

1999 Annual Survey of the Mathematical Sciences

(Second Report)

Updated Report on the 1999 Survey of New Doctoral Recipients, Starting Salary Survey of New Doctoral Recipients, Faculty Profile, Enrollment and Undergraduate Majors Profile, and Graduate Student Profile

Don O. Loftsgaarden, James W. Maxwell, and Kinda Remick Priestley

This Second Report of the 1999 Survey gives an update of the 1998-99 new doctoral recipients from the First Report, which appeared in the *Notices of the AMS* in February 2000, pages 231-43. It also gives information about faculty size, departmental enrollments, majors, and graduate students for departments of mathematical sciences in four-year colleges and universities in the United States. The First Report gave salary data for faculty members in these same departments.

The 1999 Annual Survey represents the forty-third in an annual series begun in 1957 by the Society. The 1999 Survey is under the direction of the Annual Survey Data Committee, a joint committee of the American Mathematical Society, the American Statistical Association, the Institute of Mathematical Statistics, and the Mathematical Association of America. The current members of this committee are Lorraine Denby, J. Douglas Faires, Mary W. Gray, Alfred W. Hales, Peter E. Haskell, Ellen E. Kirkman, James Kister, James Lewis, Don O. Loftsgaarden (chair), James W. Maxwell (*ex officio*), and Yashiswini Mittal. The committee is assisted by AMS survey analyst Kinda Remick Priestley and survey coordinator Colleen Rose. Comments or suggestions regarding this Survey Report may be directed to the committee.

Introduction

The Annual Survey of the Mathematical Sciences collects information each year about departments, faculties, and students in the mathematical sciences at four-year colleges and universities in the United States. Definitions of the various groups surveyed in the Annual Survey can be found in the box on page 904 of this report. For the first time this year, departments in Group Vb are no longer being surveyed. More discussion of this can be found in the 1999 First Report referenced above. This Second Report includes data from three parts of the 1999 Annual Survey. First, we update information about new doctoral recipients reported earlier in the February 2000 issue of the *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* (pages 231-43). Second, we present the starting salaries of the new

doctoral recipients who responded to a follow-up survey. Third, we present information about the faculties and instructional programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels in these departments for the 1999-2000 academic year. We report the same kinds of information in the Second Report that was reported last year and in earlier years. Several tables have been added specifically showing time trends for many variables for the 1990s.

The updated information for new doctoral recipients, since the First Report, was gathered using a questionnaire, Employment Experiences of New Doctoral Recipients, which was sent in early October 1999 to all new doctoral recipients whose address was known. This questionnaire has a number of questions on it that are the same as those on a questionnaire used by several other scientific disciplines, so that results from this questionnaire can be compared with those in other fields. Reports on these comparative data are available through *Science* magazine's Next Wave Web site at www.nextwave.org/. This particular questionnaire has been used since 1997, and more information about it can be found in the Second Report for 1998.

Information about departments and their faculties is gathered on a questionnaire, the Departmental Profile, mailed to all departments of mathematical sciences in the U.S. Projections to the entire population have been made using the data from the responding departments within each group. Since the projections are made using data from the departments who respond in a given year as opposed to a scientific random sample, biases in the projections can occur. Since the response rates for the doctoral grant-

ing departments is very high, it is felt that any biases in the projections for these groups are likely small. However, the response rates for the bachelor's and master's departments are much lower, usually less than 50% for bachelor's departments.

Because of the low response rates for the bachelor's and master's groups, past projections for these groups have been less reliable than those for the doctoral groups. Examination of past results and comparison with results from other sources indicate that some projections for these groups in the past were likely to have been on the high side. Beginning this year, stratified random samples of departments in Groups B and M were drawn, and projections were made from the Departmental Profile survey using these stratified random samples. These projections should be more accurate and free of the biases that may have been present in past projections for Groups M and B. The stratification in each group was based on the size of the school and whether it was a public or private school. Because of this change in methodology, results from the Departmental Profile Survey for 1999 that involve Groups M and B may not be directly comparable to the same results from last year and earlier years.

Update on the 1999 Survey of New Doctoral Recipients

Information about recipients of doctoral degrees awarded between July 1, 1998, and June 30, 1999, was collected from doctorate-granting departments in late spring 1999 and from a follow-up census of individual degree recipients beginning in October. The "1999 Annual Survey First Report" (*Notices of the AMS*, February 2000, pages 231-43) presents the survey results obtained about new doctoral recipients from the departments. Here we update the earlier figures on the basis of the follow-up census of the doctoral recipients themselves.

The names of the 1998-99 doctoral recipients and their thesis titles were published in "Doctoral Degrees Conferred" (*Notices of the AMS*, February 2000, pages 253-271). A supplement to this list appears at the end of this report.

Table/Figure 1 shows the fall and final counts of new doctoral recipients in the mathematical sciences awarded by U.S. institutions from 1992 through 1999. This year's final count of 1,135 represents a decrease of 3.5% from the 1,176 doctorates awarded during 1997-98. Numbers in this table/figure have been revised from previous reports to exclude new doctorates data from

Don O. Loftsgaarden is professor emeritus of mathematics, University of Montana. James W. Maxwell is AMS associate executive director for Professional Services. Kinda Remick Priestley is AMS survey analyst.

Highlights

There were 1,135 new doctoral recipients from U.S. institutions for 1998-99, down 3.5% from the previous year.

The 560 U.S. citizen new doctoral recipients was 49.3% of the total, the highest percentage since 1986-87. Women totaled 318 of the new doctoral recipients, a new high, surpassing the previous high of 298 set last year. There were 188 female U.S. citizen new doctorates, surpassing last year's record high of 163. The percentage of females among U.S. citizens was 33.6%, another all-time high. The number of male U.S. citizen new doctorates was down 51 from last year, a 12.1% drop.

The final fall 1999 unemployment rate for new doctoral recipients was 4.7%, following 4.9% in fall 1998 and 3.8% in Fall 1997.

Among 1998-99 doctoral recipients taking employment in the U.S., 26.9% took nonacademic employment (government or business and industry), compared to 35.3% for 1997-98. Forty-nine fewer new doctoral recipients accepted positions in business and industry than last year.

Sixty-three more new doctoral recipients found employment in U.S. academic institutions than in 1997-98.

Median salaries for new doctoral recipients taking 9-10 month positions in U.S. academic institutions had nice increases from 1997-98. Median female salaries increased from \$37,700 to \$39,000, while those for males increased from \$37,000 to \$40,000.

Groups I, II, III, M, and B had openings in fall 1999 for 1,510 full-time doctoral faculty, of which only 996 (66.0%) were tenure-track positions.

For all groups surveyed for this report, the estimated number of full-time faculty was 20,137, of which 23.3% were females. Groups having the highest percentage of females among their full-time faculty were Group B (30.6%), Group M (27.7%), Group III (20.2%), and Group IV (19.1%).

The number of junior/senior mathematics majors dropped from 72,800 in 1992 to 56,200 in 1999, a drop of 22.8%. Female majors dropped 22.9% during this same time period. The percentage of the majors who are females remained relatively constant during this time period at close to 43%.

The number of full-time graduate students in Groups I, II, and III dropped from 10,121 in 1992 to 8,016 in 1999, a drop of 20.8%. This same drop for full-time females was 2,895 to 2,489, a drop of 14.1%. The drop for males was 23.5%. Full-time U.S. citizen graduate students dropped from 5,759 in 1992 to 4,231 in 1999, a drop of 26.5%.


Part-time graduate students are reported for the first time this year. Groups I, II, and III combined had 1,255 part-time graduate students, with 54.2% in Group III. Group M had 7,254 part-time graduate students, which makes up 77.2% of their graduate students. A high percentage of part-time graduate students are U.S. citizens.

Group Vb departments, which are no longer surveyed.

Citizenship status is known for all of the 1,135 new doctoral recipients. The final count of new doctoral recipients who are U.S. citizens is 560. The percentage of 1998-99 new doctoral recipients who are U.S. citizens is 49.3%, up slightly from the reported 48.1% of the past year, and is the largest percentage reported by the Annual Survey since 1986-87. The final count of new doctoral recipients who are non-

Table/Figure 1: U.S. New Doctoral Recipients, Fall and Final Counts, 1992 to 1999

Year	Fall	Final
1992-93	1104	1116
1993-94	1025	1034
1994-95	1148	1157
1995-96	1098	1099
1996-97	1123	1130
1997-98	1163	1176
1998-99	1133	1135



total number of new doctorates for 1998-99 is down slightly from last year. The number of U.S. citizen men, 372, decreased by 51 (12.1%) from 1997-98.

Tables 2A and 2B display updates of employment data, found in these same tables in the First Report, for the fall count of 1998-99 doctoral recipients plus two additional doctoral recipients reported late. These tables are partitioned by field of thesis research and by the survey group of their degree department. At the time of this Second Report, the fall 1999 employment status of 1,021 of the 1,135 doctoral recipients was known.

The fall 1999 unemployment rate for new doctoral recipients, based on information gathered by the time of the Second Report, was 4.7%. The unemployment rate rose steadily in the early 1990s and reached its all-time high of 10.7% in 1994 and held that rate through 1995. It began to decrease in 1996 and dropped off in 1997 to 3.8%. Last year it was 4.9%. All of these rates are still well above the rates of the 1970s

and 1980s. The counts on which these rates are determined do not include those new doctoral recipients whose fall employment status was unknown at the time of the Second Report. Figure 3 presents the fall 1978 through fall 1999 trend in the final fall unemployment rate of new doctoral recipients. Note that prior to 1999, the unemployment rate for Group Vb is included in the total unemployment rate for each year.

Of the 560 U.S. citizen new doctoral recipients, 188 are women and 372 are men. The 188 women new doctoral recipients comprise 33.6% of the U.S. citizen total for 1998-99, an increase over last year's count of 163, which was 27.8% of the U.S. citizen new doctoral recipients, even though the

and 1980s. The counts on which these rates are determined do not include those new doctoral recipients whose fall employment status was unknown at the time of the Second Report. Figure 3 presents the fall 1978 through fall 1999 trend in the final fall unemployment rate of new doctoral recipients. Note that prior to 1999, the unemployment rate for Group Vb is included in the total unemployment rate for each year.

Of the 1,021 new doctoral recipients whose employment status is known, 59.7% found academic employment in the U.S. (including 3.1% in research institutes and other nonprofits). Another 10.0% took academic employment in other countries. These same figures for 1997-98 were 52.2% (including 2.9% in research institutes and other nonprofits) and 11.0%

While employment of 1998-99 doctoral recipients by U.S. Ph.D.-granting institutions increased by 27.8% from the corresponding figure for 1997-98, employment by research institutes, government, and business and industry decreased by 24.3% (including a decrease of 27.0% in employment by business and industry).

Among those 1998-99 doctoral recipients taking employment in the U.S., 26.9% took nonacademic employment (government or business and industry). This is down from 35.3% in 1997-98. This is a substantial change from the past few years and is almost certainly due to the fact that more academic jobs were available in the U.S. for fall 1999. Among new doctoral recipients who are known to have employment, the number taking nonacademic employment (U.S. government, U.S. business and industry, and non-U.S. nonacademic) varied significantly by field of thesis. Of those whose field of thesis was algebra/number theory; real, complex, functional, or harmonic analysis; or geometry/topology, 12.5% took nonacademic employment. For probability or statistics the analogous figure is 40.5%; and for applied mathematics, discrete mathematics, combinatorics, logic, computer science, numerical analysis, approximations, linear, or nonlinear optimization the analogous figure is 29.2%.

Of the 1,135 doctoral degrees awarded in the mathematical sciences between July 1, 1998, and June 30, 1999, 39.1% (444) were awarded by Group I departments, 21.2% (241) by Group II, and 12.2% (138) by Group III.

Tables 4A through 4G first appeared in the First Report for 1998-99, although they do not have the same table numbers in that report. They have all been updated with information obtained from the individual new doctoral recipients using a follow-up questionnaire. Here are a few things we can glean from these tables. Forty-nine fewer new doctoral recipients accepted jobs in business and industry compared to last year, a drop of 20.9%. Sixty-three more

Table 2A: Fall 1999 Employment Status of 1998-99 U.S. Doctoral Recipients in the Mathematical Sciences, Updated April 2000


TYPE OF EMPLOYER	FIELD OF THESIS											TOTAL		
	Algebra Number Theory	Real, Comp., Funct., & Harmonic Analysis	Geometry/Topology	Discr. Math./Combin./Logic/Comp. Sci.	Probability	Statistics	Applied Math.	Numerical Analysis/Approximations	Linear Nonlinear Optim./Control	Differential, Integral, & Difference Equations	Math. Education		Other/Unknown	
Group I (Public)	23	9	22	11	3	0	3	4	1	12	0	0	88	
Group I (Private)	13	6	14	2	3	1	7	3	0	6	0	0	55	
Group II	16	12	9	5	2	0	4	7	1	6	0	0	62	
Group III	5	2	3	1	0	8	1	0	1	5	2	0	28	
Group IV	1	0	0	0	1	43	0	0	0	2	0	0	47	
Group Va	0	0	1	2	0	2	6	3	2	3	0	0	19	
Master's	14	9	11	4	0	6	2	3	1	2	2	0	54	
Bachelor's	34	15	19	22	3	10	8	9	1	14	3	1	139	
Two-Year College	4	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	0	3	0	0	18	
Other Academic Dept.	3	3	4	7	2	20	12	5	3	3	6	0	68	
Research Institute/Other Nonprofit	6	1	0	0	4	13	1	3	1	3	0	0	32	
Government	1	7	1	0	5	13	3	5	0	3	0	1	39	
Business and Industry	10	5	15	15	8	70	22	18	5	16	0	1	185	
Non-U.S. Academic	18	15	11	11	3	21	5	5	1	12	0	0	102	
Non-U.S. Nonacademic	1	2	2	0	4	5	2	1	0	2	0	0	19	
Not Seeking Employment	3	2	5	2	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	18	
Still Seeking Employment	9	8	6	1	4	9	6	0	0	5	0	0	48	
Unknown (U.S.)	6	4	8	7	6	28	7	5	1	2	2	0	76	
Unknown (non-U.S.) ¹	4	1	6	3	0	15	5	2	0	1	0	1	38	
COLUMN TOTAL	171	103	139	95	50	269	94	76	18	101	15	4	1135	
COLUMN SUBTOTALS	Male	125	77	107	73	34	173	67	58	13	78	10	2	817
	Female	46	26	32	22	16	96	27	18	5	23	5	2	318

¹ Includes those whose status is reported as "unknown" or "still seeking employment".**Table 2B: Fall 1999 Employment Status of 1998-99 U.S. Doctoral Recipients by Type of Degree-Granting Department, Updated April 2000**

TYPE OF EMPLOYER	TYPE OF DOCTORAL DEGREE-GRANTING DEPARTMENT						ROW TOTAL	ROW SUBTOTAL	
	Group I (Public) Math	Group I (Private) Math	Group II Math	Group III Math	Group IV Statistics	Group Va Applied Math		Male	Female
Group I (Public)	50	23	10	2	0	3	88	63	25
Group I (Private)	17	29	3	1	1	4	55	43	12
Group II	22	6	28	3	1	2	62	43	19
Group III	7	0	4	11	6	0	28	17	11
Group IV	1	2	0	2	40	2	47	27	20
Group Va	3	2	1	0	1	12	19	15	4
Master's	14	3	21	13	3	0	54	40	14
Bachelor's	32	13	54	30	6	4	139	91	48
Two-Year College	5	1	6	4	1	1	18	14	4
Other Academic Dept.	10	5	16	15	15	7	68	48	20
Research Institute/Other Nonprofit	5	7	3	1	12	4	32	21	11
Government	6	1	11	4	14	3	39	27	12
Business and Industry	32	24	28	21	66	14	185	141	44
Non-U.S. Academic	37	18	18	3	21	5	102	78	24
Non-U.S. Nonacademic	5	2	3	1	7	1	19	16	3
Not Seeking Employment	3	5	1	3	4	2	18	10	8
Still Seeking Employment	15	4	12	5	9	3	48	36	12
Unknown (U.S.)	16	6	14	15	23	2	76	56	20
Unknown (non-U.S.) ¹	12	1	8	4	13	0	38	31	7
COLUMN TOTAL	292	152	241	138	243	69	1135	817	318
COLUMN SUBTOTALS	Male	214	114	175	104	156	817		
	Female	78	38	66	33	87	318		

¹ Includes those whose status is reported as "unknown" or "still seeking employment".

Figure 3: Percentage of New Doctoral Recipients Unemployed, As Reported in the Respective Annual Survey Second Reports, 1978-1999



U.S. For academic positions other than in the doctoral departments, about two-thirds of the new doctoral recipients hired were U.S. citizens. Table 4G shows the citizenship of the 1,135 new doctoral recipients and the fact that 834 new doctoral recipients found jobs in the U.S. this year.

Of the 1,133 new doctoral recipients reported in the

new doctoral recipients were hired in U.S. academic institutions than last year, an increase of 11.5%. Group I, II, and III departments hired 46 more new doctoral recipients this year than they

Table 4A: Number of New Doctoral Recipients Taking Positions in Business and Industry by Type of Degree-Granting Department, Fall 1998 and Fall 1999

Group	I (Pu)	I (Pr)	II	III	IV	Va	Total
Fall 1998	37	27	44	25	75	26	234
Fall 1999	32	24	28	21	66	14	185

did last year, an increase of 24.6%, while the number of new doctoral recipients hired by Group M and B departments is down by 10 (4.9%). New doctoral recipients from Group I Public departments have the highest unemployment rate this year at 5.7%, while those from Group I Private departments have the lowest unemployment rate at 2.8%. Table 4F shows that academic doctoral departments, Groups I through Va, hired 50% U.S. citizens, and the same thing is true for the hiring for nonacademic positions in the

Table 4B: Number of New Doctoral Recipients Taking U.S. Academic Positions by Type of Degree-Granting Department, Fall 1998 and Fall 1999

Group	I (Pu)	I (Pr)	II	III	IV	Va	Total
Fall 1998	133	100	138	61	85	30	547
Fall 1999	166	91	146	82	86	39	610

First Report, the 977 whose addresses were known were sent the Employment Experiences of New Doctoral Recipients (EENDR) survey in October 1999, and 590 (60.4%) responded. The response rates varied considerably among the various subgroups of new doctorates defined by their employment status as reported by departments. They ranged from 63.9% for those employed in academia in the U.S. down to 37.5% for individuals in the U.S. whose employment status was unknown to the department.

Table 4C: U.S. Academic Positions Filled by New Doctoral Recipients by Type of Hiring Department, Fall 1998 and Fall 1999

Group	I-III	IV	Va	M&B	Other	Total
Fall 1998	187	36	5	203	116	547
Fall 1999	233	47	19	193	118	610

The EENDR gathered details on employment experiences not available through departments. The rest of this section presents the additional information available on this subset of the 1998-99 doctoral recipients.

Of the 590 total respondents to the EENDR, 512 were employed in the U.S., 53 were employed outside the U.S., and 25 were unemployed in the U.S. as of the week of October 11, 1999. Among those employed in the U.S., 485 were employed full-time and 27 were employed part-time. Of the 27 reporting part-time employment, 13 reported that they were working

part-time because a suitable full-time job was not available. Five also reported they were working part-time while they pursued additional education.

Among the 512 employed in the U.S., 273 reported obtaining a permanent position and 237

Table 4D: Percentage of Female New Doctoral Recipients Produced by and Hired by Doctoral-Granting Departments, 1998-99

%	I (Pu)	I (Pr)	II	III	IV	Va	Total
Produced	26.7	25.0	27.4	23.9	35.8	23.2	28.0
Hired	28.4	21.8	30.6	39.3	42.6	21.1	30.4

a temporary position (2 individuals did not answer this question). Of the 237 in temporary positions, 101 (42.6%) reported taking temporary employment because a suitable permanent position was not available and 155 (65.4%) classified their position as postdoctoral. Furthermore, among those in postdoctoral positions, 37.4% responded that they took the position because a suitable permanent position was not available.

Among the 273 who reported obtaining a permanent position in the U.S., 59.3% were employed in academia (including 4.0% in research institutes and other nonprofits), 36.6% in business or industry, and 4.0% in government. Women held 31.1% of the permanent positions.

Among the 237 individuals with temporary employment in the U.S., 94.1% were employed in academia (including 5.1% in research institutes and other nonprofits), 0.4% in business or industry, and 5.5% in government.

Among the 53 individuals employed outside the U.S., 83.0% were employed in academia (in-

cluding 13.2% in research institutes and other nonprofits), 15.1% in business or industry, and 1.9% in government. Seven of those employed outside the U.S. were U.S. citizens, and three were U.S. permanent residents.

The most frequently used job search resources were electronic at 58.0%, periodicals (newsletters, magazines, and journals) at 44.5%, informal channels (networking with colleagues or friends) at 43.3%, and faculty advisor at 42.9%. The re-

Table/Figure 4E: Percentage of Unemployed New Doctoral Recipients by Type of Degree-Granting Department, Fall 1998 and Fall 1999

%	I (Pu)	I (Pr)	II	III	IV	Va	Total
Fall 1998	5.4	3.7	7.0	8.9	3.1	1.4	4.9
Fall 1999	5.7	2.8	5.5	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.7




Table 4F: New Doctoral Recipients Having Employment in the U.S. by Type of Employer and Citizenship


Employer	U.S.	Non-U.S.	Total
U.S. Academic, Groups I-Va	151	148	299
U.S. Academic, Other	209	102	311
U.S. Nonacademic	113	111	224
Total	473	361	834

Table 4G: Employment Status of 1998-99 U.S. New Doctoral Recipients by Type of Citizenship

TYPE OF EMPLOYER	U.S. CITIZENS	CITIZENSHIP			TOTAL DOCTORAL RECIPIENTS
		NON-U.S. CITIZENS			
		Permanent Visa	Temporary Visa	Unknown Visa	
U.S. Employer	473	70	280	11	834
U.S. Academic	360	45	198	7	610
Groups I, II, III, and Va	132	14	104	2	252
Group IV	19	7	18	3	47
Non-Ph.D. Department	197	20	61	1	279
Research Institute/Other Nonprofit	12	4	15	1	32
U.S. Nonacademic	113	25	82	4	224
Non-U.S. Employer	18	4	91	8	121
Non-U.S. Academic	14	2	80	6	102
Non-U.S. Nonacademic	4	2	11	2	19
Not Seeking Employment	10	1	7	0	18
Still Seeking Employment	22	3	23	0	48
SUBTOTAL	523	78	401	19	1021
Unknown (U.S.)	36	10	23	7	76
Unknown (non-U.S.) ¹	1	0	29	8	38
TOTAL	560	88	453	34	1135

¹ Includes those whose status is reported as "unknown" or "still seeking employment".

Figure 5: Distribution of Job Satisfaction



maining types of resources are used much less often, each below 18%. When asked to indicate the single most effective job search resource, 43.8% chose electronic resources. The next highest was informal channels at 18.2%, followed by periodicals at 9.4%. Not surprisingly, 74.6% reported using two or more of these methods. The AMS's Web site, e-MATH, was the most frequently mentioned electronic resource. The *Notices of the AMS* was the most frequently mentioned publication, followed by *Amstat News*, the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and then the publications of other mathematical societies.

Figure 6: Age Distribution of New Doctoral Recipients




Figure 5 presents the distribution of responses to the following set of four statements to which doctoral recipients were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement regarding the position they obtained for fall 1999. Response options ranged from 5 for "strongly agree" down to 1 for "strongly disagree".

1. The position is related to my field.
2. The position is commensurate with my education and training.
3. The position is similar to what I expected to be doing when I began my doctoral program.
4. The position is professionally challenging.

Figure 6 gives the age distribution of the 582 new doctoral recipients who responded to this question. The median age of new doctoral recipients was 30.5, while the mean age was 31.8. The first and third quartiles were 28 and 34 respectively. These figures are almost identical to those reported last year.

Starting Salary Survey of New Doctoral Recipients

The salary figures for 1999 were compiled from information gathered on the EENDR questionnaires sent to individuals who received doctoral degrees in the mathematical sciences during the 1998-99 academic year from universities in the United States (see previous section for more details).

The questionnaires were distributed to 977 recipients of degrees using addresses provided by the departments granting the degrees; 590 individuals responded between late October and April. Responses with insufficient data or from individuals who indicated they had part-time employment were considered unusable. Numbers of usable responses for each salary category are reported in the following tables.

Readers should be warned that the data in this report are obtained from a self-selected sample, and inferences from them may not be representative of the population. [Also note that no projections have been made with this salary data. The salaries of the responding new doctoral recipients have simply been summarized in the various categories into which they fall.]

Key to Tables. Salaries are listed in hundreds of dollars. Nine-month salaries are based on 9-10 months' teaching and/or research, not adding extra stipends for summer grants or summer teaching or the equivalent. Years listed are the academic year in which the doctorate was received. M and F are male and female respectively. Some persons receiving a doctoral degree had been employed in their present position for several years. Quartile figures are given only in cases where the number of responses is large

enough to make them meaningful. All categories of "Teaching or Teaching and Research" and "Research" contain only those recipients employed at academic institutions. The "Research, 9-10-Month Salaries" table was dropped as of last year because so few recipients respond in this category that the data was not considered meaningful. Starting salaries for those reporting a postdoctoral position are available for a third year on page 893. These salaries are also included within the academic tables and box plots on pages 893-94.

Note that salaries for teaching or teaching and research have yet to return to their high point of 1970, although considerable progress has been made since 1980.

Graphs. The graphs show standard box plots summarizing salary distribution information for the years 1994 through 1999. Values plotted for 1994 through 1998 are converted to 1999 dollars using the implicit price deflator prepared annually by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce.


For each boxplot, the box shows the first quartile (Q1), the median (M), and the third quartile (Q3). The interquartile range (IQR) is defined as $Q3 - Q1$. Think of constructing invisible fences $1.5 \times IQR$ below $Q1$ and $1.5 \times IQR$ above $Q3$. Whiskers are drawn from $Q3$ to the largest observation that falls below the upper invisible fence and from $Q1$ to the smallest observation that falls above the lower invisible fence. Think of constructing two more invisible fences, each falling $1.5 \times IQR$ above or below the existing invisible fences. Any observation that falls between the fences on each end of the boxplots is called an outlier and is plotted as \circ in the boxplots. Any observation that falls outside of both fences either above or below the box in the boxplot is called an extreme outlier and is marked as $*$ in the boxplot.

**Academic Postdoctorates
9-10-Month Salaries
(in hundreds of dollars)**

Ph.D. Year	Min	Q ₁	Median	Q ₃	Max	Reported Median in 1999 \$
1997	180	350	385	410	450	395
1998	290	350	390	420	500	396
1999	130	365	400	418	540	400
1997M	250	350	380	405	446	----
1997F	180	350	385	408	450	----
1998M	290	340	390	430	500	----
1998F	310	361	375	390	436	----
Total (54 men/25 women)						
1999M	220	373	400	428	540	
1999F	130	350	390	410	475	


**Academic Teaching/Teaching and Research
9-10-Month Salaries
(in hundreds of dollars)**

Ph.D. Year	Min	Q ₁	Median	Q ₃	Max	Reported Median in 1999 \$
1965	70		80		105	352
1970	85		110		195	396
1975	90	120	128	135	173	335
1980	105	155	171	185	250	314
1985	170	230	250	270	380	355
1990	230	305	320	350	710	387
1994	150	330	350	375	730	381
1995	220	320	350	382	640	373
1996	240	333	360	400	636	377
1997	180	340	366	400	840	376
1998	140	340	370	410	700	375
1999	180	360	400	430	700	400
1995M	220	320	350	388	640	----
1995F	240	323	350	380	525	----
1996M	240	330	360	400	636	----
1996F	270	345	365	399	500	----
1997M	180	340	367	400	571	----
1997F	180	340	366	396	840	----
1998M	140	340	370	411	700	----
1998F	250	350	377	409	600	----
Total (172 men/70 women)						
1999M	220	370	400	430	700	
1999F	180	350	390	420	540	
One year or less experience (147 men/67 women)						
1999M	220	365	400	430	700	
1999F	180	355	390	420	540	




**Academic Teaching/Teaching and Research
11-12-Month Salaries
(in hundreds of dollars)**

Ph.D. Year	Min	Q ₁	Median	Q ₃	Max	Reported Median in 1999 \$
1965	78		104		121	532
1970	95		128		200	720
1975	87		145		204	533
1980	143		195		350	642
1985	220	230	273	300	470	667
1990	225	318	365	404	670	810
1994	365	391	480	503	510	556
1995	300	354	410	478	600	640
1996	150	302	340	390	720	753
1997	260	370	400	497	650	667
1998	275	403	480	578	700	710
1999	200	374	420	469	650	420
1995M	300	380	420	490	600	-----
1995F	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1996M	150	280	330	460	720	-----
1996F	330	340	358	368	400	-----
1997M	260	360	400	420	635	-----
1997F	260	393	447	505	650	-----
1998M	275	410	495	573	700	-----
1998F	300	395	464	575	630	-----
Total (30 men/14 women)						
1999M	280	370	420	458	650	
1999F	200	393	435	590	630	
One year or less experience (25 men/10 women)						
1999M	280	370	420	450	650	
1999F	200	379	425	533	630	




**Academic Research Only
11-12-Month Salaries
(in hundreds of dollars)**

Ph.D. Year	Min	Q ₁	Median	Q ₃	Max	Reported Median in 1999 \$
1965	81		93		107	409
1970	90		120		205	432
1975	90		119		180	311
1980	120		180		321	330
1985	190	295	342	400	520	485
1990	180	280	300	365	546	363
1994	210	330	350	400	490	381
1995	196	280	340	370	587	363
1996	192	270	330	400	585	345
1997	190	300	350	400	600	359
1998	200	333	360	428	617	465
1999	270	390	440	500	720	440
1995M	196	280	350	370	587	-----
1995F	200	-----	287	-----	400	-----
1996M	210	273	330	360	585	-----
1996F	192	265	390	455	500	-----
1997M	210	300	350	406	500	-----
1997F	190	313	350	386	600	-----
1998M	200	340	360	400	600	-----
1998F	285	330	360	540	617	-----
Total (22 men/8 women)						
1999M	270	383	400	493	600	
1999F	340	468	530	581	720	
One year or less experience (21 men/4 women)						
1999M	270	390	400	500	600	
1999F	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	



**Government
11-12-Month Salaries
(in hundreds of dollars)**

Ph.D. Year	Min	Q ₁	Median	Q ₃	Max	Reported Median in 1999 \$
1965	70		126		160	554
1970	100		150		223	540
1975	78		182		247	476
1980	156		244		501	447
1985	263	294	325	381	440	461
1990	320	345	378	430	587	457
1994	250	355	455	530	576	496
1995	370	440	494	507	650	527
1996	360	420	427	504	650	447
1997	350	454	573	600	750	588
1998	320	475	540	736	1250	548
1999	400	495	550	651	720	550
1995M	440	-----	499	-----	650	-----
1995F	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1996M	360	405	427	500	650	-----
1996F	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1997M	370	476	573	608	750	-----
1997F	350	465	560	586	680	-----
1998M	320	500	568	756	1250	-----
1998F	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total (15 men/4 women)						
1999M	400	495	540	587	720	
1999F	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
One year or less experience (11 men/1 women)						
1999M	400	495	540	565	720	
1999F	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----



**Business and Industry
11-12-Month Salaries
(in hundreds of dollars)**

Ph.D. Year	Min	Q ₁	Median	Q ₃	Max	Reported Median in 1999 \$
1965	100		136		180	598
1970	96		170		235	612
1975	114		187		240	489
1980	190		284		400	521
1985	260	360	400	420	493	568
1990	320	438	495	533	700	599
1994	200	418	525	600	750	572
1995	288	480	568	690	1250	606
1996	250	510	580	610	1000	607
1997	300	483	600	658	1000	616
1998	240	550	650	750	2250	660
1999	360	600	680	761	2450	680
1995M	288	480	550	690	1250	-----
1995F	397	550	630	680	1000	-----
1996M	250	480	580	610	1000	-----
1996F	520	-----	590	-----	650	-----
1997M	300	490	600	670	1000	-----
1997F	400	460	540	620	900	-----
1998M	240	550	650	750	1250	-----
1998F	305	565	662	765	2250	-----
Total (70 men/22 women)						
1999M	360	626	700	763	2450	
1999F	440	580	644	676	1100	
One year or less experience (47 men/21 women)						
1999M	450	625	700	755	1350	
1999F	440	580	640	660	1000	





Table 7A: Faculty Attrition¹

	GROUP									
	I Public	I Private	II	III	I, II, & III	IV	Va	M	B	I, II, III, M & B
Full-time faculty who retired or died										
Total number	47	14	64	50	175	30	5	152	225	553
Percentage (%)	2.9	1.8	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.2	1.7	3.4	3.2	3.0

¹ Number and percentage of full-time faculty who were in the department in fall 1998 but were reported to have retired or died by fall 1999.

Figure 7B: Percent of Full-Time Doctoral Faculty Who Retired or Died in Groups I, II, III, M & B Combined



Faculty Profile

The Departmental Profile Survey, sent in fall 1999 to mathematical sciences departments at four-year colleges and universities as part of the Annual Survey, gathered information about faculties at these schools, which is reported in this section. All numbers in tables are projections made using data from responding departments. For the first time this year, projections for Groups M and B are based on respondents in a stratified random sample for each group. This method should provide estimates for M and B parameters which are more accurate, hence provide more reliable year to year comparisons. In addition to the information reported here, the First Report presented data collected earlier about faculty salaries (pages 239-42 of the February 2000 issue of the *Notices of the AMS*).

Table 7A displays losses of full-time mathematical sciences faculty due to retirements and deaths. The fall 1999 mathematics faculty attrition rate for Groups I, II, III, M, and B combined was 3.1% compared with fall 1998, 1997, and 1996 values of 3.1%, 2.4%, and 2.3%. Groups M

Table 7C: Recruitment of Doctoral Faculty

	GROUP									
	I Public	I Private	II	III	I, II, & III	IV	Va	M	B	I, II, III, M & B
Posted Doctoral Positions										
Total number ¹	157	105	173	164	599	129	28	309	602	1510
Tenured/tenure-track	64	33	99	120	316	100	5	258	422	996
Open to new doctoral recipients	116	75	138	136	464	100	23	253	550	1267
Tenured/tenure-track	32	10	83	98	223	74	0	253	384	859
Open at assoc/full level	27	19	20	29	94	40	4	14	88	196
Reported Hires for Above										
Male doctoral hires	126	82	125	108	441	70	18	144	309	894
Male new doctoral hires	56	40	51	41	188	38	7	47	183	418
Female doctoral hires	15	16	20	27	78	18	9	47	120	245
Female new doctoral hires	7	10	12	16	45	6	5	24	61	130
Male nondoctoral hires	2	0	4	0	6	0	0	8	33	47
Female nondoctoral hires	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	28	40	73
Unfilled positions	14	7	23	24	68	41	2	82	101	251

¹ Number of full-time doctoral positions under recruitment in 1998-99 to be filled for 1999-2000. Subtotals of rounded table values may exhibit rounding errors.

and B had the highest attrition rates at 3.4% and 3.2% respectively. Figure 7B graphically shows the trend in this attrition rate for mathematics departments during the years 1986 to 1999. For the most part, the attrition rate has been growing, going from 1.2% in 1986 to 3.0% in 1999.

Table 7C contains detailed information on the number of full-time faculty positions in mathematical sciences departments under recruitment in 1998-99 for academic year 1999-2000. Table 7D is a brief summary of Table 7C. The 1,510 positions in mathematics departments (Groups I, II, III, M, and B) under recruitment is down slightly, 1.2%, compared to 1997-98. Figure 7E shows the number of full-time doctoral positions available in these groups and the number unfilled for the years 1990 to 1999. There was a steady decrease in available positions in the first half of the decade of the '90s, but this number has been increasing since 1996.

Table 7C shows that 1,267 (83.9%) of the positions under recruitment in 1998-99 by Groups I, II, III, M, and B were available to new doctorates. Of these 1,267 positions only 859 (67.8%) were tenure-track positions. The 859 tenure-track positions open to new doctorates is down slightly from the 890 such positions in 1997-98.

Tables 7F and 7G give a detailed picture of the faculty in mathematical sciences departments. Table 7F gives the number of faculty for six different variables for all faculty broken down by group. Table 7G gives the same information for females only. The estimated total number of full-time faculty in Groups I, II, III, M, and B combined is 18,490, down 1,202 from the number reported last year. Group M is down 539 full-time faculty, while Group B is down 825 and Groups I, II, and III are up 162 full-time faculty. For Groups M and B other faculty numbers show drops as well. The authors do not believe there has been a big drop in full-time faculty numbers in Groups M and B and offer the following three comments about these drops.


1. The Group B estimates for last year were most likely too high. Estimates of full-time faculty for Group B for the past three years are fall 1997 at 7,306, fall 1998 at 7,926, and fall 1999 at 7,101. If this conjecture is true, then it explains that much of the drop in B numbers for this year compared to last year.

2. Stratified random samples were used to produce the Group M and B results for the first time this year. The M and B estimates obtained in this way should be more accurate estimates than those obtained in the past and should show less variation from year to year in the future. Our feeling is that in the past Group B estimates have tended to be on the high side, with the same

Table 7D: A Summary of Recruitment of Doctoral Faculty

	GROUP		
	I, II, III, Va, M, & B	IV	Total
Posted Doctoral Positions			
Total number	1538	129	1667
Tenured/tenure-track	1001	100	1101
Open to new doctoral recipients	1290	100	1390
Reported Hires for Above			
Total doctoral hires	1166	88	1254
Male	912	70	982
Female	254	18	272
Unfilled positions	253	41	294

Figure 7E: Number of Full-Time Doctoral Positions under Recruitment and Reported as Unfilled in Groups I, II, III, M & B Combined



thing possibly true for the Group M schools. The estimates of Groups M and B faculty numbers for this year are somewhat low compared to other recent years, and this probably accounts for some of the drop in their faculty numbers for this year. It is a little hard to say exactly what is happening until we get numbers for a few more years using the new sampling methods put into place this year.

3. Even with all the other Group M numbers dropping, the number of part-time faculty increased by 138 compared to last year. This could mean less full-time faculty.

Table 7F: Faculty Size, Fall 1999

	GROUP									
	I Public	I Private	II	III	I, II, & III	IV	Va	M	B	I, II, III, M & B
Full-time faculty	1584	821	2440	2069	6913	1338	309	4476	7101	18490
Doctoral full-time faculty	1535	815	2305	1817	6473	1297	308	3745	5094	15312
Tenured doctoral full-time faculty	1158	497	1790	1351	4795	906	172	2766	3502	11064
Untenured, tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty	118	114	242	297	770	245	28	833	1078	2680
Non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty	259	204	274	170	907	146	107	146	514	1567
Part-time faculty	166	43	278	705	1192	161	25	1906	3298	6395

Table 7G: Female Faculty Size, Fall 1999

	GROUP									
	I Public	I Private	II	III	I, II, & III	IV	Va	M	B	I, II, III, M & B
Full-time female faculty	165	85	324	417	991	255	30	1242	2174	4407
Doctoral full-time female faculty	133	83	245	274	735	229	30	807	1277	2819
Tenured, doctoral full-time female faculty	74	23	112	137	346	98	9	491	789	1626
Untenured, tenure-track doctoral full-time female faculty	19	20	53	91	183	84	7	234	366	783
Non-tenure-track doctoral full-time female faculty	40	40	81	46	206	47	14	82	122	410
Part-time female faculty	66	9	120	260	455	38	5	670	1343	2468

Table 7H: Number and Percentage of Full-time Faculty by Group, Fall 1999

	GROUP									
	I Public	I Private	II	III	IV	Va	M	B	I, II, III, IV, Va, M, & B	
Full-time Faculty										
Number	1584	821	2440	2069	1338	309	4476	7101	20137	
Percentage of full-time faculty	7.9	4.1	12.1	10.3	6.6	1.5	22.2	35.3		
Female Full-time Faculty										
Number	165	85	324	417	255	30	1242	2174	4692	
Percentage of female full-time faculty	3.5	1.8	6.9	8.9	5.4	0.6	26.5	46.3		
Female Full-time Faculty										
Percentage female full-time faculty in each group	10.4	10.4	13.3	20.2	19.1	9.7	27.7	30.6	23.3	

Table 8D: Distribution of Undergraduate Enrollments (thousands), Fall 1992 to Fall 1999

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Remedial	300	294	279	275	269	274	322	281
Precalculus	356	341	342	336	332	303	347	429
1st-year Calculus (mainstream)	315	319	298	314	312	309	325	321
1st-year Calculus (nonmainstream)	127	138	131	145	144	146	148	151
Statistics	213	215	199	209	218	233	233	282
Computer Science	141	111	119	108	119	113	116	142
Other Enrollments for Majors	270	258	233	257	263	233	218	235
Remaining Enrollments	392	353	353	411	428	426	412	390
Total Enrollment¹	2114	2029	1954	2055	2085	2037	2124	2232

¹ Totals are sums of unrounded enrollments and may not be exactly the same as the sums of rounded figures in the table.

Table 8E: Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollments per Full-time Faculty Member, Fall 1999

	GROUP							
	I Public	I Private	II	III	IV	Va	M	B
Undergraduate course enrollments Number per full-time faculty member	115	54	111	122	68	43	127	114
Graduate course enrollments Number per full-time faculty member	4	6	4	6	21	7	2	

Graduate Student Profile

Table 10A summarizes information gathered about graduate students by the 1999 Departmental Profile Survey. This table gives the number of full-time, full-time first-year, and part-time graduate students for each type of graduate department. These same numbers are also given for only female graduate students and also for only U.S. citizen graduate students. Figure 10B shows the total number of full-time, full-time female, and full-time U.S. citizen graduate students for fall 1991 to fall 1999 for Group M. Table 10C gives for Groups I, II, and III the total number of full-time, full-time first-year, full-time female, full-time male, full-time U.S. citizen, and full-time non-U.S. citizen graduate students for fall 1991 to fall 1999.

Everything in this paragraph is for Groups I, II, and III. The 8,016 full-time graduate students is down 2.1% from 1998. The 2,486 full-time first-year graduate students is up 5.9% from 1998. The 2,486 full-time female graduate students is down 3.2% from 1998. The 4,231 U.S. citizen graduate students is down 5.5% from 1998.

For the first time this year the number of part-time graduate students for various categories is reported. Groups I, II, and III have a

Table 8F: Undergraduate Enrollments per Full-time Faculty Member, Fall 1996 to Fall 1999

	GROUP							
	I Public	I Private	II	III	IV	Va ²	M	B
1996	88 ¹		110	108	69		112	100
1997	110	52	115	113	57		106	96
1998	109	52	114	108	60		117	94
1999	115	54	111	122	68	43	127	114

¹ Prior to 1997, Group I was not separated into Public and Private.

² Prior to 1999, Group Va was combined with Group Vb, which is no longer surveyed. Group Va figures for these years are not available.

total of 1,255 part-time graduate students, with 680 (54.2%) being in Group III. For Group III, 24.1% of all graduate students are part-time. Group M schools have 7,254 part-time graduate students compared to 2,146 full-time graduate students. For Group M, 77.2% of all graduate students are part-time. For Groups I, II, and III, 73.8% of the part-time graduate students are U.S. citizens. For Group M, 92.8% of the part-time graduate students are U.S. citizens.

From Table 10C it is seen that 1992 was a peak year for graduate students in Groups I, II,

Table 9A: Undergraduate Junior/Senior Majors (hundreds), Fall 1999

	GROUP								
	I Public	I Private	II	III	IV	Va	M	B	I, II, III, M & B
Total Undergraduate Junior/senior majors (hundreds)	47	16	47	54	9	6	169	230	562
Female Undergraduate Junior/senior majors (hundreds)	17	5	19	24	4	2	77	104	246


Table 9B: Junior/Senior Majors (hundreds) in Groups I, II, III, M & B Combined, Fall 1991 to Fall 1999

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Total Undergraduate Junior/senior majors (hundreds)	668	728	689	663	671	626	590	580	562
Female Undergraduate Junior/senior majors (hundreds)	293	319	299	285	284	271	255	251	246
Percentage female	43.8	43.8	43.4	43.0	42.3	43.3	43.2	43.3	43.8

Table 10A: Graduate Students, Fall 1999

	GROUP								
	I Public	I Private	II	III	I, II, & III	IV	Va	M	I, II, III, & M
Total Graduate Students	2221	1055	2603	2136	8016	3567	822	2146	10162
Number who are full-time	630	298	752	806	2486	1183	178	696	3182
Number who are first-year	198	10	367	680	1255	528	112	7254	8509
Female Graduate Students	544	242	887	813	2486	1638	280	954	3440
Number who are full-time	188	79	275	323	866	596	79	353	1219
Number who are first-year	94	3	128	270	495	238	47	2968	3463
U.S. Citizen Graduate Students	1067	499	1559	1107	4231	1722	437	1442	5673
Number who are full-time	318	138	454	399	1308	543	93	472	1780
Number who are first-year	138	9	257	523	926	392	100	6734	7661

Figure 10B: Number of Full-Time Graduate Students in Group M, Fall 1991 to Fall 1999



and III. The number of full-time graduate students dropped from 10,121 in 1992 to 8,016 in 1999, a drop of 20.8%, while the number of full-time first-year graduate students dropped 8.1% during this same time period. The number of full-time female graduate students dropped from 2,895 in 1992 to 2,486 in 1999, a drop of 14.1%, while the drop for males during the same time period was 23.5%. The number of full-time U.S. citizen graduate students dropped from 5,759 in 1992 to 4,231 in 1999, a drop of 26.5%, while the drop for non-U.S. citizens for this same time period was 13.2%.

Table 10C: Full-time Graduate Students in Groups I, II, & III by Sex and Citizenship, Fall 1991 to Fall 1999

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Total full-time graduate students	9826	10121	9863	9714	9140	8774	8399	8186	8016
First-year full-time graduate students	2871	2705	2602	2546	2459	2256	2229	2348	2486
Female full-time graduate students	2768	2895	2816	2772	2696	2539	2504	2568	2486
Male full-time graduate students	7058	7226	7047	6942	6444	6235	5895	5618	5530
U.S. citizen full-time graduate students	5540	5759	5497	5678	5261	5035	4608	4475	4231
Non-U.S. citizen full-time graduate students	4286	4362	4366	4036	3879	3739	3791	3711	3785

21%
8%

27% due

Other Data Sources

- American Association of University Professors, *The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession 1999-2000*, Academe: Bull. AAUP (March/April 2000), Washington, DC.
- W. G. Bowen and N. L. Rudenstine, *In pursuit of the Ph.D.*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1992.
- Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology, *Supply and demand for engineers in the 1990s* (90-1), April 1990; *Who is in the pipeline? Science, math, and engineering education* (90-2), July 1990; *Recruiting doctoral scientists and engineers for the twenty-first century* (90-3), October 1990; *Women in science and engineering, an illustrated progress report* (90-4), December 1990; *Recruiting and retaining a diverse, quality technical work force* (91-1), April 1991; *By the year 2000: Myths and facts* (91-2), July 1991; *Cultural diversity in higher education* (91-3), October 1991; *Supply and demand in science and engineering* (91-4), January 1992; *American minorities in science and engineering* (92-1), April 1992; *Foreign citizens among U.S. scientists and engineers* (92-2), July 1992; *What's holding up the glass ceiling? Barriers in the work force* (92-3), October 1992; *Setting the record straight: Shortages in perspective* (92-4), January 1993; Occasional Papers, prepared by Betty M. Vetter, CPST, Washington, DC.
- _____, *Professional Women and Minorities—2000*, 13th ed., CPST, Washington, DC, 2000.
- _____, *Salaries of Scientists, Engineers, and Technicians: A Summary of Salary Surveys*, 18th ed., CPST, Washington, DC, 1998.
- _____, *Employment of Recent Doctoral Graduates in S&E: Results of Professional Society Surveys*, CPST, Washington, DC, 1998.
- _____, *Employment Outcomes of Doctorates in Science and Engineering: Report of a CPST Workshop*, CPST, Washington, DC, 1998.
- _____, *Supply and Demand Indicators for New Science and Engineering Doctorates: Results of a Pilot Study*, CPST, Washington, DC, 1997.
- D. O. Loftsgaarden, D. C. Rung, and A. E. Watkins, *Statistical abstract of undergraduate programs in the mathematical sciences in the U.S.*, Fall 1995 CBMS Survey, MAA Reports No. 2, 1997.
- D. E. McClure, *Academic hiring survey, 1991-1992*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 39 (1992), 311-316.
- _____, *Employment experiences of 1990-1991 U.S. institution doctoral recipients in the mathematical sciences*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 42 (1995), 754-764.
- National Research Council, *Strengthening the Linkage Between the Sciences and the Mathematical Sciences*, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2000.
- _____, *U.S. Research Institutes in the Mathematical Sciences: Assessment and Perspectives*, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1999.
- _____, *Summary Report 1996, Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities*, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1998.
- _____, *Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change*, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1995.
- National Science Board, *Science and Engineering Indicators—2000* (NSB 00-1), National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA, 2000.
- National Science Foundation, *Science and Engineering Degrees: 1966-97* (NSF 00-310), Detailed Statistical Tables, Arlington, VA, 2000.
- _____, *Science and Engineering Degrees, by Race/Ethnicity of Recipients: 1989-97* (NSF 00-311), Detailed Statistical Tables, Arlington, VA, 2000.
- _____, *Science and engineering doctorate awards: 1998* (NSF 00-304), Detailed Statistical Tables, Arlington, VA, 2000.
- _____, *Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering: Fall 1998* (NSF 00-322), Arlington, VA, 2000.
- _____, *Characteristics of Doctoral Scientists and Engineers in the United States: 1997* (NSF 00-308), Detailed Statistical Tables, Arlington, VA, 1999.
- _____, *Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering: 1998* (NSF 99-338), Arlington, VA, 1999.
- _____, *Statistical Profiles of Foreign Doctoral Recipients in Science and Engineering: Plans to Stay in the United States* (NSF 99-304), Arlington, VA, 1998.
- _____, *Who Is Unemployed? Factors Affecting Unemployment Among Individuals with Degrees in Science and Engineering*, Higher Education Surveys Report (NSF 97-336), Arlington, VA, 1997.

Definitions of the Groups

As has been the case for a number of years, much of the data in these reports is presented for departments divided into groups according to several characteristics, the principal one being the highest degree offered in the mathematical sciences. Doctoral-granting departments of mathematics are further subdivided according to their ranking of "scholarly quality of program faculty" as reported in the 1995 publication *Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change*.¹ These rankings update those reported in a previous study published in 1982.² Consequently, the departments which now comprise Groups I, II, and III differ significantly from those used prior to the 1996 survey.

The subdivision of the Group I institutions into Group I Public and Group I Private was new for the 1996 survey. With the increase in number of the Group I departments from 39 to 48, the Annual Survey Data Committee judged that a further subdivision of public and private would provide more meaningful reporting of the data for these departments.

Brief descriptions of the groupings are as follows:

Group I is composed of 48 departments with scores in the 3.00-5.00 range. Group I Public and Group I Private are Group I departments at public institutions and private institutions respectively.

Group II is composed of 56 departments with scores in the 2.00-2.99 range.

Group III contains the remaining U.S. departments reporting a doctoral program, including a number of departments not included in the 1995 ranking of program faculty.

Group IV contains U.S. departments (or programs) of statistics, biostatistics, and biometrics reporting a doctoral program.

Group V contains U.S. departments (or programs) in applied mathematics/applied science, operations research, and management science which report a doctoral program.

Group Va is applied mathematics/applied science; Group Vb, which is no longer surveyed as of 1998-99, was operations research and management science.

Group M contains U.S. departments granting a master's degree as the highest graduate degree.

Group B contains U.S. departments granting a baccalaureate degree only.

Listings of the actual departments which comprise these groups are available on the AMS Web site at www.ams.org/employment/.

¹Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change, edited by Marvin L. Goldberger, Brendan A. Maher, and Pamela Ebert Flattau, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1995.

²These findings were published in An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Mathematical and Physical Sciences, edited by Lyle V. Jones, Gardner Lindzey, and Porter E. Coggeshall, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1982. The information on mathematics, statistics, and computer science was presented in digest form in the April 1983 issue of the Notices, pages 257-67, and an analysis of the classifications was given in the June 1983 Notices, pages 392-3.

Acknowledgments

The Annual Survey of the Mathematical Sciences attempts to provide an accurate appraisal and analysis of various aspects of the academic mathematical sciences scene for the use and benefit of the community and for filling the information needs of the professional organizations. Every year, college and university departments in the United States are invited to respond. The Annual Survey relies heavily on the conscientious efforts of the dedicated staff members of these departments for the quality of its information. On behalf of the Annual Survey Data Committee and the Annual Survey staff, we thank the many secretarial and administrative staff members in the mathematical sciences departments for their cooperation and assistance in responding to the survey questionnaires.

Supplemental Listing of New Doctoral Recipients 1998-1999

ALABAMA

University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa (1)

MATHEMATICS

Libis, Carl, Sums of powers and generalizations of Bernoulli and related polynomials.

ILLINOIS

Illinois State University (2)

MATHEMATICS

Miller, Daniel, Exploring the integration of technology in collegiate mathematics.

Mooney, Edward S., Development of a middle school statistical thinking framework.

