Distribution by Rank of 1988 Summer Investigators at MBL

Rank	No.	Percent of Total
Professor/Chief Scientist	77	53.5
Associate Professor	31	21.5
Assistant Professor	22	15.3
Research Associate/ Postdoctoral/Graduate Student*	14	9.7
Totals	144	100.0

---

* 8 of the 14 at this rank were from the Grass group

Prepared by Office of Sponsored Programs 10/26/88.

Questions about the nature of the data on the distribution of summer investigators at MBL that documents that 75% of these investigators are probably tenured, that 53% are senior scientists, and that only 15% of them are in the Assistant Professor rank.

1. Why should we see this distribution?

It would appear that there is stability in the distribution of ranks among the summer investigators at the MBL which probably tracks the class of Ph.D.s hired during the 1960's and 1970's when the number of investigators increased substantially.

2. Is this pattern likely to continue?

Any predictive model would have to know the age distribution of those in the various ranks and the distribution pattern over the last 5 years, at least. Nevertheless, since we know that the number of applicants for space has not changed markedly in the last several years, being almost a complete fit between supply and demand, we can conclude that this pattern is likely to continue until the professors withdraw from the MBL.

3. Will the professors be replaced by the younger investigators or will the numbers of summer investigators decline?

This is a problem in recruitment and would appear to involve as the major constraints to the new investigator both knowledge of the opportunity to do summer research at the MBL and the financial resources to pay the considerable costs.

It is important that they would have to know that the MBL has openings for young investigators and that there is something attractive to young investigators about doing summer research at the MBL. The degree of importance of these factors can be tested by contacting former students, by asking current Assistant Professors how they learned of the MBL, and by advertising the features we think would attract younger investigators and seeing what response we get.

Cost is another serious obstacle, and we must try novel approaches to assist financially those young investigators interested in doing research at the MBL. Moreover, by coupling an offer of financial assistance with our advertising of the unparalleled intellectual climate, perhaps the prospect of summers at MBL would be more attractive to young investigators.