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PhD production has fallen over the last decade:

Source: Taulbee Surveys
PhD Employment Trends

Fraction of PhDs going to academia has increased:

Source: Taulbee Surveys
Why Do Things Seem So Tight?

Increase in faculty size is the dominant factor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>change from prior year</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>3491</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>3947</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>4344</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00</td>
<td>4939</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>5344</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Taulbee Surveys*

The increase means that there are many more holes to fill.
Open Slots Dominate New PhDs

The number of faculty hired to achieve the increase in faculty size is considerably larger than the number of hires necessary to replace departures. The number of new faculty members that must be hired just to fill new slots also exceeds the number of PhD recipients entering academia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty growth</th>
<th>Faculty departures</th>
<th>Slots to fill</th>
<th>PhDs going to academia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Taulbee Surveys
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Recruiting Problems (PhD Chairs)

Chairs report the following recruiting problems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality grad students</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking/reputation</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup packages</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General workload</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching loads</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruiting Problems (PhD Chairs)

Chairs report the following recruiting problems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Tier 3 (NRC 73+)</th>
<th>Tier 2 (NRC 37-72)</th>
<th>Tier 1 (NRC 1-36)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality grad students</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking/reputation</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup packages</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General workload</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower-tier institutions report more problems with the quality of graduate students, salary, and ranking/reputation.
## Decision Factors (PhD Chairs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for refusing offer</th>
<th>Reasons for accepting offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Colleagues in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-body problem</td>
<td>Ranking/reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking/reputation</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality grad students</td>
<td>Quality grad students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues in area</td>
<td>Cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space/facilities</td>
<td>Teaching load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>Startup package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup package</td>
<td>General workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>Space/facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General workload</td>
<td>Two-body problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance for impact</td>
<td>Chance for impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing pressure</td>
<td>Publishing pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• Patterns vary by rank of student’s graduate institution
  Rank 1 (NRC 1-36) graduates got 8.0 interviews and 4.3 offers
  Rank 2 (NRC 36-72) graduates got 3.6 interviews and 1.9 offers
  Rank 3 (NRC 73+) graduates got 4.4 interviews and 3 offers
# Decision Factors (New Hires)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors about where to apply</th>
<th>Factors about which offer to choose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking/reputation</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Ranking/reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on research</td>
<td>Department culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance teaching/res</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department culture</td>
<td>Startup package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality grad students</td>
<td>Quality grad students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-body problem</td>
<td>Institutional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues in area</td>
<td>Focus on research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor recommends</td>
<td>Balance teaching/res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Colleagues in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup package</td>
<td>Advisor recommends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-body problem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey Overview (Colleges)

• Average of 0.7 open positions per institution
  Scaled by size, roughly half of university rate (2.2 vs. 4.0)
  Rank 2 (NRC 37-72): 98 per department; 28 per position
  Rank 3 (NRC 73+): 75 per department; 21 per position
• Approximately 10 applications per position
• Only 40% of applicants seriously considered
• 64% of open positions filled
• 32% of hires were women (vs. 22% at universities)
• 41% were not US citizens (vs. 36% at universities)
• Search took 3.3 hours/week for chair and 8 for department
• Most new hires came from academia
  New PhD: 27%  Academic institution: 51%
  Industry: 17%  Nonprofit: 4%  Government 1%
• Net influx from industry to academia
Recruiting Problems (Colleges)

Small colleges report the following recruiting problems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General workload</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup packages</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking/reputation</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality grad students</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary and teaching load are much more significant factors at colleges than at universities.
# Decision Factors (Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for refusing offer</th>
<th>Reasons for accepting offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Ranking/reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-body problem</td>
<td>Cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General workload</td>
<td>Two-body problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues in area</td>
<td>General workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking/reputation</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality grad students</td>
<td>Colleagues in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Teaching load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space/facilities</td>
<td>Publishing pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance for impact</td>
<td>Space/facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure package</td>
<td>Quality grad students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup package</td>
<td>Chance for impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing pressure</td>
<td>Startup package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors in Recruitment of Women
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  Men were more concerned about salary and departmental rank
  Women rated presence of colleagues and geography higher
  Patterns were consistent for initial hires and job changers
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