

Appendix A: Ranking Methodology for Table 2

To sort PhD programs according to women's success compared to men's, we used eight metrics for each department:

- 1) Share women: the share of all first-years in the department, from 1994-2012, who are women.
- 2) Change in share women: the percent change in the share of women among departmental PhD graduates from 1994-2005 to 2006-2017.
- 3) Retention: the share of women among graduates from 1999-2017 over the share of women among first year students from 1994-2012.
- 4) Doctoral Placement: women's placement rate, relative to men's, into tenure-track faculty roles in any PhD-granting department .
- 5) Placement Rank: the average *US News* rank for women's economics doctoral placements, relative to men's placements from the department. For consistency of sign with other metrics, we replace rank with $100 - (\text{US News rank})$, so that the "best" programs are ranked 99. Programs without a *US News* ranking are assigned a value of zero on this scale.
- 6) Top 55: the ratio between women's and men's average number of publications in top 55 journals within seven years after graduating with a PhD.
- 7) Top 5: the ratio between women's and men's average number of publications in top 5 journals within 7 years after graduating with a PhD.
- 8) Promotion: the relative probability that a woman, compared to a man, who graduated from the program before 2011 is observed as an associate or full professor within 12 years after receiving her/his PhD.

We then converted each of these relative rates into z-scores with respect to the distribution of 22 schools, and calculated the mean z-score over the eight metrics. (For the four schools where fewer than 10 women graduate before 2011, we treat the promotion measure as missing.) We first looked for jumps in the mean z-scores to establish natural groupings. On the "less equal" side of the distribution, there were two large jumps of .2 standard deviations each. These served as natural division points into the "less equal" ($<-.2$ SDs) and "least equal" ($<-.5$ SDs) groups. There were fewer large shifts in the "more equal" side of the distribution, so we identified smaller shifts in the same vicinity as the "less equal" thresholds. After sorting the PhD programs into one of the five categories, we assigned anonymous IDs from A-V based on the average z-score, with A being the highest.

Appendix B: Interview script

Hi, is this XX?

Hi XX, My name is Leyla Mocan and I'm a research assistant working with Professor Boustan at Princeton on a project about women in economics for the Journal of Economic Perspectives. How are you? We are talking to several departments and trying to learn more about the outcomes and experiences of men and women in graduate school. We were hoping to talk to you to learn more about the experience of students in your PhD Program. All of your comments will be anonymous, and we will not disclose your department either. Do you have any questions before we start? [pause]

- To start, could you tell me a bit about the graduate program? Do most students who start the program end up graduating with a PhD?
 - Follow up: Are all students guaranteed funding or is the funding competitive?
- How do students first get connected with their advisors? When does this match tend to take place (first year, second year, after)?
- How frequent would you say the average students' contact with their advisor is? Do students tend to meet with their advisors weekly or monthly, or more sporadically?
- Are their regular seminars or workshops for students to interact with faculty?
 - What is the seminar culture like?
- What is the classroom culture like?
- What is job market preparation process like for the average student?
 - Is the process very structured or professionalized?
- What do you think is distinctive about your graduate program? What sets it apart?
- Is the department doing anything specific to address the special challenges faced by women in economics?
 - Do you see any difference in the environment for men and women?
- Is there anyone else who I should talk to?
 - Specifically, we were hoping to talk to two additional people to get a deeper sense of your department: one would be a faculty member (or former faculty member) who can offer a long-run perspective, and another would be a graduate of the PhD program, preferably from before 2010, again so that person would have a longer-run perspective.