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## Fellow Nominations and Elevations - All IEEE

IEEE Data


## Fellow Elevation Probability - IEEE (bIk) and ComSoc (red)



- The largest share of all TL nominations across IEEE ( $13 \%$ ), followed by the Power \& Energy (11.8\%) and Computer (9.8\%) Societies.
- The second largest share of all RE/S nominations across IEEE (10\%), second to the Computer Society ( $14 \%$ ) and followed by the Signal Processing Society (8\%).
- The third largest share of all AE/P nominations across IEEE ( $11 \%$ ), after the Power \& Energy (22\%) and Industrial Applications (15\%) Societies.
- The fourth largest share of all EDU nominations across IEEE (9\%), after the Education (20\%), Power \& Energy (10\%), Computer (9.6\%) Societies.


## The Myth of Industry not Getting Elevated

Average (2012-2019) elevation probabilities in IEEE and ComSoc for Nominees in the four tracked employment types. The 95\% Confidence Interval for the estimate of the mean is also shown.

| ComSoc | Academia | Government | Industry | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average EP | $33.9 \% \pm 7.2 \%$ | $28.2 \% \pm 22.0 \%$ | $35.8 \% \pm 8.8 \%$ | $19.1 \% \pm 35.0 \%$ |
| IEEE | $34.2 \% \pm 2.8 \%$ | $35.7 \% \pm 4.4 \%$ | $36.2 \% \pm 4.0 \%$ | $30.9 \% \pm 15.1 \%$ |
| Average EP |  |  |  |  |

## The Real Problem Is Non-Researchers, Not Industry

Average (2012-2019) elevation probabilities in IEEE and ComSoc for Nominees in the four Fellow nomination categories. The 95\% Confidence Interval for the estimate of the mean is also shown.

|  | AE/P | EDU | RE/S | TL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ComSoc <br> Average EP | $24.0 \% \pm 17.0 \%$ | $13.5 \% \pm 16.6 \%$ | $37.4 \% \pm 6.3 \%$ | $23.4 \% \pm 11.5 \%$ |
| IEEE | $26.2 \% \pm 4.9 \%$ | $20.6 \% \pm 2.7 \%$ | $36.0 \% \pm 3.0 \%$ | $36.0 \% \pm 4.1 \%$ |
| Average EP |  |  |  |  |

We analyze a variety of reasons to explain this result in:
S. Galli and A. Reibman, "Analysis Shows No Evidence of Bias Against Fellow Nominees from Industry," The Institute, Nov. 20, 2017.

## Women in IEEE



* Since 2013 data was based on those reporting gender to IEEE


## IEEE membership by gender and grade (Dec. 2016)

## (F): Females; (M): Males; (U): Undisclosed Gender.

| Grade | (F)\% | F | (M)\% | M | (U)\% | (U) | Total per grade | Total\% per grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student | 30.3\% | 15,531 | 69.7\% | 35,716 | 28.5\% | 20,457 | 71,704 | 17.0\% |
| Graduate Stud. | 20.9\% | 6,493 | 79.1\% | 24,605 | 27.6\% | 11,832 | 42,930 | 10.2\% |
| Member | 8.7\% | 18,902 | 91.3\% | 198,103 | 14.1\% | 35,606 | 252,611 | 59.9\% |
| Senior Member | 6.4\% | 2,400 | 93.6\% | 35,018 | 3.0\% | 1,150 | 38,568 | 9.1\% |
| Fellow | 4.5\% | 339 | 95.5\% | 7,154 | 0.6\% | 49 | 7,542 | 1.8\% |
| Associate | 15.8\% | 996 | 84.2\% | 5,299 | 23.7\% | 1,958 | 8,253 | 2.0\% |
| Honorary | 4.3\% | 1 | 95.7\% | 22 | 28.1\% | 9 | 32 | 0.0\% |
| Totals | 12.7\% | 44,662 | 87.3\% | 305,917 | 16.9\% | 71,061 | 421,640 | 100.0\% |

1) Percentage of female members decreases monotonically as members move up the membership grades.
2) The $12.7 \%$ number is inflated by students, without students it would be just $8.4 \%$ vs $12 \%-14 \%$ in the world.
3) Female SM are $12.7 \%$ of $M$, but male are $17.7 \%$. Female $F$ are $14.1 \%$ of SM, but male are $20.4 \%$.

## IEEE Senior members with at least 5 years (Mar. 2019)

These are the Senor members that are eligible to be nominate for Fellow elevation

|  | Life Senior <br> Member | Senior <br> Member | Grand <br> Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Female | 137 | 2673 | 2810 |
| Male | 7595 | 27824 | 35419 |
| Unknown | 6 | 1193 | 1199 |
| Grand Total | 7738 | 31690 | 39428 |

Female SM (7.4\%) are on par with the share of female Fellow nominees (7.3\%)

## Female Fellow elevations since 1966

Female Elevations


## Female Fellow nominations \& elevations

Fellow Nominations \& Elevation - Women only


## Breakdown of female nominees

| Affiliation | AE/P | EDU | TL | RE/S | No <br> Nom. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry | $27.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ | $56.3 \%$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| Academia | $1.0 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $88.5 \%$ | 47 |
| Government | $2.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $28.0 \%$ | $69.6 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 . 5}$ |
| Other | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $<\mathbf{1}$ |


| Nom. Cat. | Acad. | Govt. | Ind. | Other | No. <br> Nom. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AE/P | $17.2 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $79.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ |
| EDU | $100.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 3}$ |
| TL | $31.0 \%$ | $33.2 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8}$ |
| RE/S | $82.1 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 3}$ |

1. By far, female RE/S nominees are the largest group with an average of 50.3 nominees per year. This is not dissimilar from the male case.
2. By far, female academic nominees are the largest group with an average of 47 nominees per year. This is not dissimilar from the male case.
3. Differently from the male case, $\mathrm{AE} / \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{EDU}$, and RE/S categories are dominated by nominees in a single employment affiliation type: industry ( $80 \%$ ), academics ( $100 \%$ !), and again academics ( $82 \%$ ), respectively.
4. Female TL nominees are equally distributed across academia, Government, and industry, while for male nominees $50 \%$ of TLs are from Industry.
5. Additional efforts should be directed at increasing the diversity of female nominees in terms of employment type: vast majority of female nominees today is from academia.

## An interesting finding

## On the statistical independence of elevation and gender

$\square$ Data suggests that the "gender" and "elevation" events can be considered independent events over the last 20 years (Fellow Class 2000-2019).

- The direct (Pr\{Pass|Gender\}) conditional elevation probability of male (38.2\%) and female (39.4\%) nominees is very close to the unconditional probability of elevation (38.3\%).
- The reverse $\operatorname{Pr}\{G e n d e r \mid P a s s\}$ conditional elevation probabilities ( $93.6 \%$ for males and $6.4 \%$ for females) are very close to the a priori unconditional distribution of male (94\%) and female nominees (6\%).
$\square$ For the 5-year average 2015-2019, the independence noted above for the 20-year average does not hold anymore. The conditional elevation for females has kept steady to $39 \%$ while the unconditional one has decreased to $33.5 \%$ like the male conditional one which is $33 \%$.
$\square$ The elevation for female nominees exhibits high variability over the past 20 years. However, in the past 10 years, the outcomes have been more consistently advantageous for a female when compared to a male nominee.


## Elevation Probability



## Plot of "Edge": Pr\{P/G\}/Pr\{P/G’\}-1

EDGE (Male and Female Nominees)


## Other Interesting Statistics

$\square$ The average (2012-2017) age of female nominees is 53.9 versus 56.3 for male nominees. For female and male nominees elevated in 2012-2016 the average age is 53.5 and 56.3, respectively.

- Females are 2.5-3 years younger than males in nominations and elevations.
$\square$ Women in the IEEE Fellow Committee
- 2019: 19\% (including the Vice-Chair)
- 2018: 12\%
- 2017: 12\% (including the Chair)
- 2016: 23\% (including the Chair)
- 2015: 18\% (including the Vice-Chair)
- 2014: 18\% (including the Vice-Chair)
- 2013: 12\%
- 2012: 10\%
- 2011: 10\%
$\square$ Women S/TC Fellow Committee Chairs
- 2019: Educ, IT, SP,
- 2018: COMP, MTT, PSE, SMC, SP, UFFC
- 2017: MTT, NPS, PHOT, SP, UFFC
- 2016: NPS, UFFC
- 2015: NPS, UFFC
- 2014: CEDA, ED, EMB, NPS, RA
- 2013: AP, ED, EMB, NPS
- 2012: EMB, NPS
- 2011: CEDA, NPS


## Thank You!

## IEEE \& WIE Membership By Region



## IEEE \& WIE Membership By Region (12/2018)

| Region | IEEE | WIE | \% WIE |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| R1 | 30,491 | 636 | $2.2 \%$ |
| R2 | 25,960 | 544 | $2.2 \%$ |
| R3 | 28,291 | 591 | $2.1 \%$ |
| R4 | 20,490 | 463 | $2.3 \%$ |
| R5 | 26,226 | 467 | $1.8 \%$ |
| R6 | 53,053 | 1,006 | $2.0 \%$ |
| R7 | 17,743 | 458 | $2.7 \%$ |
| R8 | 79,970 | 3,931 | $5.1 \%$ |
| R9 | 18,493 | 2,558 | $14.0 \%$ |
| R10 | 134,179 | 11,154 | $8.5 \%$ |

## Total IEEE and WIE Membership

| Year | IEEE | WIE | \% WIE |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2010 | 407,541 | 12,707 | $3.1 \%$ |
| 2011 | 415,989 | 14,662 | $3.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | 429,085 | 14,723 | $3.4 \%$ |
| 2013 | 431,191 | 15,455 | $3.6 \%$ |
| 2014 | 426,488 | 15,681 | $3.7 \%$ |
| 2015 | 421,355 | 17,554 | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2016 | 423,566 | 20,379 | $4.8 \%$ |
| 2017 | 417,429 | 22,968 | $5.5 \%$ |
| 2018 | 422,460 | 21,808 | $5.2 \%$ |

## Total WIE Membership 2010 to 2018



## IEEE WIE Membership 2017 and 2018

| Grade | Dec-17 | Dec-18 | \% change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Honorary | 1 |  | -100\% |
| Fellow | 119 | 122 | 3\% |
| Senior Member | 833 | 974 | 17\% |
| Member | 4,722 | 5,187 | 10\% |
| Associate Member | 150 | 212 | 41\% |
| Graduate Student | 2,343 | 2,086 | -11\% |
| Student | 14,800 | 13,227 | -11\% |
| Affiliates | 1 |  | -100\% |
| Total | 22,968 | 21,808 | -5\% |
| Region | Dec-17 | Dec-18 | \% change |
| US | 3,587 | 3,707 | 3\% |
| Canada | 453 | 458 | 1\% |
| Europe, Africa \& Middle East | 4,040 | 3,931 | -3\% |
| Latin America | 2,886 | 2,558 | -11\% |
| Asia \& Pacific | 12,002 | 11,154 | -7\% |
| Total | 22,968 | 21,808 | -5\% |
| Gender | Dec-17 | Dec-18 | \% change |
| Female | 12,464 | 12,423 | 0\% |
| Male | 6,563 | 6,214 | -5\% |
| Not Provided | 3,941 | 3,171 | -20\% |
| Total | 22,968 | 21,808 | -5\% |

* Data is based on those reporting gender to IEEE

