

# Comprehensive Report<sup>1</sup> on the 2001 Survey of Departments Offering CAC -Accredited Degree Programs

May 2002

Renée A. McCauley and Bill Manaris  
Department of Computer Science  
College of Charleston  
Charleston, SC 29424  
{mccauley | manaris}@cs.cofc.edu

## Introduction

This document provides results of the sixth survey of departments offering degree programs accredited by the Computing Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (CAC/ABET)<sup>2</sup> [1]. The survey was carried out annually from 1995 through 1999. It is now being conducted on a bi-annual basis. This work has been partially supported by the National Science Foundation's Division of Undergraduate Education through grant DUE #9752482.

The goal of this survey is to provide structured, up-to-date information in terms of demographics and statistics related to curricula, faculty, and students in accredited undergraduate computer science degree programs. This project has the following objectives:

- facilitate the sharing and communication of information among departments offering baccalaureate degree programs in CS;
- provide faculty with information that can be used to assess, monitor, and compare their programs to others in the nation in terms of curriculum issues, faculty composition, faculty workloads, student enrollment and graduation rates; and
- provide faculty with supporting information to be used in planning and implementing course and curriculum developments and program enhancements by identifying standards in infrastructure and curricula.

The tables listed in this document present summaries of various results from the survey collected in the winter of 2001-2002.<sup>3</sup> These tables are grouped according to their focus, namely academic-unit-, curriculum-, student-, and faculty-related information. Whenever relevant, data collected over the past 6 survey-years are shown.

## Academic Unit Information (Tables 1-3)

This section presents information on the academic units offering the accredited degree programs. Table 1 displays the names of the departments offering the accredited degree programs.

Name of Department	Number
Computer/Computing Science	32 (71%)
Computer Science & Engineering	3 (7%)
Computer & Information Science/Technology	3 (7%)
Mathematical Sciences	2 (4%)
Computer Science & Mathematics	1 (2%)
No department name provided	4 (9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>45 (100%)</b>

**Table 1. Names of Departments Participating in this Survey**

Table 2 displays the names of the academic divisions (college or school) housing these departments. All computing-related<sup>4</sup> divisions are grouped together. All engineering-related<sup>5</sup> divisions have been included in the *Engineering* category. All sciences-only-related<sup>6</sup> divisions have been included in the *Sciences* category.

<sup>1</sup> This report may be referenced as technical report CoC/CS TR# 2002-9-1, Department of Computer Science, College of Charleston and is available in HTML or PDF from <http://www.cs.cofc.edu/~mccauley/survey>.

<sup>2</sup> Up until recently, these programs were accredited by the Computer Science Accreditation Commission (CSAC) of the Computing Sciences Accreditation Board (CSAB).

<sup>3</sup> This survey was sent to 151 departments; 45 completed the survey instrument in time for their data to be included.

<sup>4</sup> These are divisions that included "computing," "computer science," "information science" or "technology" in their titles.

<sup>5</sup> These are divisions whose title includes the word "engineering", but do not fit into the "computing-related" category.

<sup>6</sup> These are divisions whose title includes "science", but not "arts" and don't fit into either the "engineering" or "computing-related" categories.

Name of Academic Division	Number
Arts & Sciences	10 (20%)
Computer/Information Science	11(24%)
Engineering	9 (20%)
Sciences	6 (16%)
<i>Did not indicate</i>	9 (20%)
<b>Total</b>	45 (100%)

**Table 2. Name of Academic Division**

Table 3 displays information on degrees offered by departments in addition to the accredited degree program. The percentages included in this table are calculated as the number of departments that offer this degree out of the forty-five departments responding to the survey. Nine departments (20% of respondents) offer only undergraduate degrees in Computer Science. Seventeen departments (38%) offer M.S. but no Ph.D. degrees in Computer Science.

Name of Degree	Number of Departments
Computer Science, Ph.D.	19 (42%)
Computer Science, M.S.	36 (80%)
Computer Science, B.S.	7 (16%)
Computer Science, B.A.	7 (16%)
Computer Engineering	4 (9%)
Computer Information Systems	10 (22%)
Electrical Engineering	1 (2%)
Mathematics	4 (9%)
Information Science/Technology	5 (11%)
Software Engineering	2 (4%)

**Table 3. Degrees Offered by Departments**

#### Curriculum Data (Tables 4 - 14)

This section presents curriculum-related information for academic years 1995-6 through 1999-2000 and 2001-2.

Table 4 displays five years of data on the programming languages taught as *first* programming languages for majors in accredited programs [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. It also provides information on languages expected to be taught in the 2002-3 academic year. The percentages included in this table are calculated as the number of departments using a specific language out of the total number of departments responding to the survey in the specified survey year.

First Language	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2001-2002	Projections for 2002-2003
Ada	12%	18%	19%	7%	6%	4%	2%
BASIC	-	-	-	1%	-	-	
C	17%	14%	11%	20%	19%	11%	9%
C++	32%	39%	47%	50%	54%	40%	40%
Eiffel	2%	-	2%	1%	-	-	
FORTRAN	2%	-	-	-	-	-	
Java	-	-	9%	22%	22%	49%	56%
JavaScript	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	
Modula-2	-	2%	-	-	-	-	
Pascal	36%	23%	6%	2%	5%	2%	0%
Scheme	2%	4%	4%	1%	-	-	
Visual BASIC	-	2%	-	-	-	-	

**Table 4. First Languages Taught in Curricula in Academic Years 1995-96 Through 2001-2002**

Table 5 displays data on usage of programming language(s) considered to be the primary teaching languages in degree programs [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. It also shows the languages that departments expect to be teaching in academic year 2001-2. (Several schools consider more than one language to be primary in their programs.)

Primary Language	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2001-2002	Projections for 2002-2003
Ada	17%	14%	15%	7%	6%	2%	2%

C	49%	27%	9%	24%	16%	22%	17%
C++	48%	54%	68%	77%	75%	53%	58%
Java	-	-	11%	21%	27%	51%	56%
Modula-2	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-
Pascal	25%	13%	6%	4%	3%	2%	-
Prolog	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Scheme	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	-
Smalltalk	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	2%

**Table 5. Primary Programming Languages in Use in Curricula**

Table 6 displays statistics on the primary programming paradigm taught [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. (Some schools consider both paradigms as primary to their degree program.)

Paradigm	1995-6	1996-7	1997-8	1998-9	1999-2000	2001-02
Procedure-Oriented	73%	54%	30%	35%	27%	31%
Object-Oriented	36%	55%	74%	74%	83%	82%

**Table 6. Primary Paradigm Taught**

Table 7 displays statistics on the use of closed labs<sup>7</sup> [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. Additionally, for the current survey year, 33% of respondents indicated using closed labs in a variety of courses beyond CS2.

	CS1	CS2	CS3	Other
<b>1995</b>	35 (60%)	33 (57%)	10 (17%)	17 (29%)
<b>1996</b>	39 (70%)	23 (41%)	8 (14%)	22 (39%)
<b>1997</b>	39 (74%)	28 (53%)	11 (21%)	18 (34%)
<b>1998</b>	58 (71%)	37 (45%)	-	28 (34%)
<b>1999</b>	44 (70%)	31 (49%)	-	21 (33%)
<b>2001</b>	33 (73%)	24 (53%)	-	15 (33%)

**Table 7. Use of Closed Labs**

Tables 8, 9 and 10 report credit-hour requirements in degree programs. Answers in terms of semester hours were provided by 89% of those responding. (All credit-hour data given in quarter credit hours have been converted to semester credit hours, using the formula: 120 semester credits = 180 quarter credits.) Table 8 indicates the number of semester credit hours required for a degree. These numbers are consistent with those reported over the past years, except that the maximum has decreased (down from 155 in 1999) [3, 4, 5, 6].

	Minimum	Average	Maximum
<b>Semester Hours</b>	120	125	131

**Table 8. Credit Hours Required for a Degree**

Table 9 reports on the number of semester credit hours required in computer science, mathematics and science courses. Again, these averages are consistent with those reported over the past years [3, 4, 5, 6].

Semester Hours	CS	Math	Physics	Sciences
<b>Minimum</b>	31	13	0	8
<b>Average</b>	47	17	5	14
<b>Maximum</b>	60	23	12	26

**Table 9. Credit Hours Required in Various Areas of Study**

Table 10 shows physics requirements. This information is gathered in order to ascertain to what extent physics is required in degree programs. A majority of programs (58%) require some physics credits, while the other programs allow students to choose from a variety of sciences including but not requiring physics.

<sup>7</sup> Since 1998, the survey questionnaire has not listed CS3 as choice for the closed laboratory question.

Semester	Physics	Non Physics
Minimum	0	3
Average	5	9
Maximum	12	16

**Table 10. Credit Hours Required in Specific Sciences**

Table 11 names the computer science courses offered at the upper-level during academic year 2001-02. The survey specifically asks about *required* and *elective courses offered* at the junior/senior level that are focused on the specific topics listed. The *Offered* column shows the number of departments that offer one or more courses in a the topic area. The *Required* and *Elective* columns show, respectively, the numbers of degree programs that require a course or offer an elective course in a topic area. These results are similar to those seen over past survey years [3, 4, 5, 6].

Course	Offered	Required	Elective
Analysis of Algorithms (AA)	38 (84%)	30 (67%)	11 (24%)
Architecture (AR)	39 (87%)	31 (69%)	10 (22%)
Artificial Intelligence (AI)	43 (95%)	4 (9%)	39 (87%)
Compiler Construction (CC)	38 (84%)	7 (16%)	32 (71%)
Database Management Systems (DB)	43 (96%)	14 (31%)	29 (64%)
Ethical, Social Issues (ET)	34 (76%)	34 (76%)	-
Graphics (GR)	42 (93%)	-	42 (93%)
Human-Computer Interaction (HC)	24 (53%)	2 (4%)	22 (49%)
Networks (NW)	44 (98%)	8 (18%)	37 (82%)
Operating Systems (OS)	44 (98%)	43 (96%)	5 (11%)
Parallel Computing (PC)	24 (53%)	-	24 (53%)
Programming Languages (PL)	42 (93%)	39 (87%)	4 (9%)
Robotics (RB)	12 (27%)	-	12 (27%)
Software Engineering (SE)	44 (98%)	34 (76%)	12 (27%)
Simulation (SI)	16 (36%)	-	16 (36%)
Theory of Computation (TH)	34 (76%)	22 (49%)	13 (29%)
VLSI Design (VL)	6 (13%)	0 (0%)	6 (13%)

**Table 11. Upper-Level Courses**

Twenty-seven percent of departments indicated offering some course(s) through distance learning. Table 12 shows the delivery methods in use for those courses. (The percentages shown are based on the number of schools that use a particular delivery method out of all schools that provide courses through distance learning.)

Web	Interactive Web	Streaming Video	Compressed Video	Broadcast Video
4 (33%)	1 (8%)	4 (33%)	3 (25%)	3 (25%)

**Table 12. Method of Delivery of Courses Offered Through Distance Learning**

Only one responding department requires a co-op or internship experience in their degree program.

### Student Information (Tables 13 -17)

This section presents information on degree production and enrollment figures in terms of number, gender, and ethnicity of students. Six departments did not have easy access to gender or ethnicity information for graduates and 15 departments did not have this information for enrolled students, thus, the large numbers of students listed in *Unknown* fields.

The next two tables pertain to the awarding of degrees in accredited programs. Table 13 provides a breakdown of graduates according to ethnicity; Table 14 shows the breakdown in terms of gender.

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number of Degrees</b>
Nonresident Alien	107 (4%)
African American	67 (3%)
Asian	336 (15%)
Hispanic	85 (4%)
Native American	2 (0%)
White	1190 (54%)
<i>Other</i>	47 (2%)
<i>Ethnicity Unknown</i>	367 (17%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2201 (100%)</b>

**Table 13. Degrees Awarded in 2000-1 by Ethnicity**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Number of Degrees</b>
Males	1475 (67%)
Females	358 (16%)
Unknown	368 (17%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2201 (100%)</b>

**Table 14. Degrees Awarded in 2000-1 by Gender**

The following tables display enrollment information for academic year 2000-1. Table 15 displays enrollment figures according to ethnicity; Table 16 displays enrollment figures according to gender; Table 17 displays enrollment figures according to classification. The number of enrolled students averaged 385 per department.

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number Enrolled</b>
Nonresident Alien	679 (4%)
African American	1248 (7%)
Asian	1667 (10%)
Hispanic	693 (4%)
Native American	40 (0%)
White	6901 (40%)
<i>Other</i>	110 (1%)
<i>Ethnicity Unknown</i>	5993 (35%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>17331 (100%)</b>

**Table 15. Ethnicity of Enrolled Students in 1998-99**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Number of Enrolled</b>
Male	9182 (53%)
Female	2136 (12%)
Unknown	6013 (35%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>17331 (100%)</b>

**Table 16. Gender of Enrolled Students in 1998-99**

Table 17 provides a class breakdown for enrolled students.

<b>Freshmen</b>	<b>Sophomores</b>	<b>Juniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>	<b>Unknown/Did</b>	<b>Total</b>
5232 (30%)	3328 (19%)	3118 (18%)	3782 (22%)	1871 (11%)	17331 (100%)

**Table 17. Class Breakdown of Enrolled Students in 1998-99**

### **Faculty Information (Tables 18 - 35)**

This section provides information on teaching faculty.<sup>8</sup> This information focuses on gender, rank, ethnicity, salaries, new appointments, and workload requirements in departments offering accredited degree programs.

<sup>8</sup> These are full-time faculty who have a regular teaching assignment in the accredited degree program.

Table 18 displays faculty numbers according to gender and rank for all surveyed programs. The count of 953 faculty members in 63 departments indicates that department size, in terms of numbers of full-time faculty, averages 15 faculty members per department.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total by Rank</b>	<b>Male/Female Ratio</b>
Full-Professors	188 (85%)	32 (15%)	220 (30%)	6:1
Associate Professors	184 (81%)	42 (19%)	226 (31%)	4:1
Assistant Professors	153 (87%)	23 (13%)	176 (24%)	7:1
Instructors	69 (59%)	47 (41 %)	116 (16%)	1.5:1
<b>Total by Gender</b>	594 (80%)	144 (20%)	738 (100%)	4:1

**Table 18. Gender & Rank of Faculty at All Institutions**

For comparison purposes, Table 19 shows faculty counts by gender for previous survey years [2, 3, 4, 5].

<b>Year</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Did not indicate gender</b>	<b>Total Faculty</b>	<b>Male/Female</b>
1995-96	687 (84%)	132 (16%)	-	819	5:1
1996-97	589 (81%)	140 (19%)	-	729	4:1
1997-98	663.5 (82%)	136 (17%)	9 (1%)	808.5	5:1
1998-99	1,039 (82%)	227 (18%)	-	1,266	4.5:1
1999-2000	756 (79%)	197 (21%)	-	953	4:1
2001-2002	594 (80%)	144 (20%)	-	738	4:1

**Table 19. Faculty Counts by Gender in Previous Survey Years**

The next three tables provide a breakdown of faculty by gender & rank for departments according to the highest computer science degree that they offer: Bachelor's degrees (Table 20), Master's degrees (Table 21), and Doctor of Philosophy degrees (Table 22).

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male/Female</b>
Full-Professors	17 (85%)	3 (15%)	6:1
Associate Professors	16 (73%)	6 (27%)	2.5:1
Assistant Professors	20 (91%)	2 (9%)	10:1
Instructors	7 (50%)	7 (50%)	1:1
<b>Total</b>	60 (77%)	18 (23%)	3:1

**Table 20. Gender & Rank of Faculty in 9 B.S.-granting Departments**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male/Female</b>
Full-Professors	62 (83%)	13 (17%)	5:1
Associate Professors	48 (75%)	16 (25%)	3:1
Assistant Professors	46 (87%)	7 (13%)	6.5:1
Instructors	17 (47%)	19 (53%)	1:1
<b>Total</b>	173 (76%)	55 (24%)	3:1

**Table 21. Gender & Rank of Faculty in 17 B.S. and M.S.-granting Departments**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male/Female</b>
Full-Professors	109 (87%)	16 (13%)	7:1
Associate Professors	120 (86%)	20 (14%)	5:1
Assistant Professors	87 (76%)	21 (24%)	3:1
Instructors	45 (70%)	21 (30%)	2:1
<b>Total</b>	361 (84%)	71 (16%)	5:1

**Table 22. Gender & Rank of Faculty in 19 B.S., M.S. and Ph.D.-granting Departments**

Table 23 provides information on faculty counts according to rank and ethnicity.

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Full</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Instructor</b>	<b>Total</b>
Nonresident Alien	2 (0%)	6 (1%)	19 (3%)	2 (0%)	29 (4%)
African American	1 (0%)	2 (0%)	7 (1%)	11 (1%)	21 (3%)
Asian	42 (6%)	56 (8%)	29 (4%)	8 (1%)	135 (18%)
Hispanic	2 (0%)	4 (1%)	8 (1%)	1 (0%)	15 (2%)
Native American/Alaskan	1 (0%)	-	5 (1%)	-	6 (1%)
White	172 (23%)	150 (20%)	102 (14%)	92 (12%)	516 (70%)
<i>Other</i>	0 (0%)	6 (1%)	3 (0%)	1 (0%)	10 (1%)
<i>Unknown/Did not indicate</i>	0 (0%)	2 (0%)	3 (0%)	1 (0%)	6 (1%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>220 (30%)</b>	<b>226 (31%)</b>	<b>176 (24%)</b>	<b>116 (16%)</b>	<b>738 (100%)</b>

**Table 23. Ethnicity & Rank of Faculty**

Table 24 displays data on actual and estimated numbers of full-time faculty positions in departments for academic years 1994-95 through 1999-2000. The number of departments providing information for specific years varied and thus is included in the table.

<b>Year</b>	<b># of Departments</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Positions Per Department</b>
1994-95	54	722	13
1995-96	54	720.5	13
1996-97	56	729	13
1997-98	52	808.5	15
1998-99	82	1,266	15
1999-2000	62	953	15
2001-02	45	738	16
2002-03 (projected)	44	758	17
2003-04 (projected)	44	804	18

**Table 24. Faculty Positions Per Department**

Table 25 provides nine-month salaries, effective January 2001, for faculty in all departments. Specifically, it provides statistics on the minimum salaries across ranks by identifying the minimum, mean, and maximum of all reported salary minimums. Also, it provides statistics on the maximum salaries at each rank by identifying the minimum, mean, and maximum of all reported salary maximums. Finally, it identifies the average nine-month salaries at each rank based on the average salary for a rank and the number of faculty at that rank for whom such data were reported. For comparison purposes, Table 26 shows average faculty salaries at each rank for past survey years.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Reported Salary Minimums</b>			<b>Average of Salaries</b>	<b>Reported Salary Maximums</b>		
	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Maximum</b>		<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Full Professors	\$58,690	\$79,095	\$109,150	\$92,037	\$67,975	\$107,373	\$182,117
Associate	\$47,000	\$65,392	\$78,113	\$74,871	\$55,088	\$77,249	\$100,000
Assistant	\$44,870	\$60,513	\$81,000	\$65,493	\$47,039	\$66,986	\$85,000
Instructors	\$27,000	\$41,505	\$60,000	\$45,161	\$27,000	\$48,974	\$82,000

**Table 25. Nine-Month Salaries for All Departments**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>1995-96</b>	<b>1996-97</b>	<b>1997-98</b>	<b>1998-99</b>	<b>1999-00</b>
Full Professors	\$70,400	\$70,315	\$75,139	\$81,800	\$83,626
Associate	\$57,711	\$56,992	\$61,570	\$65,659	\$66,919
Assistant	\$50,491	\$46,234	\$53,327	\$57,379	\$58,425
Instructors	\$35,041	\$35,497	\$39,181	\$42,839	\$41,758

**Table 26. Average Faculty Salaries In Previous Survey Years According to Rank**

The next three tables display faculty salary data, reported this year, according to the highest computer science degree offered by the department: bachelor's degree(s) (Table 27), M.S. degree(s) (Table 28), and Ph.D. degree(s) (Table 29).

Rank	Reported Salary Minimums			Average of Salaries	Reported Salary Maximums		
	Minimum	Mean	Maximum		Minimum	Mean	Maximum
Full Professors	\$58,690	\$76,052	\$109,150	\$76,644	\$67,975	\$84,085	\$109,150
Associate	\$47,000	\$59,669	\$71,000	\$64,316	\$55,088	\$66,907	\$84,220
Assistant	\$46,575	\$53,036	\$69,000	\$54,592	\$47,039	\$57,994	\$69,000
Instructors	\$31,300	\$40,986	\$52,500	\$42,385	\$31,300	\$42,835	\$52,500

**Table 27. Nine-Month Salaries for Departments Offering Only Bachelor's Degrees**

Rank	Reported Salary Minimums			Average of Salaries	Reported Salary Maximums		
	Minimum	Mean	Maximum		Minimum	Mean	Maximum
Full Professors	\$60,000	\$76,178	\$85,044	\$84,440	\$70,800	\$93,324	\$136,000
Associate	\$56,000	\$65,524	\$76,000	\$70,304	\$61,150	\$75,274	\$100,000
Assistant	\$44,870	\$58,231	\$68,544	\$61,798	\$50,000	\$64,001	\$75,000
Instructors	\$27,000	\$40,824	\$50,000	\$44,236	\$27,000	\$46,051	\$60,288

**Table 28. Nine-Month Salaries for Departments Offering Bachelor's and Master's Degrees**

Rank	Reported Salary Minimums			Average of Salaries	Reported Salary Maximums		
	Minimum	Mean	Maximum		Minimum	Mean	Maximum
Full Professors	\$61,282	\$82,921	\$109,000	\$99,346	\$84,779	\$129,359	\$182,117
Associate	\$55,084	\$67,812	\$78,113	\$79,033	\$67,064	\$83,710	\$94,117
Assistant	\$55,620	\$65,990	\$81,000	\$69,948	\$62,820	\$73,801	\$85,000
Instructors	\$30,000	\$42,337	\$60,000	\$46,186	\$35,000	\$54,373	\$82,000

**Table 29. Nine-Month Salaries for Departments Offering Bachelor's, Master's, and Ph.D. Degrees**

Table 30 and Table 31 display additional salary data from our survey. Table 30 provides average faculty salaries in departments categorized according to the highest computer science degree offered. Table 31 shows the average faculty salary for all faculty reported for each year of this survey [2, 3, 4, 5].

Highest Degree Offered	Average of All Salaries
B.S.	\$61,204
M.S.	\$68,982
Ph.D.	\$77,522
All Departments	\$73,048

**Table 30. Average Salaries for all Faculty According to Degrees Offered in Departments**

Academic Year	Average of All Salaries
1995-96	\$55,792
1996-97	\$57,324
1997-98	\$61,301
1998-99	\$67,677
1999-2000	\$66,624
2001-2002	\$73,048

**Table 31. Average Salaries by Survey Year**

For comparison purposes, Table 32 shows the average salaries at each rank in departments offering the Ph.D. degree in CS in the U.S. as recorded by the Taulbee Survey [7, 8, 9]. The Taulbee survey includes only Ph.D.-granting institutions, some of which may not have accredited undergraduate degree programs and thus would not be included in our survey. The salaries were effective January 1 of the year listed.

Rank	2000	2001	2002
Full Professors	\$95,526	\$99,690	\$105,496
Associate Professors	\$72,177	\$76,997	\$81,050
Assistant Professors	\$64,244	\$68,628	\$72,691

**Table 32. Average Nine-Month Salaries Reported in 1999-2000, 2000-2001 & 2001-2002 CRA Taulbee Surveys**

Table 33 shows salary figures for newly-hired, new Ph.D.s that began work in 2001-2002. The Taulbee survey reported an average nine-month salary of \$73,979 for new Ph.D.s hired into tenure-track positions in Ph.D.-granting departments for the same year [8].

Rank	Reported Salary Minimums			Average of All Salaries	Reported Salary Maximums		
	Minimum	Mean	Maximum		Minimum	Mean	Maximum
New Ph.D.'s	\$48,000	\$64,595	\$81,000	\$65,131	\$48,000	\$66,409	\$81,000

**Table 33. Nine-Month Salaries of New Ph.D.s Hired for 1998-99**

Table 34 shows data collected in this survey regarding numbers of departments hiring

Year	Number of Departments	Number of New Ph.D.s Hired	Average Salary
1995-96	14	23	\$49,768
1996-97	13	17	\$50,197
1997-98	17	24	\$53,291
1998-99	31	68	\$55,145
1999-2000	28	49	\$58,160
2000-2001	26	46	\$65,131

**Table 34. Data for Newly-Hired, New Ph.D.s**

Table 35 displays workload information in terms of job requirements in teaching, research, and service.

Responsibility	Minimum	Average	Maximum
Teaching	38%	56%	80%
Research/Scholarly Activity	10%	30%	50%
Service	0%	14%	25%

**Table 35. Faculty Workload Requirements**

## Summary & Future Directions

This report presented the results from the fifth annual survey of departments offering accredited computer science degree programs. We believe that these results are of interest and use to many accredited and non-accredited departments. This is because they facilitate monitoring and comparing individual programs to other programs in the nation in terms of faculty composition, student enrollment and graduation rates, faculty salaries, and curriculum issues.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Doris Lidtke and CAC/ABET for their support. We also thank all of the department chairs and support staff that made the time to complete and return the survey instrument.

## References

1. Computing Accreditation Commission/ Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology. "Criteria for Accrediting Computing Programs," <http://www.abet.org/criteria.html>.
2. McCauley, R.A. and B.Z. Manaris. "Comprehensive Report on the 1995 Survey of Departments offering CSAC/CSAB-Accredited Degree Programs," Technical Report #TR-96-9-1, Center for Advanced Computer Studies, University of Southwestern Louisiana, October 1996. <http://www.cs.cofc.edu/~mccauley/survey/report95/>
3. McCauley, R.A. and B.Z. Manaris. "Comprehensive Report on the 1996 Survey of Departments offering CSAC/CSAB-Accredited Degree Programs," Technical Report #TR-97-9-1, Center for Advanced Computer Studies, University of Southwestern Louisiana, October 1997. <http://www.cs.cofc.edu/~mccauley/survey/report1996/>
4. McCauley, R.A. and B.Z. Manaris. "Comprehensive Report on the 1997 Survey of Departments offering CSAC/CSAB-Accredited Degree Programs," Technical Report #TR-98-9-1, Center for Advanced Computer Studies, University of Southwestern Louisiana, October 1998. <http://www.cs.cofc.edu/~mccauley/survey/report1997/>

5. McCauley, R.A. and B.Z. Manaris. "Comprehensive Report on the 1998 Survey of Departments offering CSAC/CSAB-Accredited Degree Programs," Technical Report #TR-99-9-1, Center for Advanced Computer Studies, University of Southwestern Louisiana, October 1998. <http://www.cs.cofc.edu/~mccauley/survey/report1998/>
6. McCauley, R.A. and B.Z. Manaris. "Comprehensive Report on the 1999 Survey of Departments offering CSAC/CSAB-Accredited Degree Programs," Technical Report # CoC/CS TR# 2000-9-1, Department of Computer Science, College of Charleston. <http://www.cs.cofc.edu/~mccauley/survey/report1999/>
7. Irwin, M.J. and F. Friedman. "Ph.D. Enrollment Levels Off; M.S. and Undergrad Continue to Rise: 1998-1999 Taulbee Survey," *Computing Research News*, 12(2), March 2000, pp. 5-13.
8. Bryant, R. and M.J. Irwin. "Current and Future Ph.D. Output Will Not Satisfy Demand for Faculty: 1999-2000 Taulbee Survey," *Computing Research News*, 13(2), March 2001, pp. 5-11.
9. Bryant, R. and M.Y. Vardi. "Hope for More Balance in Supply and Demand: 2000-2001 Taulbee Survey," *Computing Research News*, 14(2), March 2002, pp. 4-11.