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#### Abstract

The Council of the Society met at noon on Saturday, 24 April 2010, in the Chicago Room of the Chicago O'Hare Hilton Hotel, O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, IL, 60666.These are the minutes of that meeting. Although some items were treated in Executive Session, all actions taken are reported in these minutes.


## I. MINUTES

## 1. Call to Order

### 1.1. Opening of the Meeting and Introductions

AMS President George Andrews called the meeting to order promptly at noon, CDT, and presided throughout. He asked those present to introduce themselves. Other Council members present were: Alejandro Adem, Georgia Benkart, Sylvain E. Cappell, Ralph L. Cohen, Robert J. Daverman, John M. Franks, Eric M. Friedlander, Robert Guralnick, Richard Hain, Bryna Kra, William A. Massey, Frank Morgan, Jennifer Schultens, Chi-Wang Shu, Joseph H. Silverman, Ronald M. Solomon, Panagiotis E. Souganidis, Janet Talvacchia, Christophe Thiele, Michelle L. Wachs, Steven H. Weintraub, Sarah J. Witherspoon, and David Wright. Other interested parties and guests were: Sandy Golden (Administrative Assistant, AMS Secretary), Sheldon H. Katz (Chair, AMS Nominating Committee), Ellen Maycock (AMS Associate Executive Director), Donald McClure (AMS Executive Director), and Ronald J. Stern (AMS Board of Trustees). Steven Weintraub was the voting Associate Secretary.

### 1.2. 2009 Elections and More

Newly elected or appointed members of the Council took office on 01 February 2010, and they are:

| President Elect | Eric Friedlander |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vice President: | Sylvain Cappell |
| Members at Large | Alejandro Adem <br> Richard Hain <br> Jenifer Schultens <br> Janet Talvacchia <br> Christophe Thiele |
| Math Reviews Editorial Committee Chair | Ronald M. Solomon |
| Proceedings Editorial Committee Chair | Ken Ono |

### 1.3. List of Council Members

A list of current Council members can be found in Attachment A.

## 2. Minutes

### 2.1. Minutes of the January 2010 Council

The minutes of the January 2010 Council were distributed by mail prior to the meeting. They also are available on the web at
http://www.ams.org/secretary/council-minutes/council-minutes0110.pdf
The Council approved the minutes as distributed.

### 2.2. Minutes of Business by Mail

The Council conducted business by mail since the last Council meeting. Minutes for this business are
 Council for a four-year term 01 Feb 2010-31 Jan 2014. The Council also approved these minutes.

## 3. Consent Agenda

### 3.1. AAAS Liaison Committee

The Secretary recommended approval of the following revised General Description and Charge for the AAAS Liaison Committee. The Council approved the changes by consent.

## General Description

- Number of members is approximately 10
- Included on the committee are the AMS representatives to AAAS Section A (Mathematics) and Q (Education), as well as the Retiring Chair, Chair, Chair-Elect and Secretary of AAAS Section A, also with ex officio terms, and approximately four Members at Large
- The term for Members at Large is two years.
- Ordinarily the Retiring Chair of AAAS Section A serves as chair of the Liaison Committee

Principal Activities (i.e., the charge):
To generate and review mathematics-related programs and activities at AAAS meetings in close contact with AMS representatives to the AAAS and with the Officers of Section A.

## 4. Reports of Boards and Standing Committees

### 4.1. Nominating Committee [Executive Session]

The AMS Nominating Committee made recommendations to the Council mostly concerning the forthcoming AMS election in Fall 2010. However, one of the items, about candidates for President Elect, pertained to the 2011 election. Sheldon Katz, Chair of the Nominating Committee, reported.

### 4.1.1. President Elect

The Nominating Committee recommended the nominations of JOHN M. GUCKENHEIMER (Cornell University) and DAVID A. VOGAN (MIT) as candidates for President Elect for the 2011 Election. This would be for a one year term, 01 February 2012-31 January 2013, followed by a two year term as President and then by a one year term as Immediate Past President. The Nominating Committee also recommended that Martin Golubitsky (Ohio State University) be named to write the nominating article for Guckenheimer and Jeffrey Adams (University of Maryland) to write the one for Vogan. The Council approved the appointment of candidates and the choice of authors for nominating articles.

### 4.1.2. Vice President

The Nominating Committee recommended the appointment of ANTHONY MICHAEL BLOCH (University of Michigan) and BARBARA LEE KEYFITZ (Ohio State University) as candidates for election to one post as Vice President for a term of three years, beginning 01 February 2011 and ending 31 January 2014. The Council appointed them as candidates.

### 4.1.3. Members at Large of the Council

The Nominating Committee recommended the appointment of .
ADEBISI AGBOOLA (University of California, Santa Barbara), MATTHEW ANDO (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), ESTELLE BASOR (American Institute of Mathematics), WILFRID GANGBO (Georgia Tech), IRA M. GESSEL (Brandeis University), LAWRENCE F. GRAY (University of Minnesota), PATRICIA HERSH (North Carolina State University), TARA S. HOLM (Cornell University). ALICE SILVERBERG (University of California, Irvine) and T. CHRISTINE STEVENS (St. Louis University) as candidates for election to positions as Member at Large of the Council. Five people are to be elected. The term is three years, beginning 01 February 2011 and ending 31 January 2014. The Council appointed them as candidates.

### 4.1.4. Trustee

The Nominating Committee recommended the appointment of WILLIAM H. JACO (Oklahoma State University) and AVNER FRIEDMAN (Ohio State University) as candidates for election to one post as Trustee for a term of five years, beginning 01 February 2011 and ending 31 January 2016. The Council appointed these two as candidates for Trustee.

In addition, it was widely agreed that guidelines to the Nominating Committee about its priorities and practices should be reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Council, before the 2011 Nominating Committee begins serious deliberations.

### 4.2. Committee on Meetings and Conferences

The AMS Committee on Meetings and Conferences (CoMC) met in Chicago, Illinois, on March 20, 2010. An interim report from this committee has been filed in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report 100401001. In the absence of Aloysius G. Helminck, the Committee Chair, Ellen Maycock described highlights of the meeting. In addition, CoMC passed along three items for Council consideration.

### 4.2.1. Lectureship Exchange with the New Zealand Mathematical Society

Late last summer the AMS received a proposal from the New Zealand Mathematical Society (NZMS) that the two societies set up a bilateral agreement for an exchange of distinguished, prominent lecturers, with a US-based mathematician touring New Zealand one year and a New Zealand based mathematician touring the United States the following year. The New Zealanders have a related agreement with the London Mathematical Society, under which every two years a prominent UK-based mathematician lectures in New Zealand, which, they claim, both sides find beneficial.
In September 2009 AMS President George Andrews established a Task Force to consider the NZMS proposal; its members were Robert J. Daverman, Aloysius G. Helminck, Vaughan F. R. Jones, Matthew Miller, Donald E. McClure, Katherine St. John and George E. Andrews, Chair. The Task Force found the prospect attractive, interesting and feasible. It recommended implementation of the procedures outlined below to CoMC, which, in turn, recommended implementation to the Council. The Council approved the plan.

## AMS/NZMS Visiting Lectureships

The object is to found a bilateral exchange of lecturers, with a US-based mathematician touring NZ and a NZ-based mathematician touring (a small part of) the US in alternate years.

It is proposed that this program be initially agreed to for 6 years, allowing three AMS lecturers to go to New Zealand, and three NZMS lecturers to travel in the US.

The AMS would have a selection committee consisting of the President, the Secretary, and the Chair of the National Program Committee. The NZMS would determine the size and nature of its selection committee.

Each committee would be in charge of recruiting and selecting potential lecturers, subject to consultation with the sister committee. Then the committees would negotiate the specifics of the tour of each lecturer. It would be expected that the NZMS would pay for an economy class air ticket to $N Z$ and local travel within NZ for the USbased lecturer. (If the lecturer had external financial support for his/her own travel, the air ticket could be used by his/her spouse.) Local expenses would be covered by each host department. In return, the AMS and the US host departments would pay for the expenses of the NZ-based lecturer to tour 3-6 universities in the US. In particular, the AMS would pledge covering travel between universities in the US, and would ask host universities to pay local expenses. Also, serious consideration would be given to

# inviting the visiting lecturer to present an address at a regional AMS meeting, assuming this could fit within the agreed upon itinerary. 

### 4.2.2. Possible AMS Event at MAA Mathfests

The Presidents of the AMS and MAA, who favor increased collaborations between the societies, have discussed having a small AMS presence at the MAA MathFest (= the MAA summer meeting).
The MAA has made a proposal about the desired AMS presence. According to a June 24, 2009, email from MAA President David Bressoud to AMS President George Andrews,"We (= MAA officers and Executive Director) are in agreement that we like the idea of involving AMS in MathFest, along the lines of the recommendation made by the CoMC back in 2000 . We are thinking of it as a co-sponsored lecture that would be expository in nature and would be tied to a special session, probably organized by the AMS, that would be a venue for research presentations."

By way of background, MathFest currently features five Invited Addresses, one cosponsored with AWM. MAA is proposing that a second of these be co-sponsored by the AMS. That would leave three MAA-only Invited Addresses, one on each of the MathFest meeting days.

It should be noted no proposal is contemplated at present about having the AMS and MAA jointly run MathFest, as they do with the Joint Mathematics Meetings.
It is understood that the AMS and MAA would split the costs associated with the Joint Lecture. The speaker would be chosen by a joint committee.
CoMC recommended that the AMS join the MAA in co-sponsoring one plenary lecture at Mathfest, under these terms. The Council approved.

### 4.2.3. AMS Travel Grants for Graduate Students Program

The AMS Travel Grants for Graduate Students Program provides grants for graduate students in mathematics to attend the Joint Mathematics Meetings in January. These travel grants were first offered for attendance at the 2009 Joint Meetings, based on a gift from an anonymous donor.

This has been treated as a matching grant program, under which the AMS matches funds provided by the student's home department. At present, the maximum AMS grant amount is $\$ 500$. Demand far exceeds supply, and in the two years the program has been in existence, approximately $20-25 \%$ of the applicants have been awarded grants. While the AMS hopes to expand the scope of this program, the Society foresees a continued situation in which there are many more qualified applicants than can be supported.

A three-person committee, the Joint Mathematics Meetings Travel Grants Committee, chooses the grantees. This committee was appointed ad hoc in the past, but now that the grant program is expected to continue, it has become a standing committee, approved by the Council in January 2010. The actual administration of the grant is done by AMS staff.

Students apply for this program online, using a form adapted from the standard mathprograms.org form. It asks for basic biographical information, and also:

What year did you begin your graduate studies in the mathematical sciences?
What month/year do you expect to complete your graduate studies?
What is your department, and specifically, your area of study?
Thesis Advisor:
List any sessions in which you are speaking or poster session in which you are presenting:
List up to five sessions you plan to attend at the Joint Mathematics Meetings (minimum of two):
Explain why attending the Joint Mathematics Meetings will be beneficial to your research (1500 character limit):
Applications are also reviewed online. The reviewers access the mathprograms.org website in order to do so, and can rate the applicants electronically on the forms at that website.
The operating procedures were assembled rather hastily in order to make the initial grants. In view of the expected continuation and possible expansion of the program, CoMC decided the procedures should be formalized and it named a subcommittee (Skip Garibaldi, Alexander Iosevitch and Steve Weintraub, chair) for that purpose. Based on the work of the subcommittee, CoMC passed along the recommendations below to the Council.

## Recommendations:

1. This program should continue essentially along its current lines, as a matching grants program.
2. We commend the intent of this program to be a broad-based program providing support to a large number of students.
3. It should be restricted to doctoral students in mathematics who are expected to be in their last year of study, i.e., applicants must not yet have received their doctoral degrees but must expect to receive them no later than August of the following year. No student shall be eligible to receive a grant more than once.
4. The information asked for on the current application form is appropriate. In addition, the form should ask for the title of the applicant's thesis. With that exception, we do not see that asking for more information is warranted.
5. For a number of reasons, we do not feel it is appropriate (and perhaps not even possible) to make fine distinctions among the applicants. We recommend a system in which the applicants are grouped into three categories: Definitely Fund, Fund if Possible, and Ineligible for Funding. Students in the Definitely Fund category should be stand-outs. While there should be no a priori percentage of applicants in this category, we envision it as containing $\mathbf{1 0 - 2 5 \%}$ of the applicants. We expect that relatively few applicants will be in the Ineligible for Funding category (due to the matching requirement acting as a filter).
6. The committee shall use its judgment in evaluating the applicants, weighing such factors as the applicants' statements, whether or not they are speaking in special
sessions, and the remaining information provided by the applicants, as they see fit. However, whether or not an applicant is speaking in a contributed paper session should not be a criterion.
7. Given the above parameters, there will be sufficient funds to support all students in the Definitely Fund category, but not all students in the Fund if Possible category. Grant recipients in the Fund if Possible category shall be decided by lot.

The Council had concerns about the requirement of matching funds from a student's graduate department. On one hand was the desirability of having an endorsement from the department, as a meaningful filter, and on the other was the possible punishment encountered by students from financially strapped departments.
It was moved and seconded that the guidelines are appropriate for use in determining the grants for the January 2011 Joint Mathematics Meetings. The motion carried.

### 4.3. Committee on Science Policy

The AMS Committee on Science Policy (CSP) met in Washington, D.C., on March 12-13, 2010. Its annual report will be placed on the January 2011 Council agenda.

## 5. Old Business

There were no items of Old Business.

## 6. New Business

### 6.1. Association for Women in Science AWARDS Project

In June 2009 the Association for Women in Science (AWIS) approached several scientific societies, the AMS included, about participating in an in-depth study of awards to women. They were planning to submit an NSF proposal to fund that study. At their request, before the proposal was fully developed, the AMS provided a letter of support for inclusion with the submitted proposal, pledging to provide data about AMS awards and the award processes.
The study has been funded. The AMS has provided data, as promised. Now the AWIS has formed/will form several administrative committees. They include:

- An AWARDS Executive Committee to direct the AWARDS project, monitor work with partner Societies and plan for long term continuance of award equity work.
- An AWARDS Task Force composed of volunteers from AWIS, AWM, and other disciplinary societies who will be trained in equity issues, disciplinary society structure and organizational dynamics and will lead workshops, training, and other activities in the partner Societies.
- An AWARDS Advisory Committee with experienced social and STEM scientists to advise on design of benchmark surveys and recommended changes to Societies, suggest resources, and facilitate the incorporation of appropriate strategies.
It also proposes that the AMS form an Action Group, whose charge will be to choose and initiate actions that will increase the equity of the Society's awards and to lead the organizational changes that will sustain them.
The President and the Secretary sought Council's reaction to the prospect of forming this Action Group. Based on the proposal the AMS itself would seem to have small input into the determination of best practices. Its role for the future would be to consider implementation steps. The members of the Action Group would be asked to devote significant effort and AWIS hopes that the Action Group will include people holding key positions within AMS, selected primarily by virtue of their position and their ability to encourage and sustain the needed changes. AWIS would provide partial funding from its NSF grant for Action Group members' travel, but the AMS would be obliged to cover the shortfall.

After extensive discussion during which several Council members spoke in favor of a cautious, measured response, it was moved and seconded to seek two or three AMS volunteers to attend the June 2010 Task Force meeting and to charge them with reporting on Task Force activities to the AMS Committee on the Profession at its Fall 2010 meeting. The motion carried.

### 6.2. Council Discussion Period

Repeating an item first tried in April 2002, the Council devoted a portion of this meeting to a discussion of one of the items in its purview. At its November 2009 meeting, the Council's Executive Committee decided that the discussion topic again should be Improving the Employment Prospects for Young Mathematicians, intending this to be a continuation, not merely a repetition, of the Spring 2009 discussion. The aim again was to identify steps the AMS can take to help young mathematicians improve their employment chances. Included here as background were (1) the report from last year's AMS Employment Prospects Task Force and (2) employment advertising statistics put together in the AMS office. In addition, distributed just before the meeting were the results of a Faculty Recruitment Survey (Attachment C).
Due to the press of time-consuming other business at this meeting, the discussion this year was very brief. Most of the available time was spent in coming to terms with the data presented in Attachment G . One member's reaction to the data was, "The job market last year was catastrophic; this year it is even worse." No action was taken.

### 6.3. Report of the Executive Director

The Executive Director, Donald McClure, gave his annual report to the Council orally, highlighting major events of the past year. Among them were the celebration of the $70^{\text {th }}$ anniversary of Mathematical Reviews, the second year of operation of the Mathematical Research Communities program, successful price-freezing
responses to the economic crisis, the journal digitization project, progress toward a new development initiative, and steps to support young mathematicians through the employment crisis. He also commented on the financial health of the AMS, detailing the positive impact on the Society's long term investment portfolio due to recovery of the economic markets .

## 7. Announcements, Information and Record

### 7.1. 2010-2011 Centennial Fellowship

The AMS Centennial Fellowship Committee announced that Joel Bellaiche (Brandeis University) is the winner of the 2010 Fellowship competition. Bellaiche has accepted the award. The amount of this fellowship for 2010-2011 will be $\$ 77,000$, with an additional expense allowance of $\$ 7,700$.

### 7.2. AMS-ASA-IMS-MAA-SIAM Data Committee

The name of the AMS-ASA-IMS-MAA-SIAM Data Committee has been changed to delete "IMS" from the title. The Institute of Mathematical Statistics (IMS) will continue to support the Annual Survey but no longer will send a representative to the Joint Data Committee. Due to its financial support of the project, the IMS initials will appear on the Annual Survey reports.

## 8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:12 CDT.

## 2010 AMS GOVERNANCE

## 2010 COUNCIL

## Officers

| President | George E. Andrews |
| :--- | :--- |
| President Elect | Eric Friedlander |
| Vice Presidents | Sylvain Cappell |
|  | Frank Morgan |
|  | Bernd Sturmfels |
| Secretary | Robert J. Daverman |
| Associate Secretaries | Georgia Benkart |
|  | Michel Lapidus |
|  | Matthew Miller |
|  | Steven H. Weintraub |
| Treasurer | John M. Franks |
| Associate Treasurer | Linda Keen |

## Representatives of Committees

Bulletin Editorial
Colloquium Editorial
Executive Committee
Executive Committee
Executive Committee
Journal of the AMS
Math Reviews Editorial
Math Surveys \& Monographs
Mathematics of Computation
Proceedings Editorial
Transactions and Memoirs

| Susan J. Friedlander, Chair | University of Southern California 2011 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Paul J. Sally, Jr., Chair | University of Chicago | 2011 |
| Ruth Charney | Brandeis University | 2010 |
| Craig L. Huneke | University of Kansas | 2011 |
| Joseph H. Silverman | Brown University | 2012 |
| Karl Rubin, Chair | University of California, Irvine | 2013 |
| Ronald M. Solomon, Chair | Ohio State University | 2012 |
| Ralph L. Cohen, Chair | Stanford University | 2012 |
| Chi-Wang Shu, Chair | Brown University | 2011 |
| Ken Ono, Chair | University of Wisconsin | 2013 |
| Robert Guralnick, Chair | University of Southern California 2012 |  |

## Members at Large

Alejandro Adem
Aaron Bertram
Rebecca F. Goldin
Richard Hain
Bryna Kra
William A. Massey
Irena Peeva
Jennifer Schultens
Joseph H. Silverman
Panagiotis E. Souganidis
Janet Talvacchia
Christoph Thiele
Michelle L. Wachs
Sarah J. Witherspoon
David Wright

## 2010 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

George Andrews
Ruth M. Charney
Robert J. Daverman
Eric M. Friedlander
Craig L. Huneke
Bryna Kra
Joseph H. Silverman

| Pennsylvania State University | ex officio |
| :--- | :--- |
| Brandeis University | 2010 |
| University of Tennessee | ex officio |
| University of Southern California | ex officio |
| University of Kansas | 2011 |
| Northwestern University | 2013 |
| Brown University | 2012 |

## 2010 TRUSTEES

| George E. Andrews | Pennsylvania State University | ex officio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| John B. Conway | George Washington University | 2010 |
| John M. Franks | Northwestern University | ex officio |
| Mark L. Green | University of California, Los Angeles | 2014 |
| Linda Keen | CUNY - Lehman College | ex officio |
| Ronald J. Stern | University of California, Irvine | 2013 |
| Karen Vogtmann | Cornell University | 2012 |
| Carol S. Wood | Wesleyan University | 2011 |

# AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL BUSINESS BY MAIL 

18 March 2010

In a mail ballot dated 15 February 2010, there were 21 ballots cast, by:

| Alejandro Adem | Paul J. Sally, Jr. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Robert J. Daverman | Jennifer Schultens |
| Eric Friedlander | Chi-Wang Shu |
| Susan J. Friedlander | Joseph H. Silverman |
| Rebecca F. Goldin | Ronald M. Solomon |
| Craig L. Huneke | Bernd Sturmfels |
| Linda Keen | Janet Talvacchia |
| Bryna Kra | Michelle L. Wachs |
| Frank Morgan | Sarah J. Witherspoon |
| Ken Ono | David Wright |
| Karl Rubin |  |

In the election to the Executive Committee the result was:
Bryna Kra
13
Frank Morgan 8

Accordingly, Kra is declared elected, effective immediately, and ending when a replacement is determined in the election of February 2014.

Robert J. Daverman
Secretary
March 18, 2010

## Survey Results (Faculty Recruitment)

## Em ployment Survey, Febr uary 2009 \& March 2010

This document presents some summary results from the survey of recruitment and retirement sent to 68 departments in February 2009 and again in March 2010. The information herein is from a snapshot of the complete survey responses received by Monday, March 2, 2009 for the 2009 Survey and Thursday, April 15, 2010 for the 2010 Survey. The response rate was $100 \%$ in 2009 and 88\% in 2010.

This summary reports projections of counts to the full population of departments in Groups I Public, I Private, II, III, M and B according to the standard groupings of the Annual Survey. The method used to calculate the projected counts from the sample counts is described in the Endnotes.

## 2010 Results

## Response

## Rate

| Survey Group | Number Sampled | Number of Responses | Proportion of Faculty Sampled |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group I Public | 10 | 9 | 0.409 |
| Group I Private | 10 | 8 | 0.309 |
| Group II | 10 | 10 | 0.242 |
| Group III | 11 | 10 | 0.162 |
| Group M | 13 | 11 | 0.081 |
| Group B | 14 | 12 | 0.033 |
| TOTAL | 68 | 60 |  |

Total Recruitment, Change from 2007-08 to 2009-10, Projected Counts Survey question: Report the number of full-time positions requiring a doctorate you have tried to fill for the 2010-2011 academic year.

| Survey Group | Number Reported <br> in March 2010 | Change in Number <br> from 07-08 to 09-10 | Percentage Change <br> from 07-08 to 09-10 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group I Public | 125 | -31 | $-22.7 \%$ |
| Group I Private | 91 | -45 | $-33.3 \%$ |
| Group II | 136 | -99 | $-42.1 \%$ |


| Group III | 56 | -87 | $-60.9 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group M | 99 | -358 | $-78.4 \%$ |
| Group B | 336 | -551 | $-62.1 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 842 | -1176 | $-58.3 \%$ |
| I+II+III | 351 | -181 | $-34.0 \%$ |
| I+II+III+M | 450 | -539 | $-54.5 \%$ |

New Doc Recruitment, Change from 2007-08 to 2009-10, Projected Counts Survey question: Report the number of positions reported in Question 1 that were (are) open to new doctoral recipients.

| Survey Group | Number Reported <br> in March 2010 | Change in Number <br> from 07-08 to 09-10 | Percentage Change <br> from 07-08 to 09-10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group I Public | 105 | -39 | $-27.1 \%$ |
| Group I Private | 78 | -16 | $-17.2 \%$ |
| Group II | 116 | -37 | $24.3 \%$ |
| Group III | 37 | -93 | $-71.4 \%$ |
| Group M | 99 | -74 | $-42.9 \%$ |
| Group B | 336 | -459 | $-57.7 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 771 | -718 | $-48.2 \%$ |
| I+II+III | 298 | -92 | $-23.7 \%$ |
| I+II+III+M | 397 | -167 | $-29.5 \%$ |

## 2009 Results

## Response

## Rate

| Survey Group | Number Sampled | Number of Responses | Proportion of Faculty Sampled |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group I Public | 10 | 10 | 0.455 |
| Group I Private | 10 | 10 | 0.387 |
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| Group II | 10 | 10 | 0.242 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Group III | 10 | 10 | 0.162 |
| Group M | 14 | 14 | 0.103 |
| Group B | 14 | 14 | 0.038 |
| TOTAL | 68 | 68 |  |

Total Recruitment, Change from 2007-08 to 2008-09, Projected Counts Survey question: Report the number of full-time positions requiring a doctorate you have tried to fill for the 2009-2010 academic year.

| Survey Group | Number Reported <br> in February 2009 | Change in Number <br> from 07-08 to 08-09 | Percentage Change <br> from 07-08 to 08-09 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group I Public | 165 | -4 | $-2.6 \%$ |
| Group I Private | 90 | -57 | $-38.6 \%$ |
| Group II | 153 | -83 | $-35.1 \%$ |
| Group III | 74 | -62 | $-45.5 \%$ |
| Group M | 184 | -252 | $-57.8 \%$ |
| Group B | 367 | -472 | $-56.3 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 1034 | -930 | $-47.3 \%$ |
| I+II+III | 483 | -206 | $-29.9 \%$ |
| I+II+III+M | 667 | -458 | $-40.7 \%$ |

## New Doc Recruitment, Change from 2007-08 to 2008-09, Projected Counts

 Survey question: Report the number of positions reported in Question 1 that were (are) open to new doctoral recipients.| Survey Group | Number Reported <br> in February 2009 | Change in Number <br> from 07-08 to 08-09 | Percentage Change <br> from 07-08 to 08-09 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group I Public | 117 | -33 | $-22.1 \%$ |
| Group I Private | 39 | -70 | $-64.3 \%$ |
| Group II | 157 | 4 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Group III | 74 | -50 | $-40.0 \%$ |
| Group M | 165 | -39 | $-19.0 \%$ |
| Group B | 367 | -393 | $-51.7 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 918 | -580 | $-38.7 \%$ |


| $\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{II}+\mathrm{III}$ | 387 | -148 | $-27.7 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{II}+\mathrm{III}+\mathrm{M}$ | 551 | -187 | $-25.3 \%$ |

## Attachment C

## Endnotes

## Projected Counts

Within a Survey Group, the ratio between a projected count reported herein and the corresponding actual count for the sample is equal to the ratio within that Survey Group of the Total Doctoral Faculty (2007TDF) for that group in 2007 to the Total Doctoral Faculty In The Sampled Departments (2007TDFS) for that group in 2007.

The 2007 data are used for TDF because the analysis of the 2008 Annual Survey is still in progress.

Within Group---

$$
\text { Projected Count }=(\text { Sample Count }) \times(2007 T D F \div 2007 T D F S)
$$

There is a variation to this rule for the Group M and Group B analysis. 2008TDFS replaces 2007TDFS because the 2008 data are complete and the 2007 data are not.

## Participating

## Departments Group I

## Public

University of California, Los Angeles University of California, San Diego University of Illinois at Chicago Purdue University University of

Michigan City University of New York, Graduate
Center Ohio State University, Columbus
Pennsylvania State University University of
Washington University of Wisconsin

## Group I Private

California Institute of Technology
Northwestern University Harvard
University Washington University
Princeton University Columbia
University Cornell University
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Carnegie Mellon University
Brown University
Group IIArizona State UniversityUniversity of California, Davis
University of Florida University of
Georgia University of Iowa
University of Kentucky
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
North Carolina State University, Raleigh
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Texas
A\&M University
Group III
University of Alabama
University of South Florida
University of Kansas
University of Louisiana
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
University of Mississippi Boston College
Montana State University New Jersey
Institute of Technology Bowling Green
State University University of Memphis
Group M
Florida International University
Georgia State University Western
Illinois University Ball State
University Western Kentucky
University University of Dayton
John Carroll University Wright
State University
University of Tulsa
Millersville University
Villanova University
University of Texas-Pan American
Hampton University

Group B<br>Loyola Marymount University Bradley<br>University University of Southern<br>Indiana Northern Kentucky University<br>Williams College Grand Valley State<br>University St. Olaf College Truman<br>State University Lafayette College<br>Providence College Weber State<br>University University of Richmond<br>Gonzaga University University of<br>Wisconsin-Eau Claire

