occurred at all ranks (increasing by a half percentage point among full professors, by 3.3 percentage points among associate professors, and by 3.5 percentage points among assistant professors).

Table 3 (page 5-7) presents the composition of the faculty across departments, illustrating again the substantial variability in minority representation across academic units. While many departments have sizeable proportions of their faculties drawn from underrepresented groups, a large number contain no minority faculty members. Much of this variability is a function of the small size of many units, where a difference of one or two faculty members may exert a substantial influence on the listed percentages. Focusing just on departments with ten or more faculty members helps to clarify the patterns. Among departments of this size, 11 have minorities making up a quarter or more of the faculty; six contain no minority faculty.

Given the size of Penn's standing faculty, and the natural turnover that results from retirements, resignations, or non-reappointments after mandatory review, a great deal of recruiting effort is required to produce meaningful changes in faculty composition. Consequently, we examined minority representation in the faculty overall, as well as new hires and departures. These data are displayed in Table 4 (page 7), which separately tallies new standing-faculty hires (Panel A) and departures (Panel B) from fall 2003 to fall 2006. During this three-year period, the overall size of the faculty grew modestly, by 27 faculty members. Achieving this increase, however, required the recruitment of 462 new members of the faculty since nearly that number departed owing to retirement, resignation, or other reasons.

Several patterns are noteworthy in Table 4. First, while minorities presently make up 16.6% of our standing faculty, they made up 28% of new

Table 1. Trends in Minority Standing Faculty Representation 1991-2006 by School

School	Percent Minority 1991	Percent Minority 1996	Percent Minority 2001	Percent Minority 2003	Percent Minority 2004	Percent Minority 2005	Percent Minority 2006	Percentage-Point Difference 2003-2006
Annenberg	16.7%	9.1%	14.3%	12.5%	12.5%	11.8%	11.1%	-1.4
Engineering & Applied Science	18.1%	17.9%	26.0%	25.0%	26.9%	25.5%	27.0%	2.0
Graduate School of Education	4.0%	10.7%	17.1%	16.2%	18.4%	22.0%	21.6%	5.4
Design	2.9%	3.8%	16.1%	12.9%	11.4%	12.1%	12.9%	0.0
Law	10.0%	8.8%	12.8%	12.2%	9.5%	9.5%	11.1%	-1.1
Arts and Sciences	7.3%	8.7%	10.5%	10.7%	12.7%	13.2%	14.2%	3.5
Dental Medicine	10.2%	14.8%	26.3%	25.4%	26.8%	26.0%	27.5%	2.1
Medicine	8.5%	9.1%	14.3%	15.1%	15.9%	16.6%	17.9%	2.8
Nursing	4.8%	8.9%	4.3%	6.5%	11.8%	10.4%	9.4%	2.9
Social Policy & Practice	25.0%	35.3%	33.3%	25.0%	22.2%	30.0%	28.6%	3.6
Veterinary Medicine	5.6%	3.9%	5.0%	7.0%	8.3%	9.0%	7.8%	0.8
Wharton	12.9%	7.9%	12.1%	15.1%	15.6%	14.4%	14.8%	-0.3
All	8.9%	9.4%	13.7%	14.3%	15.4%	15.7%	16.6%	2.3

hires over the 2003–2006 period (Panel A). In the fall of 2006, Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians made up 3.2%, 2.5%, and 10.8% respectively of standing faculty; by comparison, they made up 4.5%, 4.3%, and 17.9% respectively of new hires over the 2003–2006 interval. At the same time, standing faculty losses over the period, a total of 435 faculty members (Panel B) reflect almost perfectly the overall-makeup of the faculty: 3.4% Black, 2.5% Hispanic, and 10.6% Asian. We find, then, little to suggest disproportionate losses of minority faculty, while new hires show a pattern of improved minority representation.

Comparisons to Penn's Ivy-plus peers help place the data in context, since these institutions share similar challenges in trying to diversify their faculties. Such comparisons are complicated by differences in the way institutions structure their faculties and the ways different surveys gather faculty data. Here, as in the *Minority Equity Report*, we draw upon data from the US Department of Education, this time from their fall 2005 IPEDS survey. Consistent with our focus on the standing faculty, we present data for full-time, tenure-track appointments. Clinician-educators, which are not common to many of our peers, are omitted. (The Minority Equity Committee, by contrast, relied on data including associated faculty in 2005 for its peer comparisons; we believe that focusing on the standing faculty provides a clearer benchmark.). The results of this comparison, shown in Table 5 (page 8), illustrate that the percentages of minority faculty are relatively similar across the set of peer institutions. Penn is toward the front of the pack in Black faculty representation (ranked 4 of 18), but lower in Asian and Hispanic representation (ranked 12 of 18, and 16 of 18, respectively). It is important to note, however, that the low-to-high range among institutions in the percentages of minority faculty is quite narrow, particularly for representation of Blacks (from just 1.6 to 4.1%) and Hispanics (from .08 to 3.2%).

Improving Recruitment and Retention

We are making progress in building a distinguished and diverse faculty, but our success remains uneven and much more work must be done. In responding to the *Report*, we resolved that we would examine Penn's policies and their implementation related to recruitment, retention and promotion; that we would launch broader and more effective outreach efforts to recruit minority faculty; and that we would strengthen our efforts to mentor all junior faculty and graduate students, with appreciation of the particular challenges faced by minority faculty and graduate students. A variety of significant initiatives have been pursued along these lines, including the following:

- During the past academic year, we sponsored workshops with department chairs on best practices for academic searches, avoiding unconscious bias, and enhancing diversity.
- Also during the past year, Dr. Shelley Correll, a leading expert on gender inequality and social psychology, was commissioned to survey the literature on unconscious bias. Her review was circulated to deans, department chairs, search and personnel committee chairs, and others involved in the schools' appointment processes, and also discussed at a faculty recruitment workshop for department chairs last spring.
- The University has similarly commissioned studies on the challenges associated with faculty mentoring across difference, with the intention of disseminating and discussing the findings this academic year.
- In partnership with the Faculty Senate's Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity, the Council of Deans, and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee, mentoring guidelines were developed aimed at encouraging the schools to formalize these efforts. The schools have engaged in a spirited debate about how best to structure their mentoring programs, and all of the programs are currently operational.
- This fall, we sponsored a presentation on diversifying the faculty by Professor Martha Pollack, a graduate of Penn's School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and now Dean of the School of Information at the University of Michigan.
- This past academic year, we represented Penn at a meeting with a group of nine premier research institutions, the MIT 9, to discuss, among other things, the recruitment and retention of faculty of color in STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math).

The schools have also undertaken a myriad of excellent initiatives with respect to faculty recruitment and retention, and more University initiatives are planned for the upcoming academic year and beyond in this area.

Strengthening Information Systems

Following the recommendation of the Minority Equity Committee, the University committed to work at producing complete and consistent administrative data across schools, with the aim of enabling more informative analyses of faculty recruitment, promotions, and departures.

To enhance our ability to monitor the progress of faculty searches, we are presently implementing a faculty recruitment database that allows us to post positions and track applications for faculty positions. In applying through the system, candidates for faculty positions will have the option of voluntarily providing racial and ethnic self-identifications, which will both improve our record-keeping on the ethnicity of our faculty and allow administrators to readily examine pools of applicants, a valuable means of monitoring the efficacy of outreach efforts to minority faculty. When fully implemented, the new database also will contain full information (e.g., curricula vitae) on all applicants, further enhancing our ability to determine whether our recruitment efforts are reaching the best candidates. We are, at the same time, building a Faculty Information System (FIS) that tracks all faculty appointments and promotions at Penn in detail. Our efforts are now directed at developing analytic reporting systems offering access to aggregate data from FIS for school and department administrators. Finally, we are planning a system for gathering exit-interview data from faculty leaving Penn, which will prove, over time, useful in gaining a sound understanding of the factors most relevant to faculty attrition.

Opening the Pipeline at Penn

At every level—from pre-undergraduate to faculty programs—the University has worked to increase minority access to the professoriate. Because pool limitations play so significantly into our efforts to create an excellent and diverse faculty, we feel that we must address this root challenge. To that end we have taken a number of important steps.

- A variety of programs around the University seek to increase inclusion of under-represented minorities in academic and research professions. Examples include the McNair Scholars Program, a federally funded program for low-income and first-generation college students to support entry into research activities and graduate school; and PREP, a post-baccalaureate biomedical research program for underrepresented minorities.
- A search is underway to appoint an Associate Vice Provost for Access and Academic Support Initiatives, who will serve as a senior deputy to the Vice Provost for University Life and provide leadership for administration of critical student-access, pipeline, and retention initiatives for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students at Penn. A new Faculty Council for Access and Academic Support Initiatives will also be established to advise and assist us in realizing student diversity objectives.
- In the summer of 2007, we implemented the Summer Mentorship Program for 10th and 11th graders from populations underrepresented in college. During this past summer, Penn hosted 61 students from area high schools in a program that spanned our Dental Medicine, Education, Engineering, Law, Medicine, and Nursing schools.
- Last spring, following discussions with the deans about enhancing faculty diversity and improving our recruitment and retention capabilities, we instituted the Faculty Opportunity Fund. This centralized Fund provides a portion of salary and benefits for candidates who, in the dean's opinion, will make extraordinary contributions to faculty scholarship and diversity and add distinctive strength to the University overall.
- Over the past decade, the Diversity Fund has made grants to approximately 20 projects per year, many of them aimed at the recruitment and retention of minorities and economically disadvantaged students. Some focus on preparing high-school students for college. Others aim to engage and excite current Penn students and open post-graduate opportunities, such as the Asian Pacific Leadership Initiative and the Latino Professional Pathways Program.

A Continuing Effort

This progress report offers some heartening evidence of success, but underlines as well the need for perseverance and creativity in our efforts to build a diverse and exceptional faculty. We commend the Penn community for its enthusiastic embrace of the challenges before us, and for the many exciting new initiatives aimed at increasing minority equity throughout the faculty ranks. We look forward to continued innovation in this area, and expect to report even greater progress in our next formal update on this important topic.

FROM THE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Table 2. Percentage of Standing Faculty by School, Rank, and Minority Status, Fall 2006

		Black	Hispanic	Asian	Minority	Total Minority (#)	Total Faculty (#)
Annenberg	Professor	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	1	14
	Associate	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1	1
	Assistant	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	3
Engineering & Applied Science	Professor	0.0%	3.3%	15.0%	18.3%	11	60
	Associate	5.9%	5.9%	35.3%	47.1%	8	17
	Assistant	4.3%	0.0%	30.4%	34.8%	8	23
Graduate School of Education	Professor	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	3	17
	Associate	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	1	11
	Assistant	11.1%	0.0%	33.3%	44.4%	4	9
Design	Professor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	14
	Associate	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	27.3%	3	11
	Assistant	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	1	6
Law	Professor	7.5%	0.0%	2.5%	10.0%	4	40
	Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Assistant	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	1	5
Arts & Sciences	Professor	3.3%	1.1%	3.3%	7.7%	21	271
	Associate	6.7%	4.8%	11.4%	22.9%	24	105
	Assistant	1.8%	4.5%	15.5%	21.8%	24	110
Dental Medicine	Professor	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	5.3%	1	19
	Associate	8.3%	0.0%	25.0%	33.3%	4	12
	Assistant	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%	45.0%	9	20
Medicine	Professor	1.6%	1.6%	5.8%	8.9%	40	447
	Associate	2.6%	2.9%	9.4%	14.9%	52	350
	Assistant	3.3%	3.7%	21.2%	28.2%	137	485
Nursing	Professor	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	1	15
	Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	24
	Assistant	21.4%	7.1%	0.0%	28.6%	4	14
Social Policy & Practice	Professor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	11
	Associate	37.5%	0.0%	25.0%	62.5%	5	8
	Assistant	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	1	2
Veterinary Medicine	Professor	0.0%	3.8%	3.8%	7.5%	4	53
	Associate	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	3	36
	Assistant	0.0%	3.8%	3.8%	7.7%	4	52
Wharton	Professor	2.0%	0.0%	5.1%	7.1%	7	98
	Associate	2.3%	0.0%	6.8%	9.1%	4	44
	Assistant	2.9%	4.4%	22.1%	29.4%	20	68
Total All Schools	Professor	2.5%	1.3%	5.0%	8.8%	93	1,059
	Associate	4.0%	2.7%	10.2%	17.0%	105	619
	Assistant	3.6%	4.0%	19.1%	26.7%	213	797
	All Rank	3.2%	2.5%	10.8%	16.6%	411	2,475

Table 3. Standing Faculty by School, Academic Division and Department, Fall 2006

School	Academic Division	Department	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Total	Percent Minority
Annenberg	Annenberg	Total for Communication	2	0	0	16	18	11.1%
Engineering & Applied Science	Engineering	Bioengineering	0	3	0	13	16	18.8%
		Chemical	0	1	1	9	11	18.2%
		Computer & Information Science	1	7	0	19	27	29.6%
		Electrical	0	3	1	17	21	19.0%
		Material Science	0	3	0	10	13	23.1%
		Mechanical	1	5	1	4	11	63.6%
		System	0	0	0	1	1	0.0%
		Total for Engineering	2	22	3	73	100	27.0%
Graduate School of Education	Education	Total for Education	5	3	0	29	37	21.6%
Design	Design	Architecture	0	0	0	11	11	0.0%
		City Planning	0	1	0	7	8	12.5%
		Fine Arts	1	0	0	4	5	20.0%
		Historic Preservation	0	0	0	2	2	0.0%
		Landscape Architecture	0	1	1	3	5	40.0%
		Total for Design	1	2	1	27	31	12.9%
Law	Law	Law	3	2	0	40	45	11.1%
Arts & Sciences	SAS-Humanities	Classical Studies	0	0	0	11	11	0.0%
		East Asian Language & Culture	0	2	0	6	8	25.0%
		English	2	5	1	31	39	20.5%
		German	0	0	0	6	6	0.0%
		History	5	2	1	41	49	16.3%
		History of Art	1	0	0	13	14	7.1%
		Linguistics	0	2	0	10	12	16.7%
		Music	1	0	0	12	13	7.7%
		Near Eastern Language & Culture	0	0	0	13	13	0.0%
		Philosophy	0	1	0	14	15	6.7%
		Religious Studies	2	1	0	3	6	50.0%
		Romance Languages	1	0	6	11	18	38.9%
		Slavic Languages & Literature	0	0	0	4	4	0.0%
		South Asian Studies	0	1	0	3	4	25.0%
		SAS-Humanities Total	12	14	8	178	212	16.0%
		SAS-Natural Science	Biology	0	3	0	27	30
	Chemistry		0	4	0	27	31	12.9%
	Earth & Environmental Science		0	0	0	6	6	0.0%
	Mathematics		0	1	0	25	26	3.8%
	Physics & Astronomy		1	7	0	27	35	22.9%
	Psychology		0	1	0	26	27	3.7%
	SAS-Natural Science Total		1	16	0	138	155	11.0%
	SAS-Social Science	Anthropology	1	2	2	14	19	26.3%
		Criminology	0	0	0	3	3	0.0%
		Economics	0	2	2	28	32	12.5%
		History & Sociology of Science	0	0	0	10	10	0.0%
		Political Science	1	2	1	25	29	13.8%
		Sociology	3	2	0	21	26	19.2%
		SAS-Social Science Total	5	8	5	101	119	15.1%
	Total for Arts & Sciences	18	38	13	417	486	14.2%	

(Table 3 continues on next page)

FROM THE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

School	Academic Division	Department	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Total	Percent Minority		
Dental Medicine	Dental-Basic Science	Biochemistry	0	0	0	4	4	0.0%		
		Histology	0	0	0	4	4	0.0%		
		Microbiology	0	1	0	3	4	25.0%		
		Pathology	0	2	0	3	5	40.0%		
		Dental-Basic Total	0	3	0	14	17	17.6%		
	Dental-Clinical	Dental Care Systems	2	0	0	1	3	66.7%		
		Endodontics	0	2	0	1	3	66.7%		
		Oral Medicine	1	0	1	4	6	33.3%		
		Oral Surgery	0	0	1	6	7	14.3%		
		Orthodontics	0	1	1	2	4	50.0%		
		Pedodontics	0	0	0	2	2	0.0%		
		Periodontics	0	0	0	4	4	0.0%		
		Restorative Dentistry	1	1	0	3	5	40.0%		
		Dental-Clinical Total	4	4	3	23	34	32.4%		
		Total for Dental Medicine	4	7	3	37	51	27.5%		
		Medicine	SOM-Basic Science	Biochemistry & Biophysics	0	2	0	17	19	10.5%
				Biostatistics & Epidemiology	5	9	0	23	37	37.8%
Cancer Biology	0			2	0	4	6	33.3%		
Cell & Development Biology	0			3	0	11	14	21.4%		
Genetics	0			3	0	11	14	21.4%		
Medical Ethics	0			0	0	3	3	0.0%		
Microbiology	1			4	0	14	19	26.3%		
Neuroscience	0			2	2	14	18	22.2%		
Pharmacology	0			1	1	18	20	10.0%		
Physiology	0			4	1	16	21	23.8%		
SOM-Basic Total	6		30	4	131	171	23.4%			
SOM-Clinical	Anesthesia		1	11	3	59	74	20.3%		
	Dermatology		2	3	0	18	23	21.7%		
	Emergency Medicine		1	2	2	25	30	16.7%		
	Family Medicine		0	0	0	11	11	0.0%		
	Medicine		4	23	5	211	243	13.2%		
	Neurology		0	3	2	50	55	9.1%		
	Neurosurgery		0	1	1	11	13	15.4%		
	Obstetrics & Gynecology		1	2	2	17	22	22.7%		
	Ophthalmology		0	1	1	21	23	8.7%		
	Orthopaedic Surgery		4	0	1	31	36	13.9%		
	Otorhinolaryngology		1	6	0	21	28	25.0%		
	Pathology		1	17	2	72	92	21.7%		
	Pediatrics		3	20	7	152	182	16.5%		
	Psychiatry		5	1	0	73	79	7.6%		
	Radiation Oncology		1	9	0	15	25	40.0%		
	Radiology		1	19	3	59	82	28.0%		
	Rehabilitation Medicine		0	1	1	4	6	33.3%		
	Surgery		1	13	1	72	87	17.2%		
	SOM-Clinical Total		26	132	31	922	1,111	17.0%		
	Total for Medicine		32	162	35	1,053	1,282	17.9%		

(Table 3 continues on next page)

School	Academic Division	Department	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Total	Percent Minority
Nursing	Nursing	Biobehavioral & Health Science	1	0	1	28	30	6.7%
		Family & Community Health	3	0	0	20	23	13.0%
		Total for Nursing	4	0	1	48	53	9.4%
Social Policy & Practice	Social Policy	Social Policy & Practice	4	2	0	15	21	28.6%
Veterinary Medicine	Veterinary	Clinical Studies-New Bolton	0	2	2	39	43	9.3%
		Clinical Studies-Philadelphia	0	2	1	44	47	6.4%
		Veterinary Animal Biology	0	2	1	19	22	13.6%
		Pathobiology	0	1	0	28	29	3.4%
		Total for Veterinary Medicine	0	7	4	130	141	7.8%
Wharton	Wharton	Accounting	0	1	0	16	17	5.9%
		Business & Public Policy	0	0	0	10	10	0.0%
		Finance	0	4	0	36	40	10.0%
		Health Care	0	0	0	5	5	0.0%
		Insurance & Risk	0	0	0	7	7	0.0%
		Legal Studies	1	2	0	12	15	20.0%
		Management	1	4	0	34	39	12.8%
		Marketing	1	3	0	21	25	16.0%
		Operations & Information	1	6	1	18	26	30.8%
		Real Estate	1	1	2	4	8	50.0%
		Statistics	0	2	0	16	18	11.1%
Total for Wharton	5	23	3	179	210	14.8%		
All	University-Wide	University-Wide Total	80	268	63	2,064	2,475	16.6%

Table 4. New Faculty Recruitments and Departures, Fall 2003 to Fall 2006

Panel A. Faculty Recruitments						Panel B. Faculty Departures					
	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White/Other	Total		Black	Hispanic	Asian	White/Other*	Total
Annenberg	1	0	0	1	2	Annenberg	1	0	0	0	1
Engineering & Applied Science	0	0	7	5	12	Engineering & Applied Science	1	0	3	11	15
Graduate School of Education	1	0	1	3	5	Graduate School of Education	0	0	0	6	6
Design	0	0	0	5	5	Design	0	0	0	8	8
Law	0	0	1	6	7	Law	0	0	1	3	4
Arts and Sciences	5	3	13	61	82	Arts and Sciences	3	4	4	64	75
Dental Medicine	0	2	1	6	9	Dental Medicine	1	0	2	12	15
Medicine	10	12	49	176	247	Medicine	7	5	30	201	243
Nursing	2	0	0	12	14	Nursing	1	0	0	10	11
Social Policy & Practice	1	0	1	3	5	Social Policy & Practice	0	0	0	3	3
Veterinary Medicine	0	2	2	32	36	Veterinary Medicine	1	0	1	26	28
Wharton	1	1	8	28	38	Wharton	0	2	5	19	26
Total	21	20	83	338	462	Total	15	11	46	363	435
Percent of Total	4.5%	4.3%	17.9%	73.0%	100%	Percent of Total	3.4%	2.5%	10.6%	83.4%	100%

* Includes one Native American faculty member

FROM THE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Table 5. Percentage of Full-time Faculty by Minority Group Among Peer Universities, Fall 2005

	Am. Indian or Alaska Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black non- Hispanic	Hispanic
University of Pennsylvania	0.1%	7.6%	3.4%	1.3%
Rank of Penn among Peer Set	7 of 18	12 of 18	4 of 18	16 of 18
Brown University	0.2%	5.6%	3.9%	1.9%
Columbia University in the City of New York	0.1%	11.1%	3.0%	2.5%
Cornell University	0.5%	6.7%	3.0%	2.4%
Dartmouth College	0.4%	5.1%	3.0%	2.8%
Duke University	0.1%	7.7%	3.4%	1.8%
Georgetown University	0.0%	9.3%	4.1%	2.5%
Harvard University	0.3%	7.4%	2.6%	1.6%
Johns Hopkins University	0.0%	13.2%	3.0%	2.1%
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	0.0%	9.0%	3.0%	1.2%
Northwestern University	0.1%	10.3%	3.2%	2.4%
Princeton University	0.0%	8.2%	2.9%	1.9%
Rice University	0.2%	7.4%	1.9%	3.2%
Stanford University	0.3%	10.0%	2.9%	2.5%
University of Chicago	0.0%	11.3%	2.3%	1.5%
University of Rochester	0.0%	6.4%	1.6%	0.8%
Washington University in St Louis	0.0%	9.3%	2.6%	1.8%
Yale University	0.0%	9.2%	3.5%	2.0%

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Faculty by Ethnicity, Fall 2005

Includes Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty of rank Assistant Professor or higher

Does not include Clinician Educators