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## 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 828 of this report. For the second year, departments in Group Vb are no longer being surveyed. More discussion of this can be found in the 1999 First Report in the February 2000 Notices of the AMS. We present information about the faculties and instructional programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels in these departments for the 2000-2001 academic year. We report the same kind of information in the Third Report that was reported last year and in earlier years as part of the Second Report. Another table has been added showing time trends for non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty and part-time faculty for the past five years.

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. in Groups I, II, III, IV, and Va. Projections to the entire population have been made using the data from the responding departments within each of these groups. Since the projections are made using


#### Abstract

This new Third Report of the 2000 Survey 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. In prior years these data were included as part of the Second Report.

The 2000 Annual Survey represents the forty-fourth in an annual series begun in 1957 by the American Mathematical Society. The 2000 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 M. 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.


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-granting departments are high, most greater than $80 \%$, it is felt that any biases in the projections for these groups are likely to be small.

Beginning with the 1999-2000 survey, stratified random samples of departments in Groups $M$ and $B$ were drawn, and projections were made from the Departmental Profile survey for Groups M and B

## Highlights

Openings in fall 2000 for full-time faculty increased in all groups over 1999. There were 1,854 such openings in Groups I, II, III, M, and $B$, of which only 1,278 were tenure-track positions.

Of these 1,854 positions, 1,613 were open to new doctoral recipients, and of these, 1,134 were tenure-track.

The estimated total number of full-time faculty for all groups surveyed is 21,166 , of which 18,000 have doctoral degrees and 4,662 are females.

The number of non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty, at 1,915 , and the number of part-time faculty, at 7,491 , continue to grow in most groups.

The number of junior/senior mathematics majors increased by 3,200 , with most groups showing gains.

Full-time graduate students in Groups I, II, III, and M increased from 9,609 in 1999 to 11,388 in 2000, an increase of $18.5 \%$. Firstyear full-time, female full-time, male full-time, U.S. citizen full-time, and non-U.S. citizen full-time graduate students all had substantial increases. These increases were seen in nearly all groups.

There was a total of 3,592 part-time graduate students reported, which is up by 536 from 1999. U.S. citizens account for $78.9 \%$ of the part-time graduate students.
using respondents from these stratified random samples. These projections should be more accurate and less subject to the biases that may have been present in past projections for Groups M and $B$, where the response rates were always low. The stratification in each group was based on the enrollment level 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 years 1999 and later that involve Groups M and B may not be directly comparable to the same results from earlier years.

## Faculty Profile

The Departmental Profile Survey, sent in fall 2000 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. The First Report presented data

Table 1 A: Faculty Attrition, ${ }^{1}$ Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underset{\text { Public }}{\text { I }}$ | I <br> Private | II | III | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, III, } \\ & \& \text { III } \end{aligned}$ | IV | Va | M | B | I, II, III, M \& B |
| Full-time faculty who retired or died <br> Total number <br> Percentage (\%) | $\begin{array}{r} 37 \\ 2.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ 2.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 59 \\ 2.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 60 \\ 3.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 178 \\ 2.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 1.8 \end{array}$ | 8 2.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 174 \\ 3.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 238 \\ 3.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 590 \\ 3.0 \end{array}$ |

${ }^{1}$ Number and percentage of full-time faculty who were in the department in fall 1999 but were reported to have retired or died by fall 2000.

Figure 1B: Percent of Full-Time Doctoral Faculty Who Retired or Died in Groups I, II, III, M, \& B Combined, Fall 1986 to Fall 2000

collected earlier about faculty salaries (pages 203-7 of the February 2001 issue of the Notices of the AMS).

Table 1A displays losses of full-time mathematical sciences faculty due to retirements and deaths. The fall 2000 mathematics faculty attrition rate for Groups I, II, III, M, and B combined was $3.0 \%$ compared with fall 1999, 1998, and 1997 values of $3.0 \%, 3.1 \%$, and $2.4 \%$. Groups M and $B$ had the highest attrition rates at $3.6 \%$ and $3.1 \%$ respectively. Figure 1B shows the trend in this attrition rate for mathematics departments during the years 1986 to 2000.

Table 2A contains detailed information on the number of full-time faculty positions in mathematical sciences departments under recruitment in 1999-2000 for employment beginning in the academic year 2000-2001. Among mathematics departments (Groups I, II, III, M, and

[^0]Table 2A: Recruitment of Doctoral Faculty, Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { I } \\ \text { Public } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { Private }}{\text { I }}$ | II | III | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, II, } \\ & \& \quad \mathrm{III} \end{aligned}$ | IV | Va | M | B | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{II}, \mathrm{III}, \\ & \mathrm{M} \& \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ |
| Posted Doctoral Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total number ${ }^{1}$ | 195 | 139 | 173 | 146 | 654 | 184 | 22 | 407 | 794 | 1854 |
| Tenured/tenure-track | 75 | 41 | 100 | 95 | 311 | 124 | 17 | 327 | 640 | 1278 |
| Open to new doctoral recipients | 148 | 107 | 139 | 134 | 529 | 147 | 17 | 378 | 706 | 1613 |
| Tenured/tenure-track | 33 | 22 | 78 | 86 | 218 | 78 | 12 | 320 | 595 | 1134 |
| Open at assoc/full level | 35 | 20 | 27 | 22 | 104 | 58 | 7 | 76 | 137 | 318 |
| Reported Hires for Above |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male doctoral hires | 145 | 108 | 122 | 98 | 473 | 89 | 16 | 176 | 319 | 968 |
| Male new doctoral hires | 72 | 68 | 51 | 23 | 214 | 32 | 5 | 53 | 120 | 387 |
| Female doctoral hires | 30 | 13 | 18 | 19 | 79 | 39 | 1 | 80 | 145 | 304 |
| Female new doctoral hires | 21 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 46 | 23 | 0 | 26 | 66 | 139 |
| Male nondoctoral hires | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 66 | 82 |
| Female nondoctoral hires | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 76 | 91 |
| Unfilled positions | 20 | 18 | 32 | 27 | 98 | 55 | 5 | 123 | 187 | 408 |

${ }^{1}$ Number of full-time doctoral positions under recruitment in 1999-2000 to be filled for 2000-2001. Subtotals of rounded table values may exhibit rounding errors.
B), 1,854 positions were under recruitment in 1999-2000, up 22.8\% compared to 1998-1999. Of those 1,854 positions, 1,613 ( $87.0 \%$ ) were available to new doctoral recipients, and of those 1,613 positions, 1,134 ( $70.3 \%$ ) were tenuretrack positions. The 1,134 tenure-track positions open to new doctoral recipients is up substantially from the 859 such positions in 1998-1999. Table 2B provides a brief summary of Table 2A.

Figure 2C shows the number of full-time doctoral positions available in these groups, as well as the number of those that are tenured/tenuretrack and the number unfilled for the years 1990 to 2000. (Note: The tenured/tenure-track status of these positions was not surveyed until 1992.) There was a sharp decrease in available positions in the first three years of the decade of the 1990s, but this number has increased significantly since 1997. Particularly interesting is the dramatic increase in tenuretrack positions under recruitment.

Table 3A gives the number of faculty for six different categories of faculty broken down by group. Table 3B gives the same information for females only. The estimated total number of full-time faculty in Groups I, II, III, M and

Table 2B: A Summary of Recruitment of Doctoral Faculty, Fall 2000

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | I, II, III, <br> Va, <br> M \& B | IV | Total |
| Posted Doctoral Positions | 1876 | 184 | $\mathbf{2 0 6 0}$ |
| Total number | 1293 | 124 | $\mathbf{1 4 1 7}$ |
| Tenured/tenure-track | 1630 | 147 | $\mathbf{1 7 7 7}$ |
| Open to new doctoral recipients |  |  |  |
| Reported Hires for Above | 1289 | 128 | $\mathbf{1 4 1 7}$ |
| Total doctoral hires | 984 | 89 | $\mathbf{1 0 7 3}$ |
| Male | 305 | 39 | 344 |
| Female | 413 | 55 | $\mathbf{4 6 8}$ |
| Unfilled positions |  |  |  |

Figure 2C: Number of Full-Time Doctoral Positions under Recruitment: Total, Tenured/Tenure-Track, and Unfilled in Groups I, II, III, M, \& B Combined, Fall 1990 to Fall 2000


Table 3A: Faculty Size, Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underset{\text { Public }}{\text { I }}$ | $\underset{\text { Private }}{\text { I }}$ | II | III | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{II}, \\ & \& \mathrm{III} \end{aligned}$ | IV | Va | M | B | I, II, III, <br> M \& B |
| Full-time faculty | 1641 | 907 | 2393 | 2023 | 6964 | 1387 | 335 | 4775 | 7705 | 19444 |
| Doctoral full-time faculty | 1594 | 906 | 2197 | 1784 | 6482 | 1361 | 333 | 3932 | 5893 | 16306 |
| Tenured doctoral full-time faculty | 1192 | 550 | 1696 | 1342 | 4780 | 857 | 218 | 2851 | 4129 | 11760 |
| Untenured, tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty | 127 | 82 | 275 | 304 | 788 | 251 | 37 | 819 | 1357 | 2963 |
| Non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty | 275 | 275 | 226 | 138 | 915 | 253 | 78 | 262 | 407 | 1583 |
| Part-time faculty | 186 | 49 | 434 | 717 | 1386 | 190 | 13 | 2323 | 3580 | 7288 |

Table 3B: Female Faculty Size, Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { I } \\ \text { Public } \end{gathered}$ | I <br> Private | II | III | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{II}, \\ & \& \mathrm{III} \end{aligned}$ | IV | Va | M | B | $\begin{aligned} & I, I I, I I I, \\ & M \& B \end{aligned}$ |
| Full-time female faculty | 171 | 81 | 320 | 390 | 961 | 316 | 29 | 1272 | 2084 | 4317 |
| Doctoral full-time female faculty | 146 | 79 | 211 | 256 | 692 | 305 | 29 | 847 | 1350 | 2889 |
| Tenured doctoral full-time female faculty | 73 | 29 | 111 | 133 | 346 | 119 | 9 | 513 | 799 | 1658 |
| Untenured, tenure-track doctoral full-time female faculty | 19 | 10 | 47 | 76 | 153 | 86 | 8 | 258 | 428 | 838 |
| Non-tenure-track doctoral full-time female faculty | 54 | 40 | 53 | 47 | 193 | 100 | 12 | 76 | 123 | 393 |
| Part-time female faculty | 61 | 8 | 173 | 272 | 514 | 63 | 4 | 842 | 1447 | 2803 |

B combined is 19,444, up 954 from the number reported last year. Group M is up 299 full-time faculty, while Group B is up 604 and Groups I, II, and III are up 51 full-time faculty. Last year was the first year in which sampling from

Groups M and B was used. Substantial drops in faculty numbers in Groups M and B were reported last year. In last year's Second Report the authors discussed this fact and felt that the reported estimates for Groups M and B were on

Table 3C: Number and Percentage of Full-Time Faculty, Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underset{\text { Public }}{\text { I }}$ | I <br> Private | II | III | IV | Va | M | B | Total All Groups |
| Full-Time Faculty <br> Number <br> Percentage of total full-time faculty (\%) | $\begin{array}{r} 1641 \\ 7.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 907 \\ 4.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2393 \\ 11.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2023 \\ 9.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1387 \\ 6.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 335 \\ 1.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4775 \\ 22.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7705 \\ 36.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21166 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
| Female Full-Time Faculty <br> Number <br> Percentage of female full-time faculty (\%) | 171 3.7 | $\begin{gathered} 81 \\ 1.7 \end{gathered}$ | 320 6.9 | 390 8.4 | 316 6.8 | 29 0.6 | 1272 27.3 | 2084 44.7 | $\begin{gathered} 4662 \\ 100.0 \end{gathered}$ |
| Female Full-Time Faculty Percentage female full-time faculty by group (\%) | 10.4 | 8.9 | 13.4 | 19.3 | 22.8 | 8.6 | 26.6 | 27.1 | 22.0 |

Table 3D: Number, and Percentage of Those Female, of Non-tenure-track Doctoral Full-Time Faculty and Part-Time Faculty by Group, Fall 1996 to Fall 2000

|  | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Groups I, II, \& III |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty | 618 | 669 | 844 | 907 | 915 |
| Percentage female (\%) | 22.7 | 21.8 | 21.2 | 22.7 | 21.1 |
| Part-time faculty | 1088 | 941 | 1088 | 1192 | 1386 |
| Percentage female (\%) | 36.9 | 36.9 | 37.6 | 38.2 | 37.1 |
| Group M |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty | 138 | 216 | 140 | 146 | 262 |
| Percentage female (\%) | 23.9 | 29.6 | 27.1 | 56.2 | 29.0 |
| Part-time faculty | 1879 | 1612 | 1768 | 1906 | 2323 |
| Percentage female (\%) | 41.4 | 45.5 | 42.8 | 35.2 | 36.2 |
| Group B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty | 419 | 385 | 427 | 514 | 407 |
| Percentage female (\%) | 22.9 | 26.2 | 31.1 | 23.7 | 30.2 |
| Part-time faculty | 3055 | 3107 | 3585 | 3298 | 3580 |
| Percentage female (\%) | 44.0 | 46.0 | 42.3 | 40.7 | 40.4 |

the low side. If that is true, the increases in faculty in Groups M and B are not as large as they appear this year. For further discussion of this matter see the 1999 Second Report in the September 2000 issue of the Notices of the AMS.

Table 3C gives some percentages based on the information in Tables 3A and 3 B .

The number of non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty and the number of part-time faculty have been steadily increasing in recent years. Table 3D gives a five-year history of these two types of

Table 3E: Summary of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty by Sex, Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, II, } \\ & \text { \& III } \end{aligned}$ |  | IV |  | M \& B |  |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Full-time faculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 6003 | 961 | 1071 | 316 | 9123 | 3356 |
| Percentage (\%) | 86.2 | 13.8 | 77.2 | 22.8 | 73.1 | 26.9 |
| Doctoral full-time faculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 5790 | 692 | 1057 | 305 | 7628 | 2197 |
| Percentage (\%) | 89.3 | 10.7 | 77.6 | 22.4 | 77.6 | 22.4 |
| Tenured doctoral full-time faculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 4434 | 346 | 738 | 119 | 5668 | 1312 |
| Percentage (\%) | 92.8 | 7.2 | 86.1 | 13.9 | 81.2 | 18.8 |
| Untenured, tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage (\%) | 80.6 | 19.4 | 65.8 | 34.2 | 68.5 | 31.5 |
| Non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage (\%) | 78.8 | 21.2 | 60.6 | 39.4 | 70.2 | 29.8 |
| Part-time faculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 872 | 514 | 127 | 63 | 3613 | 2289 |
| Percentage (\%) | 62.9 | 37.1 | 66.9 | 33.1 | 61.2 | 38.8 | faculty for Groups I,

II, and III combined, for Group M, and for Group B. Also shown for each number in this table is the percentage of females. This increase in non-tenure-track full-time doctoral positions continues a disturbing trend reported in "Changes in Mathematics Faculty Composition, Fall 1990-Fall 1996" (James W. Maxwell, Notices of the AMS, November 1997, pages 1321-3). The growth in part-time faculty appears to be more recent, since it was absent in the earlier period 1990-1996.

## Faculty Profile for Females

Table 3B gives a complete breakdown of all categories of female faculty by group. The total number of full-time faculty in all groups for 2000-2001 is 21,166 , of which 4,662 (22.0\%) are females.

Table 3C shows the number and percentage of all full-time faculty that fall in each group for 2000-2001 and the number and percentage of all female full-time faculty that fall in each group for 2000-2001. In addition, the percentage of

Table 4A: Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollments (thousands), Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underset{\text { Public }}{\text { I }}$ | I Private | II | III | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, II, } \\ & \& \text { III } \end{aligned}$ | IV | Va | M | B |  |
| Undergraduate Course Enrollments Total number (thousands) | 175 | 47 | 279 | 241 | 742 | 77 | 13 | 526 | 729 | 2087 |
| Graduate Course Enrollments Total number (thousands) | 7 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 29 | 24 | 2 | 14 |  | 69 |

Table 4B: Distribution of Undergraduate Enrollments (thousands), Fall 2000

${ }^{1}$ Arithmetic, high school algebra, geometry.
${ }^{2}$ Percents are "column percents" describing relative enrollments within the respective survey groups of the different types of undergraduate courses.
the full-time faculty within each group who are female is given in the bottom section of Table 3C. We see that the number of females as a percentage of full-time faculty varies considerably among the groups, from $8.9 \%$ and

Table 4C: Total Undergraduate Enrollments (thousands), Fall 1996 to Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 1 | II | III | IV | Va ${ }^{2}$ | M | B | Total ${ }^{3}$ |
| 1996 |  |  | 245 | 212 | 98 |  | 589 | 705 | 2085 |
| 1997 | 173 | 42 | 247 | 220 | 69 |  | 561 | 701 | 2037 |
| 1998 | 182 | 43 | 258 | 214 | 78 |  | 585 | 741 | 2124 |
| 1999 | 182 | 45 | 271 | 251 | 92 | 13 | 568 | 810 | 2232 |
| 2000 | 175 | 47 | 279 | 241 | 77 | 13 | 526 | 729 | 2087 |

[^1]8.6\% for Groups I Private and Va to $26.6 \%$ and 27.1\% for Groups M and B respectively. Note: In Table 3C the percentages for each group in rows 2 and 4 are of the row totals. The percentages in row 5 are column percentages using the numbers in rows 1 and 3.

Table 3D contains information about non-tenure-track doctoral full-time faculty and parttime faculty for 1996 to 2000 for Groups I, II, and III combined, M, and B. This table includes the total number for each category as well as the percentage female for each number.

Table 3E gives the male/female breakdown by count and percentage for Groups I, II, and III combined for various categories of faculty in columns 2 and 3. The same breakdowns are given for Group IV in columns 4 and 5 and for Groups M and B combined in columns 6 and 7.

Table 4D: Distribution of Undergraduate Enrollments (thousands), Fall 1992 to Fall 2000

|  | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Remedial Mathematics | 300 | 294 | 279 | 275 | 269 | 274 | 322 | 281 | 265 |
| Precalculus | 356 | 341 | 342 | 336 | 332 | 303 | 347 | 429 | 403 |
| 1 st-Year Calculus (mainstream) | 315 | 319 | 298 | 314 | 312 | 309 | 325 | 321 | 309 |
| 1st-Year Calculus (nonmainstream) | 127 | 138 | 131 | 145 | 144 | 146 | 148 | 151 | 154 |
| Statistics | 213 | 215 | 199 | 209 | 218 | 233 | 233 | 282 | 236 |
| Computer Science | 141 | 111 | 119 | 108 | 119 | 113 | 116 | 142 | 129 |
| Other Enrollments for Majors | 270 | 258 | 233 | 257 | 263 | 233 | 218 | 235 | 220 |
| Remaining Undergraduate Enroll. | 392 | 353 | 353 | 411 | 428 | 426 | 412 | 390 | 371 |
| Total Enrollments ${ }^{1}$ | 2114 | 2029 | 1954 | 2055 | 2085 | 2037 | 2124 | 2232 | $\mathbf{2 0 8 7}$ |

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

Table 4E: Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollments per Full-Time Faculty Member, Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { I }}{\text { Public }}$ | $\stackrel{1}{\text { Private }}$ | II | III | IV | Va | M | B |
| Undergraduate Course Enrollments Number per full-time faculty member | 107 | 52 | 117 | 119 | 56 | 39 | 110 | 95 |
| Graduate Course Enrollments Number per full-time faculty member | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 7 | 3 |  |

## Enrollment Profile and Undergraduate Majors Profile

The Departmental Profile Survey obtained information about enrollments and distribution of instructional effort among various course groupings in mathematical sciences departments. Table 4A gives the total undergraduate and total graduate enrollments in mathematics courses for each group that is part of the Annual Survey. Each enrollment in this and other tables in this section is projected from schools responding to the survey. In fall 2000, for the second year, the projections for Groups M and B were made using the responding schools that were part of a stratified random sample for each of these groups.

Table 4B presents a further breakdown of the undergraduate enrollments into eight categories of courses. For each group the percentage of the total enrollment in each of these eight categories is also given. Column totals in Table 4B give the total enrollments for each group, and they are the numbers given in the first row of Table 4A. Table 4C gives these totals for fall 1996 to fall 2000. Row totals in Table 4B give the total enrollments in each of the eight categories of courses for all mathematical sciences depart-
ments. Table 4D shows these same enrollments for fall 1992 to fall 2000.

Total enrollments in undergraduate mathematics courses dropped 145,000 from 1999 to 2000. Most of this drop was in Groups M and B. In 1999 a switch in methodology to sampling was instituted for Groups M and B. Until more years of experience with sampling are available, year-to-year comparisons are not reliable. The authors believe that this estimate of total enrollment in 1999 was somewhat high, which

Table 4F: Undergraduate Enrollments per Full-Time Faculty Member, Fall 1996 to Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | I <br> Public | I <br> 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 |  |
| 2000 | 107 | 52 | 117 | 119 | 56 | 39 | 110 | 95 |  |

[^2]Table 5A: Undergraduate Junior/Senior Majors (hundreds), Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underset{\text { Public }}{\text { I }}$ | I <br> Private | II | III | IV | Va | M | B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, II, III, } \\ & \text { M \& B } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Undergraduate Junior/senior majors (hundreds) | 51 | 18 | 49 | 59 | 8 | 5 | 158 | 260 | 594 |
| Female Undergraduate Junior/senior majors (hundreds) | 19 | 5 | 21 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 70 | 103 | 242 |

Table 5B: Junior/Senior Majors (hundreds) in Groups I, II, III, M \& B Combined, Fall 1992 to Fall 2000

|  | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Undergraduate <br> Junior/senior majors (hundreds) | 728 | 689 | 663 | 671 | 626 | 590 | 580 | 562 |  |
| Female Undergraduate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Junior/senior majors (hundreds) | 319 | 299 | 285 | 284 | 271 | 255 | 251 | 246 | 242 |
| Percentage female (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

would explain a good deal about the size of the drop in the estimate of total enrollment for 2000. Group B especially seemed overprojected in 1999.

Table 4E gives the undergraduate enrollments per faculty member and the graduate enrollments per faculty member for each group. Table 4F gives the undergraduate enrollments per faculty member for fall 1996 to fall 2000.

Table 5A gives the number of junior/senior majors and the number of female junior/senior majors for each group. Table 5B gives the total number of junior/senior majors and female junior/senior majors for fall 1992 to fall 2000. The number of junior/senior mathematics majors in Groups I, II, III, M, and B dropped from 72,800 in 1992 to 56,200 in 1999, but showed an increase of 3,200 in 2000. The number of female
junior/senior majors was down 400 from 1999. The percentage of the junior/senior majors who are females has remained relatively constant, near 43\%, during the years 1991 through 1999, but dropped $3.1 \%$ in 2000 to $40.7 \%$. Although the number of female junior/senior majors dropped only 400 compared to last year, there was an increase of 3,600 male junior/senior majors in 2000, which accounts for most of the drop of $3.1 \%$ in the percentage of junior/senior majors who are female.

The reader should be aware that at least 60 of the 227 departments in the 2000 Group M population and at least 260 of the 1,018 departments in the 2000 Group B population also offer a computer science program in addition to their offerings in mathematics. In some instances, these computer science programs

Table 6A: Graduate Students, Fall 2000

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underset{\text { Public }}{\text { I }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { I }}{\text { Private }}$ | II | III | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{II}, \\ & \& \mathrm{III} \end{aligned}$ | IV | Va | M | $\underset{\& M}{I, I I, I I I}$ |
| Total Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number who are full-time | 2733 | 1314 | 2712 | 2143 | 8902 | 3622 | 735 | 2486 | 11388 |
| Number who are first-year | 722 | 365 | 790 | 738 | 2614 | 1188 | 225 | 971 | 3585 |
| Number who are part-time | 244 | 135 | 436 | 686 | 1501 | 948 | 99 | 2091 | 3592 |
| Female Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number who are full-time | 726 | 271 | 935 | 853 | 2784 | 1773 | 232 | 1168 | 3952 |
| Number who are first-year | 220 | 68 | 301 | 290 | 879 | 670 | 88 | 456 | 1334 |
| Number who are part-time | 119 | 42 | 153 | 293 | 607 | 507 | 32 | 971 | 1578 |
| U.S. Citizen Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number who are full-time | 1386 | 674 | 1578 | 1044 | 4682 | 1739 | 403 | 1502 | 6183 |
| Number who are first-year | 381 | 204 | 467 | 336 | 1388 | 596 | 139 | 509 | 1896 |
| Number who are part-time | 154 | 104 | 302 | 571 | 1131 | 765 | 84 | 1703 | 2834 |

Table 6B: Full-time Graduate Students in Groups I, II, \& III by Sex and Citizenship, Fall 1992 to Fall 2000

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

account for a major fraction of the department's undergraduate majors (and even the degrees awarded by the departments.) The data on majors currently collected do not distinguish computer science majors from mathematics majors, so it is not possible to estimate the size of these computer science programs.

The 1995 CBMS survey Statistical abstract of undergraduate programs in the mathematical sciences in the U.S. (MAA Reports No. 2, 1997) provides a more comprehensive study of departmental majors. The 2000 CBMS survey results will be available in spring 2002.

## Graduate Student Profile

Table 6A summarizes information gathered about graduate students by the 2000 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 for only U.S. citizen graduate students.

There were substantial increases in nearly all types of graduate students from 1999 to 2000. Of the 63 entries in the group columns in Table 6A, only 10 were down, most only slightly; the rest were up, and many were up substantially. Six of the decreases were in Group Va, and three were in Group III. Nearly half of this increase of 1,779 full-time graduate students in Groups I, II, III, and M was in Group M, which may have been underestimated last year.
(Note: These comparisons were made against numbers from a corrected Table 10A from the Second Report for 1999. This table, which first appeared on page 902 of the September 2000 issue of the Notices of the AMS, had errors in the last two columns. The corrected data are presented in a table that appears in a note on the the right side of this page.)

The total number of full-time graduate students in Groups I, II, III, and M increased from 9,609 to 11,388 , an increase of $18.5 \%$. First-year full-time graduate students in Groups I, II, III, and

## Correction to Table 10A in the 1999 Second Report

Table 10A in the 1999 Second Report, which appeared in the September 2000 issue of the Notices of the AMS on page 902, contained incorrect numbers in the last two columns. The table below contains the reported figures and the newly revised figures.

The second to last paragraph from the 1999 Second Report on page 901 uses some of these bad numbers from the original Table 10A. A corrected version of this paragraph follows:

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 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 1,801 part-time graduate students compared to 1,593 full-time graduate students. For Group M, $53.1 \%$ 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, 88.2\% of the part-time graduate students are U.S. citizens.
In addition, the third sentence in the last paragraph in the Highlights section, page 887, should read:

Group M had 1,801 part-time students, which makes up
$53.1 \%$ of their graduate students.

Reported and Revised Figures for Table 10A: Graduate Students, Fall 1999

|  | GROUP |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | M |  | I, II, III, \& M |  |
|  | Reported | Revised | Reported | Revised |
| Total Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |
| Number who are full-time | 2146 | 1593 | 10162 | 9609 |
| $\quad$ Number who are first-year | 696 | 591 | 3182 | 3077 |
| Number who are part-time | 7254 | 1801 | 8509 | 3056 |
| Female Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |
| Number who are full-time | 954 | 737 | 3440 | 3223 |
| $\quad$ Number who are first-year | 353 | 297 | 1219 | 1163 |
| Number who are part-time | 2968 | 819 | 3463 | 1314 |
| U.S. Citizen Graduate Students |  |  |  |  |
| Number who are full-time | 1442 | 1169 | 5673 | 5400 |
| Number who are first-year | 472 | 437 | 1780 | 1745 |
| Number who are part-time | 6734 | $\mathbf{1 5 8 9}$ | 7661 | $\mathbf{2 5 1 6}$ |

## 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 website at www. ams.org/employment/.

[^3]M increased by 508 to 3,585 , an increase of $16.5 \%$. Full-time female graduate students in Groups I, II, III, and M increased from 3,223 to 3,952 , a $22.6 \%$ increase. U.S. citizen full-time graduate students in these groups increased $14.5 \%$. Part-time graduate students in these same groups increased $17.5 \%$ to 3,592 .

Table 6B 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 1992 to fall 2000. For most of these categories there has been a downward or stable trend for the years 1992 through 1999. All of them had a substantial increase in 2000. The percentage increases from 1999 for Groups I, II, and III graduate students are:

| Full-time | $11.1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| First-year full-time | $5.1 \%$ |
| Female full-time | $12.0 \%$ |
| Male full-time | $10.6 \%$ |
| U.S. citizen full-time | $10.7 \%$ |
| Non-U.S. citizen full-time | $11.5 \%$ |

Non-U.S. citizen full-time 11.5\%
For the second year the number of part-time graduate students is reported for the various groups. Part-time graduate students in Groups I, II, and III increased from 1,255 to 1,501 , a $19.6 \%$ increase. Group III has 686 (45.7\%) of the part-time graduate students. For Groups I, II, and III, $75.3 \%$ of the part-time graduate students are U.S. citizens and $40.4 \%$ are females. Group M departments have 2,091 part-time graduate students compared to 2,486 full-time graduate students. For Group M, $81.4 \%$ of the part-time graduate students are U.S. citizens and $46.6 \%$ are females.
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