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Abstract

This paper documents differences across higher-education courses in the coverage of frontier knowledge. Comparing the text of 1.7M syllabi and 20M academic articles, we construct the “education-innovation gap,” a syllabus’s relative proximity to old and new knowledge. We show that courses differ greatly in the extent to which they cover frontier knowledge. More selective and better funded schools, and those enrolling socio-economically advantaged students, teach more frontier knowledge. Third, instructors play a big role in shaping course content; research-active instructors teach more frontier knowledge. Lastly, the presence of frontier knowledge is strongly related to students’ ability to innovate and their labor market outcomes.
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1 Introduction

The dissemination of up-to-date knowledge is key for innovation and economic growth (Goldin and Katz, 2010; Jones, 2009). Higher education (HE) plays a central role in this process. Through the teaching of their curricula, HE programs facilitate human capital accumulation and nurture future innovators (Biasi, Deming, and Moser, 2020). These programs, though, might differ in their ability to equip students with up-to-date knowledge. These differences can have important implications for labor market outcomes, education choices, and technological progress. Yet, they have so far remained unexplored; very little is known on how the content of HE varies across and within schools, how it is shaped, and how it relates to students’ outcomes.

This paper brings together new data and a novel methodology to measure the extent to which HE courses cover frontier, i.e., recently produced, knowledge. Applying natural language processing (NLP) techniques to textual information on course syllabi (the content of HE courses) and academic publications (the frontier of knowledge), we build a novel metric: the education-innovation gap, designed to capture the distance between education content and the knowledge frontier. Specifically, we define the gap as a ratio of similarities of a course’s content with knowledge from older vintages (covered by articles published decades ago) and new, frontier knowledge (covered by the most recent articles). For example, a Computer Science course that teaches Visual Basic (a relatively obsolete programming language) in 2020 would have a larger gap compared with a course that teaches Julia (a more recent programming language), because Visual Basic is mostly covered by old articles and Julia is mostly covered by recent articles.

Using the education-innovation gap, we study the content of HE courses and provide four findings. First, HE courses differ greatly in their coverage of frontier knowledge, even conditioning on discipline and course level. Second, more selective and better funded institutions offer courses with a lower gap. These schools also enroll fewer disadvantaged students (Chetty et al., 2020), which implies that access to frontier knowledge is highly unequal. Third, instructors play a big role in shaping the content of their courses and research-active instructors teach more frontier knowledge, suggesting complementarities between teaching and research activities. Lastly, the dissemination of

---

1 Differences in HE programs attended have been associated with differences in earnings (Hoxby, 2020; Mountjoy and Hickman, 2020) and rates of invention (Bell et al., 2019).
2 First released in 1991, Visual Basic is still supported by Microsoft in recent software frameworks but the company announced in 2020 that it would not be further evolved (https://visualstudiomagazine.com/articles/2020/03/vb-in-net-5.aspx, retrieved 9/30/2020). Julia is a general-purpose language initially developed in 2009. Constantly updated, it is among the best for numerical analyses and computational science. As of July 2021 it was used at 1,500 universities, with over 29 million downloads and a 87 percent increase in a single year (https://juliacomputing.com/blog/2021/08/newsletter-august/, retrieved 9/30/2021).
frontier knowledge through HE courses is strongly and positively related to students’ labor market outcomes and their ability to innovate in the future.

Our empirical analysis uses a novel source of information: the text of a sample of 1.7 million college and university syllabi, including about 540,000 courses taught at 800 four-year US institutions between 1998 and 2018. This sample represents about 5% of all courses taught in this time window, and it covers nearly all fields. While the sample over-represents courses from very selective schools, it is representative of the population in terms of fields, course levels (basic, advanced undergraduate, and graduate), and a broad set of school characteristics.

To construct the education-innovation gap, we start by calculating measures of textual similarity between each syllabus and the title, abstract, and keywords of over 20 million academic articles published in top academic journals since the journal’s creation. Calculating pair-wise textual similarities involves three steps. First, we represent each document (a syllabus or an article) as a term frequency vector, projecting the text of the document on a comprehensive list of terms that refer to knowledge items. Each vector element is the frequency of a given term in the document, divided by the length of the document. Second, we use the “term-frequency-backward-inverse-document-frequency” (TFBIDF) approach (Kelly et al., 2021) to increase the importance of terms that are more informative of a document’s content. This approach gives more weight to terms that are “unique” to a document and de-emphasizes terms more commonly used across all documents. Third, we use these reweighted term frequency vectors to compute the cosine similarity between each syllabus and each article.

Armed with these cosine similarities, we construct the education-innovation gap of a given syllabus as the ratio of its average similarities with (a) older knowledge vintages, i.e., all articles published 13-15 years prior to the syllabus’s date and (b) frontier knowledge, i.e., all articles published 1-3 years prior. Naturally, the gap is higher for syllabi that cover more older (rather than newer) knowledge. By virtue of being constructed as a ratio of similarities, the gap is not affected by idiosyncratic attributes of a syllabus such as length, structure, or writing style, which could introduce noise in the measurement of content. Moreover, the TFBIDF-adjustment implies that our method does not penalize syllabi for covering “classic” or “fundamental” knowledge, which may belong to older knowledge vintages but still be relevant; being common across many documents, terms pertaining to classic topics will receive a low weight.

A few empirical regularities confirm the ability of our measure to capture the distance between course content and the knowledge frontier. First, the gap is lower for syllabi that reference more
recent articles and books in their lists of recommended readings. Second, the gap varies reason-
ably across course levels: It is largest for basic undergraduate courses (taught in the first two years
of a bachelor’s degree and more likely to cover the fundamentals of a discipline) and smallest for
graduate-level courses (master’s and PhD). Third, using a simulation exercise, we show that gradu-
ally replacing “older” knowledge in a syllabus with “newer” knowledge (i.e., words most fre-
quently appearing in old and new articles, respectively) progressively reduces the gap.

We begin by documenting significant differences in the gap across syllabi. To move a syllabus
from the 25th (91.6) to the 75th percentile (98.8) of the gap distribution, approximately half of its
content would have to be replaced with newer knowledge. Most of this variation occurs across
courses and instructors; a smaller share can be attributed to differences across fields and course
levels. To account for these differences, the rest of our analysis compares syllabi within each field,
course level, and year. The average syllabus in our data is more similar to newer than to older
knowledge: Multiplying the gap by 100 for simplicity, its average equals 95.

Differences in the education-innovation gap across schools are useful to understand how the
content of higher education is shaped. The gap is smaller in schools with a stronger focus on re-
search (ranked as R1 in the Carnegie classification) and with more resources (higher endowment
and spending on instruction and research). The gap is also smaller in more selective schools (for
example the “Ivy-Plus,” including the eight Ivy League colleges plus Stanford, MIT, Duke, and
the University of Chicago) compared to non-selective schools. The magnitude of this difference is
such that, in order to make the average syllabus in non-selective schools comparable to the aver-
age syllabus in an Ivy-Plus school, 8 percent of its content would have to be replaced with newer
knowledge.

Importantly, differences across schools translate into disparities in access to up-to-date knowl-
dge across students with different backgrounds. The education-innovation gap is significantly
higher in schools enrolling students with lower median parental income and those with a higher
share of Black or Hispanic students. This occurs because wealthier and more selective schools enroll
more socio-economically advantaged students (Chetty et al., 2020).

In principle, part of these differences could be due to a “vertical differentiation” of educational
content across schools. If students with greater ability enroll in more selective or better funded
schools and are more capable of absorbing up-to-date content, cross-school differences in the gap
might simply reflect schools’ efforts to provide students with better tailored educational content.

We do not find evidence supporting this hypothesis: The negative correlation between the gap and
parental income remains when we control for student ability, using the SAT and ACS scores of admitted students.

While the education-innovation gap varies significantly across schools with different characteristics, most of its variation (about a quarter) occurs within schools, across courses taught by different instructors. This can also be seen from the fact that the content of the typical course remains stable over time, but it declines significantly when the instructor of a course changes.

Most higher-education instructors have two jobs—teaching and research—often seen as competing due to time constraints (Courant and Turner, 2020). Our findings, though, point to some complementarities between these two tasks. The education-innovation gap is significantly lower for courses taught by instructors who are more active in producing research (i.e., they publish more, are cited more, and receive more and larger grants). The gap is instead higher for non-ladder faculty, who specialize in teaching. The gap is also lower when the instructor’s own research is closer to the topics of the course. These findings highlight that a proper deployment of faculty across courses can have important impacts on the content of education. They also suggest that investments on faculty research (both public, in the form of government grants, and institution-specific) can generate additional returns in the form of more updated instruction.

Our results so far unveil differences in the coverage of frontier knowledge across HE courses. Do these differences matter for the production of innovation and for students’ outcomes? To answer this question, the ideal experiment would randomly allocate students to courses with different gaps. In the absence of this random variation, we set on the more modest goal of characterizing the empirical relationship between the education-innovation gap and graduation rates, incomes, and measures of innovation of the students at each school. In an attempt to account for students’ selection into each school and other determinants of student outcomes related to instruction, we control for a large set of school observables such as institutional characteristics, expenditures, instructional characteristics, enrollment by demographic groups and major, selectivity, and parental background. We find that students in schools that offer courses with a lower gap are more likely to complete a PhD, produce more patents, and earn more after graduation. They are also more likely to graduate from college; a possible explanation is that the availability of up-to-date courses makes students more likely to complete a program.

So far, we have focused on measuring the academic content of each course. The richness of the information included in the syllabi allows us to go beyond knowledge and explore the skills students develop in each course. Recent works have highlighted the increasing importance of soft
skills—non-cognitive attributes that shape the way people interact with others—for students’ success (Deming, 2017; Deming and Kahn, 2018). We measure the “soft-skills intensity” of each course as the extent to which evaluations are based on activities such as group projects, presentations, and surveys, which train soft skills. We find that courses with a lower education-innovation gap also tend to have a higher soft-skills intensity. More selective schools, those with more resources, and those serving more socio-economically advantaged students teach more soft-skills intensive courses. Within schools, research-active instructors are most likely to teach soft-skills intensive courses. Lastly, soft-skills intensity is strongly positively associated with student outcomes.

In the final part of the paper, we probe the robustness of our results to the use of alternative measures for the education-innovation gap. We consider three of them: The share of all “new” knowledge contained in a syllabus, designed not to penalize a syllabus that contains old and new knowledge compared with one that only contains new knowledge; a measure of “tail” knowledge, aimed at capturing the presence of the most recent content; and the education-innovation gap obtained using patent filings as a measure of frontier knowledge. All these alternative measures are significantly correlated with the gap, and our main results are qualitatively unchanged when we use them in lieu of the gap.

The main contribution of our paper is to document differences in the coverage of frontier knowledge across HE programs, a new and important dimension of heterogeneity. Analyzing the education-innovation gap, we shed new light on some of the most central questions related to innovation and higher education.

Several studies have characterized heterogeneity in the production of human capital, focusing on differences in the returns to educational attainment (Hanushek and Woessmann, 2012), majors and curricula (Altonji et al., 2012), college selectivity (Hoxby, 1998; Dale and Krueger, 2011), and the skill content of college majors (Hemelt et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021). Here, we take a novel approach: We directly examine curricula and educational content, among the most central components of higher education. With this approach, we document significant differences in the knowledge covered by each course, which could have important implications for students.

Our study is also related to the literature on education and the production of frontier knowledge and innovation. Earlier works (Nelson and Phelps, 1966; Benhabib and Spiegel, 2005) have highlighted an important role for human capital and education in the diffusion of ideas and technological advancements. More recent studies have emphasized the importance of specific fields,
such as STEM (Baumol, 2005; Toivanen and Väänänen, 2016; Bianchi and Giorcelli, 2019). Our findings highlight differences in the ability of HE programs to equip students with the knowledge necessary to innovate, which originates from heterogeneous course content. Importantly, these differences confirm a “lack of democratization” in access to valuable knowledge. US inventors have been shown to come from a small set of schools, enrolling very few low-income students (Bell et al., 2019). We find that these schools provide the most up-to-date educational content, which in turn suggests that access to frontier knowledge is highly unequal.

Lastly, we provide direct evidence on the importance of instructors in shaping the content of higher education. While some studies have found important effects on student outcomes (Hoffman and Oreopoulos, 2009; Carrell and West, 2010; Braga et al., 2016; Feld et al., 2020), much less is known on why and how instructors impact students (De Vlieger et al., 2020). We study instructors’ contribution to the production of educational content and carefully characterize differences across instructor types. Our findings also highlight complementarities between teaching and research activities.

2 Data

Our empirical analysis combines data from multiple sources. These include the text of course syllabi; the abstract of academic publications; job titles, publications, and grants of each instructor; characteristics of US higher education institutions; and labor market outcomes for the students at these institutions. More detail on the construction of our final data set can be found in Appendix B.

2.1 College and University Course Syllabi

We obtained the raw text of a large sample of college and university syllabi from Open Syllabus (OSP), a non-profit organization which collects these data by crawling publicly accessible university and faculty websites to support educational research and applications. The initial sample contains more than seven million English-language syllabi of courses taught in over 80 countries between 1990 and 2018.

Most syllabi share a standard structure. The standard syllabus begins with basic details of the course (such as title, code, and the name of the instructor). It proceeds with a short description of its content, followed by a list of topics and required or recommended readings for each class session. Most syllabi contain information on evaluation criteria, such as assignments and exams; some also
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3The literature on the effects of education on innovation encompasses studies of the effects of the land grant college system (Kantor and Whalley, 2019; Andrews, 2017) and, more generally, of the establishment of research universities (Valero and Van Reenen, 2019) on patenting and economic activity.
include general policies regarding grading, absences, lateness, and misconduct. Following this
general structure, we parse each syllabus and extract four pieces of information: (i) basic course
details, (ii) the course’s content, (iii) the list of required and recommended readings, and (iv) a
description of evaluation methods.4

**Basic course details** These include the name of the institution, the title and code of the course,
the name of the instructor, as well as the quarter or semester and the academic year in which the
course is taught. Course titles and codes allow us to classify each syllabus into one of three course
levels: basic undergraduate, advanced undergraduate, or graduate. OSP assigns each syllabus to
one of 69 detailed fields.5 We use this classification throughout the paper. For some tests, we further
aggregate fields into four macro-fields: STEM, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Business.6

**Course content** We identify the portion of a syllabus that contains a description of the course’s
content by searching for section titles such as “Summary,” “Description,” and “Content.” Typically,
this portion describes the basic structure of the course, the key concepts that are covered, and (in
many cases) a timeline of the content and the materials for each lecture.

**Reference list** We compile a list of bibliographic information for the required and recommended
readings of each course by combining the list provided to us by OSP with all other in-text citations
that we could find, such as “Biasi and Ma (2022).” We were able to compile a list of references for
71 percent of all syllabi. We then collect bibliographic information on each reference from Elsevier’s
SCOPUS database (described in more detail in Section 2.2); this includes title, abstract, journal,
keywords (where available), and textbook edition (for textbooks).

**Methods of evaluation** To gather information on the methods used to evaluate students and the
set of skills trained in the course, we use information on exams and other assignments. We identify
and extract the relevant portion of the syllabus by searching for sections titled “Exam,” “Assignment,”
“Homework,” “Evaluation,” and “Group.” Using the text of these sections, we distinguish
between hard skills (assessed through exams, homework, assignments, and problem sets) and soft
skills (assessed through presentations, group projects, and teamwork). We were able to identify this
information for 99.9 percent of all syllabi.

---

4 Angrist and Pischke (2017) use hand-coded syllabi from 38 universities to study the evolution of undergraduate econometrics classes.
6 Appendix Table BVII lists all 69 fields and shows the correspondence between fields and macro-fields.
7 The full list of section titles used to identify each section is shown in Appendix Table BVI.
Sample restrictions and description  To maximize consistency over time, we focus our attention on syllabi taught between 1998 and 2018 in four-year US institutions with at least one hundred syllabi in our sample.8 We exclude 35,917 syllabi (1.9 percent) with less than 20 words or more than 10,000 words (the top and bottom 1 percent of the length distribution).

Our final sample, described in panel (a) of Table 1, contains about 1.7 million syllabi of 542,251 courses at 767 institutions. Thirty-three percent of all syllabi cover STEM courses, ten percent cover Business, 30 percent cover Humanities, and 24 percent cover Social Science. Basic courses represent 39 percent of all syllabi and graduate courses represent 33 percent. A syllabus contains an average of 2,226 words in total, with a median of 1,778. Our textual analysis focuses on “knowledge” words, i.e., words that belong to a dictionary (see Section 3 for details). The average syllabus contains 420 unique knowledge words, with a median of 327.

2.2 Academic Publications

We use information from Elsevier’s SCOPUS database and compile the list of all peer-reviewed articles that appeared in the top academic journals of each field since the journal’s foundation.9 Top journals are defined as those ranked among the top 10 by Impact Factor (IF) in each field at least once since 1975 (or the journal’s creation, if it occurred after 1975).10 Our final list of publications includes 20 million articles, corresponding to approximately 100,000 articles per year.11

Alternative measure of knowledge: Patents  An alternative way to measure the knowledge frontier is to use the text of patents, rather than academic publications. To this purpose, we collected the text of more than six million patents issued since 1976 from the US Patents and Trading Office (USPTO) website.12 We capture the content of each patent with its abstract.

2.3 Instructors: Research Productivity, Funding, and Job Titles

Nearly all course syllabi report the name of the course instructor. Using this information, we collected data on instructors’ research productivity (publications and citations) and the receipt of public research funding. For a subset of instructors, we also collected information on job titles and annual salary.

---

8For consistency and comparability, we removed 129,429 syllabi from one online-only university, the University of Maryland Global Campus.

9We accessed the SCOPUS data through the official API in April-August 2019.

10Even if a journal appeared only once in the top 10, we collect all articles published since its foundation.

11SCOPUS classifies articles into 191 fields. To map each of these to the 69 syllabi fields, we calculate the cosine similarity (see Section 3) between each syllabus and each article. We then map each syllabi field with the SCOPUS field with the highest average similarity.

12Our web crawler collected the text content of all patents (in HTML format) from http://patft.uspto.gov/netahml/PTO/srchnum.htm, with patent numbers ranging from 3850000 to 10279999).
Research Productivity  Individual-level publications and citations data come from Microsoft Academic (MA). Discontinued at the end of 2021, MA was a search engine listing publications, working papers, other manuscripts, and patents for each researcher, together with the counts of citations to these documents. We linked MA records to syllabi instructors via fuzzy matching based on name and institution (details on this procedure are in Appendix B). We were able to successfully find 41 percent of all instructors, and we assume that the instructors we could not find never published any article (Table 1, panel (b)).

Using data from MA, we measure each instructor’s research quantity and quality with the number of publications and received citations in the previous five years. On average, instructors published 6 articles in the previous five years, with a total of 172 citations (Table 1, panel (b)). The distributions of citation and publication counts are highly skewed: The median instructor in our sample only published one article in the previous five years and received no citations.

Funding  We also collected information on government grants received by each researcher. Beyond research productivity, this information allows us to measure public investment in academic research. We focus on two of the main funding agencies of the U.S. government: the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institute of Health (NIH). Our grant data include 480,633 NSF grants active between 1960 and 2022 (with an average size of $582K in 2019 dollars) and 2,566,358 NIH grants active between 1978 and 2021 (with an average size of $504K). We link grants to instructors via fuzzy matching between the name and institution of the investigator and those of the instructor (more details can be found in Appendix B). Eighteen percent of all syllabi instructors are linked to at least one grant; among these, the average instructor receives 10 grants, with a combined size of $4,023K (Table 1, panel (b)).

Job Titles  In many US states, information on public college and university employees are disclosed online, to comply with state regulations on transparency and accountability. These records usually contain each employee’s name and job title. We were able to collect information on job titles for 35,178 instructors in our syllabi sample (10.6 percent of all instructors and 14.3 percent of public-sector instructors), employed in 490 public institutions in 16 states. On average, we observe instructors for two years (the modal year is 2017; we detail the coverage of these data in the Appendix B). Among all syllabi instructors for which we have job title information, 42 percent are

---

13 Using citations and publications in the previous five years helps address issues related to the life cycle of publications and citations, with older instructors having a higher number of citations and publications per year even if their productivity declines with time.

14 These data are published by each agency, at https://www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/download.jsp and https://exporter.nih.gov/ExPORTER_Catalog.aspx. We accessed these data on May 25, 2021.
ladder faculty (including 11 percent of assistant professors, 13 percent of associate professors, and 18 percent of full professors; Appendix Figure AI).

2.4 Information on US Higher Education Institutions

The last component of our dataset includes information on all US colleges and universities of the syllabi in our data. Our primary source is the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), maintained by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). For each school, IPEDS reports a set of institutional characteristics (such as name and address, control, affiliation, and Carnegie classification); the types of degrees and programs offered; expenditure and endowment; characteristics of the student population, such as the distribution of SAT and ACT scores of all admitted students, enrollment figures for different demographic groups, completion rates, and graduation rates; and faculty composition (ladder and non-ladder). We linked each syllabus to the corresponding IPEDS record via a fuzzy matching algorithm based on school names. We were able to successfully link all syllabi in our sample.

We complement data from IPEDS with information on schools and students from three additional sources. The first one is the school-level dataset assembled and used by Chetty et al. (2020), which includes a school’s selectivity tier (defined using Barron’s scale), the incomes of students and parents, the number of patents obtained by all students, and a measure of intergenerational mobility (the share of students with parental income in the bottom quintile who reach the top income quintile as adults). These data are calculated using data on US tax records for a cross-section of cohorts who graduated between 2002 and 2004. The second is the Survey of Earned Doctorates, conducted by the NSF, which reports characteristics of all PhD receivers in US institutions each year. We use information on students’ graduating cohort and bachelor’s institution to construct the share of undergraduate students in each school and graduation year who eventually complete a PhD, for the years 1998-2018. The third is the College Scorecard Database of the US Department of Education, an online tool designed to help users compare costs and returns of attending various colleges and universities in the US. This database reports the incomes of graduates ten years after the start of the program. We use these variables, available for the academic years 1997-98 to 2007-08, to measure student outcomes for each school.

---

15IPEDS includes responses to surveys from all postsecondary institutions since 1993. Completing these surveys is mandatory for all institutions that participate, or apply to participate, in any federal financial assistance programs.

16The Survey of Earned Doctorates has been conducted since 1957. To assign a PhD recipient to their undergraduate institution, we use information on the institution where they obtained their bachelor’s degree; to assign the recipient to a bachelor’s degree cohort, we subtract 6 to their year of PhD receipt.
Panel (c) of Table 1 summarizes the sample of colleges and universities for which we have syllabi data. On average, the median parental income of all students at each school is $97,91e. Across all schools, 3 percent of all students have parents with incomes in the top percentile. The share of minority students equals 0.22. Graduation rates average 61.4 percent in 2018, whereas students’ incomes ten years after school entry, for the 2003–04 and 2004–05 cohorts, are equal to $45,035. Students’ average intergenerational mobility is equal to 0.29.

2.5 Data Coverage and Sample Selection

Our syllabi sample only covers a small fraction of all courses taught in US schools between 1998 and 2018. The number of syllabi increases over time, from 17,479 in 2000 to 68,792 in 2010 and 190,874 in 2018 (Appendix Figure AII).

To more accurately interpret our empirical results, it is crucial to establish patterns of sample selection. To do so, we compiled the full list of courses offered between 2010 and 2019 in a sub-sample of 161 US institutions (representative of all institutions included in IPEDS) using the course catalogs in the archives of each school. This allows us to compare our sample to the population of all courses for these schools and years.

This exercise does not reveal stark patterns of selection based on observables. The share of catalog courses covered by the syllabi sample remained stable over time, at 5 percent (Appendix Figure AIII). This suggest that, at least among the schools with catalog information, the increase in the number of syllabi over time is driven by an increase in the number of courses that are offered, rather than an increase in sample coverage. Our syllabi sample is also similar to the population in terms of field and course level composition. Between 2010 and 2018, STEM courses represent 33 percent of syllabi in our sample and 24 percent of courses in the catalog; Humanities represent 30 and 32 percent, and Social Sciences represent 24 and 20 percent, respectively (Appendix Figure AIV). Similarly, basic undergraduate courses represent 39 percent of syllabi in our sample and 31 percent of courses in the catalog; advanced undergraduate courses represent 28 and 30 percent, and graduate courses represent 33 and 38 percent (Appendix Figure AV). These shares are fairly stable over time.

In addition, a school’s portion of the catalog that is included in our sample and the change in this portion over time are unrelated to school observables. We show this in panel (a) of Table 2 (column

---

17We begin by randomly selecting 200 schools among all 4-year IPEDS institutions. Among these, we were able to compile course catalogs for 161 institutions, listed in Appendix Table AII. These look very similar in terms of observables to all schools in our sample (Appendix Table AIII). We focus our attention on years from 2010 to maximize our coverage. For an example of a course catalogue, see https://registrar.yale.edu/course-catalogs.
1), where we regress a school’s share of courses included in our sample in 2018 on the following variables, one at the time and also measured in 2018: financial attributes (such as expenditure on instruction, endowment per capita, sticker price, and average salary of all faculty), enrollment, the share of students in different demographic categories (Black, Hispanic, alien), and the share of students graduating in Arts and Humanities, STEM, and the Social Sciences. We also test for the joint significance of all these variables. We find that these variables are individually and jointly uncorrelated with the share of courses in the syllabi sample, with an F-statistic close to one. In column 2 we repeat the same exercise, using the 2015-2018 change in the share of courses included in the syllabi as the dependent variable. Our conclusions are unchanged.

The only dimension in which our syllabi sample appears selected is school selectivity. Relative to non-selective institutions (for whom the share of courses in the sample is less than 0.1 percent), Ivy-Plus and Elite schools have a 2.4 percentage point higher share of courses included in the syllabi sample, and selective public schools have a 4.0 percentage point higher share. Taken together, these tests indicate that our syllabi sample does not appear to be selected on the basis of observable characteristics of schools and fields, although it does over-represent Ivy-Plus and Elite and selective public schools. By construction, though, we cannot test for selection based on unobservables. Our results should therefore be interpreted with this caveat in mind.

3 Measuring the Education-Innovation Gap

This section describes the construction of the education-innovation gap. We first explain how we measure similarities between course syllabi and academic publications. Then, we define and construct the gap using measures of similarity, implementing a series of adjustments to better describe each syllabus’ content. Lastly, we validate our measure and describe its variation.

3.1 Measuring The Similarity Between Syllabi and Academic Publications

3.1.1 Constructing Term Frequency Vectors

We start by representing each document $d$ (a syllabus or an article) as a term-frequency vector $TF_d$. Each element $TF_{wd}$ of $TF_d$ represents the frequency of term $w$ in $d$:

$$TF_{wd} = \frac{c_{wd}}{\sum_{k \in W} c_{dk}},$$

where, at the numerator, $c_{dw}$ counts the number of times term $w$ appears in $d$ and the denominator is the total number of terms in $d$. To maximize our ability to capture the knowledge content of each
document, we construct $TF$ vectors focusing exclusively on terms related to knowledge concepts and skills, belonging to a dictionary $W$ with $|W|$ terms (as a result, each term vectors contains $|W|$ elements). Our primary dictionary is the list of all unique term ever used as keywords in academic publications from the beginning of our publication sample until 2019.\footnote{We have also used the list of all terms that have an English Wikipedia webpage as of 2019. Our results are robust to this choice.} Appendix C contains details on the construction of term vectors and the use of a dictionary.

### 3.1.2 Adjusting for Term Relevance

When constructing similarity metrics, it is crucial to ensure that each term receives a weight proportional to its importance in capturing a document’s content. $TF$ vectors give more weight to terms with a higher document frequency. However, terms that are very common across all documents receive more weight regardless of their ability to capture the content of a given document. For example, holding term frequency fixed, terms such as “Programming” or “Animals” – very common among Computer Science and Biology syllabi, respectively – are usually less informative of content than terms such as “Natural Language Processing” or “CRISPR.”\footnote{Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR) is a family of DNA sequences found in the genomes of prokaryotic organisms such as bacteria and archaea. The also term refers to a recent technology that can be used to edit genes.}

To this purpose, we use a leading approach in the text analysis literature called “term-frequency-inverse-document-frequency” (TFIDF, Kelly et al., 2021). This approach assigns each term a weight inversely proportional to the frequency of the term across all documents, underweighting terms that are not diagnostic of a document’s content.

We implement this approach by constructing an inverse-document frequency vector $IDF$ (of length $|W|$) with elements defined as

$$IDF_w \equiv \ln \left( \frac{|D|}{\sum_{n \in D} c_{wn}} \right),$$

where $D$ is the set of all documents (syllabi and articles). Using $IDF$, we can then transform $TF_d$ into a term-frequency-inverse-document-frequency vector $TFIDF_d$, with elements equal to

$$TFIDF_{dw} = TF_{dw} \times IDF_w.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

### Accounting for Changes in Term Relevance Over Time

The weighting approach described so far calculates the relative importance of each term for a given document pooling together documents
published in different years. This is not ideal for our analysis, because we are interested in the novelty of the content of a syllabus \(d\) relative to research published in the years prior to \(d\). Consider, for example, course CS229 at Stanford University, taught by Andrew Ng in the early 2000 and one of the first that entirely focused on Machine Learning. This term has become very popular in later years, so its frequency across all documents is very high and its \(IDF_w\) very low. Pooling together documents from different years would thus result in a very low \(TFIDF_{dw}\) for the term “machine learning” in the course’s syllabus. Not accounting for changes in term frequency over time would then lead us to severely mischaracterize the course’s path-breaking content.

To overcome this issue, we modify the traditional \(TFIDF\) and construct a retrospective or “point-in-time” version of \(IDF\), meant to capture the inverse frequency of a term among all documents published prior to \(d\). We call this vector “backward-IDF,” or \(BIDF_t\). It is indexed by \(t\) because it varies over time, and its elements are defined as

\[
BIDF_{wt} = \log \left( \frac{\sum_{n \in D} c_{wn} \mathbb{I}(t(n) < t)}{\sum_{n \in D} c_{wn} \mathbb{I}(t(n) < t)} \right)
\]

where \(t(n)\) is the publication year of document \(n\). The use of this weighting approach allows us to give a temporally appropriate weight to each term in a document. Using \(BIDF_t\), we can then calculate a “backward” version of \(TFIDF_d\)—called \(TFBIDF_d\)—whose elements are

\[
TFBIDF_{wd} = TF_{wd} \times BIDF_{wt(d)}.
\]

### 3.1.3 Building Textual Similarities Between Syllabi and Articles

Armed with weighted term vectors, we can now construct measures of textual similarities between syllabi and articles. For simplicity, we denote \(TFBIDF_d\) as \(V_d\) for each \(d\). The measure of similarity we use is the cosine similarity, defined for two documents \(d\) and \(d'\) as

\[
\rho_{d,d'} = \frac{V_d}{\|V_d\|} \cdot \frac{V_{d'}}{\|V_{d'}\|}
\]

where \(\|V_d\|\) is the Euclidean norm of \(V_d\). Since each element of \(V_d\) is non-negative, \(\rho\) lies in the interval \([0, 1]\). If \(d\) and \(d'\) use the exact same set of terms with the same frequency, \(\rho_{d,d'} = 1\); if they have no terms in common, \(\rho_{d,d'} = 0\).
3.2 Calculating the Education-Innovation Gap

We capture the similarity between each syllabus \(d\) and different vintages of knowledge using the average similarity of \(d\) with all the articles published in a three-year time period ending \(\tau\) years before \(t(d)\):

\[
S_T^d = \frac{\sum_{k \in \Omega_T(d)} \rho_{dk}}{|\Omega_T(d)|}
\]

where \(\rho_{dk}\) is the cosine similarity between syllabus \(d\) and an article \(k\), \(\Omega_T(d)\) is the set of all articles published in the three-year time interval \([t(d) - \tau - 2, t(d) - \tau]\), and \(|\Omega_T(d)|\) is the total number of these articles.\(^{20}\)

We construct the education-innovation gap as the ratio between the average similarity of a syllabus with older technologies (published in \(\tau\)) and the similarity with more recent ones (\(\tau' < \tau\)):

\[
\text{Gap}_d = \left( \frac{S_T^d}{S_T^d} \right)
\]

Given this definition, the syllabus of a course taught in \(t\) has a lower education-innovation gap if its text is more similar to more recent research (published in \(t - \tau'\)) than to older research (published in \(t - \tau\)). For our analysis, we set \(\tau = 13\) ([\(t - 15, t - 13\] vintage) and \(\tau' = 1\) ([\(t - 3, t - 1\] vintage). We multiply the gap by 100 for readability.

Our measure features two attractive properties. First, being constructed as a ratio, the gap is not affected by syllabus-specific attributes such as style, format, or length, which could introduce noise in the ability of a simple measure of similarity to capture content. For example, a course could have a higher similarity with existing research compared with another course covering the same material, if the syllabus of the former is longer or uses more academic terms. We illustrate this point with a simulation exercise in Appendix C.\(^{21}\)

Second, our measure does not heavily penalize syllabi for covering “classic” topics in the literature, as long as these are widespread across courses. This is guaranteed by the use of a \(T F B I D F\) approach, which reduces the impact on the gap of terms—such as classics—frequently used across all documents. For example, the term “Ordinary Least Squares” (“OLS”) refers to a relatively old but very common concept taught in most econometrics and statistics courses. As such, it will receive a low weight and syllabi will not be penalized much by covering it.

\(^{20}\)Our main analysis uses three-years intervals; our results are robust to the use of one-year or two-years intervals.

\(^{21}\)To this purpose, we manually create a sample of 1.7 million syllabi as sets of dictionary terms, for which we know ex ante the ratio between “old” knowledge terms (more popular among old publications) and “new” knowledge terms (most popular among recent publications). The education-innovation gap performs much better as a measure of this ratio than a simple measure of similarity with new terms (Appendix C).
3.3 Validating The Measure and Interpreting Its Magnitude

We perform a series of tests to validate our measure’s ability to capture the distance between the content of a course and the research frontier. First, we show that the relationship between the gap and the average age of its reference list (defined as the average difference between the year of each syllabus and the publication year of each reference) is positive and significant (Figure 1, panel (a)). While the average reference age is easy to calculate, our text-based measure is available for all syllabi (including those for whom the reference list is unavailable) and is more accurate in capturing the content of courses that only rely on very few bibliographic sources (for example, a textbook).

Second, we show that the gap varies reasonably across course levels: More advanced and graduate courses have a lower gap compared with basic undergraduate courses. Controlling for field-by-year effects, basic undergraduate courses have a gap of 95.7; advanced undergraduate courses have a gap of 95.3, and graduate courses have a gap of 94.7 (Figure 1, panel (b)). This confirms the intuition that more advanced courses cover content that is closer to the knowledge frontier.

Third, we use a simulation exercise to confirm that our measure is able to pick up changes in course content and the similarity between each syllabus and different knowledge vintages. Specifically, we randomly draw a subsample of 100,000 syllabi. Then, we progressively replace terms that are more frequent in older knowledge vintages (“old words”) with terms more frequent in newer vintage (“new words”), and we re-calculate the gap as we replace more words. Old words are those in the top 5 percent in terms of frequency in the old publication corpus between $t - 15$ and $t - 13$ or in the old publication corpus between $t - 15$ and $t - 13$ but not in the new publication corpus between $t - 3$ and $t - 1$; new words as those in the top 5 percent in terms of frequency in the new publication corpus between $t - 3$ and $t - 1$ or in the new publication corpus between $t - 3$ and $t - 1$ but not in the old publication corpus between $t - 15$ and $t - 13$. The gap monotonically decreases as we replace more old words with new ones (Figure 1, panel (c)). This simulation is also useful to gauge the economic magnitude of changes in the gap. In particular, a unit change in the gap is equivalent to the replacement of 10 percent of a syllabus’s old words (or 34 old words, compared with 330 words for the median syllabus).

3.4 The Education-Innovation Gap: Variation and Variance Decomposition

The average course has a gap of 95.3, with a standard deviation of 5.8, a 25th percentile of 91.6, and a 75th percentile of 98.8 (Table 1, panel (a) and Appendix Figure AVI). To give an economic meaning to this variation, we use of the relationship illustrated in panel (c) of Figure 1. In order to move a
syllabus from the 75th to the 25th percentile of the distribution (a 7.2 change in the gap) we would have to replace approximately 200 of its words, or 60 percent of the content of the median syllabus.

To better understand what drives variations in the gap, we perform a Shapley-Owen decomposition ([Israeli, 2007]) of its variance into five sets of factors: year, field, school, course, and instructor. For each factor \( j \), we calculate the partial \( R^2 \) as

\[
R^2_j = \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{R^2 - R^2(-j)}{K! / j!(K - j - 1)!}
\]

where \( R^2(-j) \) is the adjusted \( R^2 \) of a regression that excludes fixed effects for all factors except \( j \); this quantity captures the share of the variation captured by factor \( j \).22

This exercise indicates that differences across fields explain 4 percent of the total variation in the gap, while differences across schools explain 2 percent (Table 3, column 1. Courses explain a large 33 percent, indicating a great deal of persistence in the content of a course over time. Importantly, differences across instructors explain a large 25 percent. Results are similar when we use course levels instead of courses; the latter explain less than 1 percent of the total variation (column 2).

4 The Education-Innovation Gap Across Schools

Cross-school differences are helpful to understand how educational content is shaped and how access to it relates to students’ socio-economic background. We explore these differences next.

4.1 School Characteristics

We begin by testing how the education-innovation-gap relates to three sets of school attributes: (i) institutional, such as sector (public or private), research intensity (distinguishing between schools classified as R1 – “Very High Research Intensity” – according to the Carnegie classification, and all other schools) and emphasis on liberal arts and sciences relative to other subjects (distinguishing between Liberal Arts Colleges (LAC) and all other schools); (ii) financial, such as endowment and spending on instruction, faculty salaries, and research; (iii) and faculty composition and productivity, such as the share of non-ladder faculty, the share of tenure-track (non-tenured) faculty, and the number of academic publications per faculty.

We estimate pairwise correlations between the gap and these attributes controlling for field,22We use adjusted \( R^2 \) throughout to account for the large number of fixed effects in the model.
course level, and year of the syllabus, captured by $\beta$ in the following equation:

$$\text{Gap}_i = \beta X_{s(i)} + \phi_{f(i)}t(i)l(i) + \varepsilon_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)$$

where $\text{Gap}_i$ measures the education-innovation gap of syllabus $i$, taught in school $s(i)$ and year $t(i)$; the variable $X_s$ is the institutional characteristic of interest in school $s$; and field-by-level-by-year fixed effects $\phi_{flt}$ control for systematic differences in the gap, common to all syllabi in the same field ($f$) and course level ($l$), that vary over time ($t$). We cluster standard errors at the institution level.

**Institutional and financial characteristics**  Estimates of $\beta$ for each school characteristic are shown in Figure 2. Public schools have a slightly larger gap compared with non-public schools, but this difference is indistinguishable from zero. No differences emerge between LACs and other schools. R1 schools have a 0.2 smaller gap compared with schools with a lower research intensity.

In order to quantify the economic magnitude of these differences, we can use the simulation results in Figure 1 (panel (c)). In order to close the difference in the gap between R1 and other schools, we would have to replace approximately 2 percent of the knowledge content of the median syllabus (7 terms). The difference between R1 and other schools, although significant, is thus quite small.

A statistically and economically significant relationship exists between the gap and financial characteristics, such as endowment and spending on instruction, faculty salary, and research. For example, a 10-percent increase in instructional spending is associated with a 3.5 lower gap, or a 35 percent change in the syllabus; a 10-percent increase in research spending is associated with a unit lower gap or a 10 percent change in the syllabus.

**Selectivity**  Next, we test whether the gap differs across schools with different selectivity. Following Chetty et al. (2020), we bin schools in four “tiers” according to their selectivity in admissions, measured with Barron’s 2009 ranking. “Ivy Plus” include Ivy League universities and the University of Chicago, Stanford, MIT, and Duke. “Elite” schools are all the other schools classified as tier 1 in Barron’s ranking. “Highly selective” schools include those in tiers 2 and 3, while “Selective” schools are those in tiers 4 and 5. Lastly, “Non-selective” schools include those in Barron’s tier 9 and all four-year institutions not included in Barron’s classification.

To compare the gap across different school tiers, we use the following equation:

$$\text{Gap}_i = S_i^{'}\beta + \phi_{f(i)}t(i)l(i) + \varepsilon_i$$
where the vector $S_i$ contains indicators for selectivity tiers (we omit non-selective schools), and everything is as before.

Point estimates of the coefficients vector $\beta$ in equation (6), shown as diamonds in Figure 2, indicate that more selective schools offer content that is closer to the research frontier. Ivy Plus and Elite schools have the smallest gap, -0.84 smaller than non-selective schools (corresponding to an 8 percent difference in the median syllabus). Highly selective schools have a -0.67 smaller gap and selective schools have a -0.51 percent smaller gap (5 percent). A possible interpretation for these differences is that more selective schools offer higher-quality education. However, if higher-ability students are better able to absorb frontier knowledge, another possibility is that schools tailor instruction to the abilities of their students. We attempt to test this hypothesis in the next section and in Section 6, where we relate the education-innovation gap to student outcomes.

### 4.2 Students’ Characteristics

Schools with different characteristics serve different populations of students; for example, Ivy-Plus and Elite schools are disproportionately more likely to enroll students from wealthier backgrounds (Chetty et al., 2020). Cross-school differences might therefore translate into significant disparities in access to up-to-date knowledge among students with different backgrounds. Here, we focus on two dimensions of socio-economic background: parental income and race and ethnicity.

**Parental income** We re-estimate equation (5) using two measures of parental income as the explanatory variable: median parental income and the share of parents with incomes in the top percentile of the national distribution, constructed using tax returns for the years 1996 to 2004 (Chetty et al., 2020). These estimates, shown as the full triangles in Figure 2, indicate that schools serving more economically disadvantaged students offer courses with a higher gap. Specifically, a one-percent higher median parental income is associated with a 0.56 lower gap, which corresponds to a 5 percent difference in the median syllabus. Similarly, a 10-percentage point higher share of students with parental income in the top percentile is associated with a 0.42 lower gap (4 percent).

In principle, part of these differences could be due to a “vertical differentiation” of educational content across schools. If students with greater ability are better able to absorb more up-to-date content, cross-school differences in the gap might reflect schools’ efforts to provide students with appropriate educational content. Our data, however, do not support this hypothesis. Controlling for the average SAT score of students admitted at each school as a proxy for their ability yields only slightly smaller estimates compared with the baseline (Figure 2, hollow triangles). This rules out vertical differentiation as an explanation for cross-school differences in the gap.
**Students’ race and ethnicity**  Schools that enroll a higher share of minority students (Black or Hispanic) also offer courses with a higher gap. Using the share of minority students as the explanatory variable in equation (5) reveals that a one-percentage point higher share is associated with a 0.58 higher gap, equivalent to a 6 percent change in the average syllabus. As before, this relationship holds (but is less precise) if we control for average student ability.

In line with existing evidence on disparities in access to selective schools among more and less advantaged students, our results document a new dimension of inequality: That in access to educational content that is close to the research frontier. Importantly, this inequality cannot be explained by differences in student ability.

5 The Role of Instructors

Instructors are considered one of the most important input for the production of student learning, and one of the most costly (De Vlieger, Jacob, and Stange, 2020). In line with this, our data show that most of the variation in the gap occurs within schools and across courses taught by different people. We now investigate in depth the role of instructors and their characteristics in shaping the content of higher education.

5.1 Persistency In A Course’s Content Over Time and Changes in Instructors

To understand how instructors shape the content of the courses they teach, we start by studying how the education-innovation gap of a course varies when the course instructor changes. We estimate an event study of the gap in a $[-4, 4]$ year window around the time of an instructor change:

$$\text{Gap}_i = \sum_{k=-4}^{4} \delta_k I(t(i) - T_{c(i)} = k) + \gamma_{c(i)} + \phi_{f(i)}(i) + \varepsilon_i,$$

where $i$, $f$, and $t$ denote a syllabus, field, and year respectively. The subscript $c$ denotes a specific course within each school (for example, Econ 101 at Yale University); the variable $T_c$ represents the first year in our sample in which the instructor of course $c$ changes.\(^{23}\) To more precisely capture the impact of an instructor change, we restrict our attention to courses taught by a maximum of two instructors in each year and set the indicator function to zero for all courses without an instructor change, which serve as the comparison group. We cluster standard errors at the course level. Assuming $\delta_0 = 0$, the parameters $\delta_k$ capture the differences between the gap $k$ years after an instructor change relative to the year preceding the change.

\(^{23}\)Our results are robust to using the median or the last year with an instructor change.
OLS estimates of $\delta_k$, shown in Figure 3, indicate that a change in a course’s instructor is associated with a sudden decline in the education-innovation gap. Estimates are indistinguishable from zero and on a flat trend in the years leading to an instructor change; the year of the change, the gap declines by 0.1. This decline is equivalent to replacing 2 percent of the content of a syllabus.

In Table 4 we re-estimate equation (6) for different subsamples of syllabi, pooling together years preceding and following an instructor change. After a change, the gap declines for all fields and course levels by about 0.1 on average (2 percent of a course’s content, column 1, significant at 1 percent). The decline is largest for Humanities and STEM courses (-0.14 and -0.11, columns 3 and 4, respectively), as well as for graduate courses (-0.12, column 8).

These results indicate that course updating is not a gradual process over time. Instructors who teach the same course for many years tend to leave content unchanged. Instead, those who take over a course from someone else significantly update its content, bringing it closer to the knowledge frontier. Our findings also confirm that instructors play a crucial role in shaping the content of the courses they teach, particularly for advanced courses.

5.2 The Education-Innovation Gap and Instructors’ Characteristics

The decline in the gap that follows an instructor change, though, could mask substantial differences across instructors. For example, the decline could differ for instructors who are more research-active, who spend less time teaching but are better informed on the frontier of knowledge. Similarly, the decline could depend on whether the new instructor is an expert on the topics covered by the course. We explore these possibilities next.

Ladder vs non-ladder faculty  Ladder (i.e., tenure-track or tenured) faculty are generally more focused on research compared with non-ladder faculty, whose primary job is to teach. In recent years, universities have started to increasingly rely on non-ladder faculty to meet a rapid rise in enrollment (Goosbee and Syverson, 2019).24 Ex ante, whether one type of faculty or the other would be better at teaching up-to-date content is ambiguous. On the one hand, being specialized on teaching, non-ladder faculty might be better at keeping educational content updated. On the other hand, being better informed on frontier knowledge, ladder faculty might be more likely to include this knowledge in the courses they teach.

Comparing the education-innovation gap across job titles and controlling by field-by-course

---

24Employing non-ladder faculty makes it easier (and cheaper) for schools to face increases in enrollment. Colleges have monopsony power on tenure-track, but not ladder faculty: the latter earn substantially lower wages and have a much higher elasticity of labor supply. This implies that, when enrollment increases, schools are better off hiring more non-ladder faculty to avoid increasing wages for tenure-track faculty (Goosbee and Syverson, 2019)
level-by-year effects, we find that non-ladder faculty (adjunct professors) have the largest gap, at 95.8 (Figure 4). Tenure-track assistant professors, on the other hand, have the lowest gap at 95. The difference between assistant and adjunct professors is equivalent to 7 percent of a syllabus’s content.

Notably, the gap is almost as high for full (tenured) professors as it is for adjuncts, at 95.6. Associate professors have a slightly smaller gap than full (95.5), but still significantly higher than assistant professors. Junior faculty on the tenure track thus appear to teach the courses with the most updated content.

**Research productivity** One possible explanation for these results is that assistant professors are more recently trained and face stronger incentives to be active in research. This might make them more informed about the knowledge frontier. We test this hypothesis directly by exploring the relationship between a course’s gap and the research productivity of the instructor, measured using individual counts of citations and publications in the previous five years. We estimate the following equation:

$$\text{Gap}_i = \sum_{n=1}^{4} \beta^n q^n_{k(i)t(i)} + \gamma c(i) + \psi f(i)t(i) + \varepsilon_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $q^n_{k(i)}$ equals one if instructor $k$’s measure of research productivity (publications or citations) is in the $n$th quartile of the distribution (the omitted category are courses with instructors whose measure $k$ equals zero). Course fixed effects $\gamma c(i)$ and field-by-year fixed effects $\psi f(i)t(i)$ control for unobserved determinants of the gap that are specific to a course in a given field and year. Estimates of $\beta^n$ capture the difference in the gap between courses taught by faculty with productivity in the $n$th quartile and those taught by faculty with no citations or publications and are identified out of changes in instructors for the same course over time.

Estimates of $\beta^n$, shown in Table 5, indicate that the gap progressively declines as the research productivity of the instructor grows. In particular, a switch from an instructor without publications and one with a number of publications in the top quartile of the field distribution is associated with a 0.11 decline in gap (equivalent to updating 2 percent of a course’s syllabus; Table 5, panel (a), column 1, significant at 1 percent). Similarly, a switch from an instructor without citations to one with citations in the top quartile is associated with a 0.06 lower gap (panel (b), column 1, significant at 5 percent). These relationships are stronger for Social Sciences courses (column 5) and for courses at the graduate level (column 8).\(^{25}\)

\(^{25}\)Panels (a) and (b) of Appendix Figure AVII show a binned scatterplot of the gap and either citations (panel (a)) or publications (panel (c)) in the prior 5 years, controlling for field effects. In this figure, the horizontal axis corresponds to quantiles of each productivity measures; the vertical axis shows the average gap in each quantile.
Fit with the course  A natural explanation for this finding is that research-active instructors are better informed about the research frontier. If this is the case, we should expect the relationship between productivity and the gap be stronger for courses whose topics are more similar to the instructor’s own research. To test for this possibility, we construct a measure of “fit” between the course and the instructor’s research. This measure is defined as the cosine similarity between the instructor’s research in the previous 5 years and the most updated course on the same topic across all schools (for example, Introductory Econometrics). We then correlate this measure with the education-innovation gap, controlling for course and field-by-year fixed effects (as in equation 7). Estimates of this relationship indicate that a one-standard deviation higher instructor-course fit is associated with a 0.09 lower gap (Table 6, significant at 5 percent). This relationship is particularly strong for STEM and Social Sciences courses (column 4) and for courses at the advanced undergraduate level (column 7).

Research funding  In Table 7, we use data on the number of NSF and NIH grants received by each instructor and test whether the same relationship holds for research inputs, such as government grants; as before, we control for course and field-by-year effects. A switch from an instructor who never received a grant to one with at least one grant is associated with a 0.05 reduction in the gap (column 1, significant at 5 percent). This suggest that public investments in academic research can yield additional private and social returns in the form of more up-to-date instruction.

Taken together, these findings indicate that instructors play a crucial role shaping the content of the course they teach. They also document some complementarities between research and teaching: Research-active instructors are more likely to cover frontier knowledge in their courses, especially when teaching advanced courses and courses closest in topic to their own research agenda. Our results suggest that a proper deployment of faculty across courses can have important impacts on the content of education, and that investments on faculty research (both public, in the form of government grants, and institution-specific) can generate additional returns in the form of more updated instruction.

One attractive property of this measure is that it is does not uniquely reflect the content of the syllabus itself, which is of course directly shaped by the instructor; rather, it aims at capturing the content of all courses on the same topic. Constructing this measure requires obtaining a unique identifier for courses on the same field or topic (e.g. Machine Learning) across schools. We describe the procedure we use to do this in Appendix B.

A binned scatterplot reveals a negative relationship between the gap and the number of NSF and NIH grants (Appendix Figure AVII, panel d).
6 The Education-Innovation Gap and Students’ Outcomes

Significant differences in access to up-to-date knowledge exist both across and within schools, and across courses taught by different people. Do these differences matter for students’ outcomes and for the production of innovation? To begin answering this question, we now explore the relationship between the gap and a) innovation measures, such as a school’s share of undergraduate students who complete a PhD and the number of patents produced by all students; and b) labor-market measures, such as graduation rates, income, and intergenerational mobility.

All these outcomes are measured at the school level or at the school-by-cohort level (with the exception of the share of students who attend graduate school, also available by macro-field). The education-innovation gap is instead measured at the syllabus level. To construct a school-level measure, we follow the school value-added literature (Deming, 2014) and estimate the school component of the gap using the following model:

\[
\text{Gap}_i = \theta_s(i) + \phi_f(i)l(i)f(i) + \varepsilon_i. \tag{8}
\]

In this equation, the quantity \(\theta_s\) captures the school component of the education-innovation gap for school \(s\), accounting for flexible time trends that are specific to the level \(l\) and field \(f\) of the course. Because outcome measures refer to students who complete undergraduate programs at each school, we construct \(\theta_s\) using only undergraduate syllabi; our results are robust to the use of all syllabi. Appendix Figure AX shows the distribution of \(\theta_s\); its standard deviation is 0.85, corresponding to a 5 percent change in the average syllabus.

In the remainder of this section, we present estimates of the parameter \(\delta\) in the following equation:

\[
Y_{st} = \delta\hat{\theta}_s + X_{st}\gamma + \tau_t + \varepsilon_{st} \tag{9}
\]

where \(Y_{st}\) is the outcome for students who graduated from school \(s\) in year \(t\); \(\hat{\theta}_s\) is the school-level component of the gap (estimated from equation (8) and standardized to have mean zero and variance one); \(X_{st}\) is a vector of school observables; and \(\tau_t\) are year fixed effects. We calculate bootstrapped standard errors, clustered at the level of the school, to account for the fact that \(\hat{\theta}_s\) is an estimated quantity.

It should be stressed that the parameter \(\delta\) does not necessarily capture the causal effect of the gap on outcomes. There might be school and student attributes related to both the content of a school’s courses and student outcomes. To account for as many of these attributes as it is possible, we con-
trol for a rich set of school observables from IPEDS and show how baseline estimates change when we implement this strategy. We include seven groups of controls, including institutional characteristics (private-public, selectivity tiers, and an interaction between selectivity tiers and an indicator for R1 institutions according to the Carnegie classification); instructional characteristics (student-to-faculty ratio and the share of ladder faculty); financials (total expenditure, research expenditure, instructional expenditure, and salary instructional expenditure per student); enrollment (share of undergraduate and graduate enrollment, share of white and minority students); selectivity (indicator for institutions with admission share equal to 100, median SAT and ACT scores of admitted students in 2006, indicators for schools not using either SAT or ACT in admission); major composition (share of students with majors in Arts and Humanities, Business, Health, Public and Social Service, Social Sciences, STEM, and multi-disciplinary fields); and family background, measured as the natural logarithm of median parental income.

6.1 Innovation Measures

Obtaining a PhD We begin by studying the relationship between the gap and the share of students who obtain a PhD. We construct this variable using data from the NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates, separately for five macro-fields: STEM, Health, Business, Social Science, and Humanities. To map the level of aggregation of this variable, we aggregate the education-innovation gap at the school-by-macro field level (rather than just at the school level) and modify equation (9) slightly so that one observation in our data is a school-by-macro field in a year. In column 1 of Table 8 (panel (a)) we pool data across macro-fields. The unconditional correlation between the gap and the share of students who obtain a PhD is negative and statistically significant: A one-standard deviation lower gap is associated with a 0.4 percentage point higher share, or 17 percent compared with an average of 0.0265 percent. The correlation is particularly strong for Social Science (-0.0124) and Health (-0.0074), while it is small and indistinguishable from zero for STEM, Business, and Humanities. These correlations remain remarkably robust when we control for school characteristics (Table 8, panel (b)).

Invention Next, we test whether students at schools which offer courses with a lower gap produce more inventions later in their life, in the form of patents. We do so by substituting the total number of patents received after graduation by students at each school as the outcome in equation (9). Unconditionally, a one-standard deviation decline in the gap is associated with 27 additional patents at a given school, or 20 percent compared with an average of 131 patents (Table 8, panel (b), column 8, p-value equal to 0.11). The relationship remains robust and even becomes more precise
6.2 Labor Market Outcomes

Graduation rates Next, we examine the relationship between the education-innovation gap and labor market outcomes. We begin with graduation rates, an outcome that immediately precedes entry in the labor market; graduation is in part also a function of choices made by the students, which could be impacted by the content of the courses they took.

Column 1 of Table 9 shows the relationship between the gap (measured in standard deviations) and graduation rates. An estimate of -0.05 in panel (a), significant at 1 percent, indicates that a one-standard deviation decline in the gap (or a 10 percent change in the content of a syllabus) is associated with a 5 percentage point higher graduation rates. Compared with an average of 0.61, this corresponds to an 8 percent increase in graduation rates.

The estimate of $\delta$ declines as we control for observable school characteristics, indicating that part of this correlation can be explained by other differences across schools. However, it remains negative and significant at -0.007, indicating that a one-standard deviation reduction in the gap is associated to a 1.1 percent increase in graduation rates (panel (b), column 1, significant at 5 percent).

Students’ income and intergenerational mobility Graduation rates are a strictly academic measure of student success; however, they are also likely to affect students’ long-run economic trajectories. To directly examine the relationship between the education-innovation gap and students’ economic success after they leave college, in columns 2-8 of Table 9 we study the relationship between the gap and various income statistics.

Column 2 shows estimates on the natural logarithm of mean student income from the College Scorecard. While imprecise, this estimate indicates that a one-standard deviation in the gap is associated with a 0.7 percent increase in income controlling for the full set of observables (panel (b), p-value equal to 0.17). The College Scorecard also reports mean incomes for students with parental incomes in the bottom tercile of the distribution; for these students, the relationship is slightly larger at 0.8 percent (column 3, significant at 10 percent). Estimates are largely unchanged when we use median instead of mean income (column 4).

Information on mean student incomes at the school level is also reported by Chetty et al. (2020), calculated using tax records for a cross section of students. Unconditional estimates (which omit year effects due to the cross-sectional structure of the data) indicate that a one-standard deviation in the gap is associated with a 7 percent increase in students’ mean income (panel (a), column 5,
significant at 1 percent). This estimate is smaller, at 1.4 percent, when controlling for institutional characteristics (panel (b), column 5, significant at 1 percent).

In columns 6 through 8 of Table 9 we investigate the relationship between the gap and the probability that students’ incomes reach the top echelons of the distribution. Estimates with the full set of controls indicate that a one-standard deviation decline in the gap is associated with a 0.84 percentage-point increase in the probability of reaching the top 20 percent (2.2 percent, panel (b), column 6, significant at 1 percent), a 0.53 percentage-point increase in the probability of reaching the top 10 percent (2.5 percent, column 7, significant at 5 percent), and a 0.31 percentage-point increase in the probability of reaching the top 5 percent (2.7 percent, column 8, significant at 10 percent). Taken together, these results indicate a positive relationship between the school-level education-innovation gap and students’ average and top incomes.

Lastly, in column 9 of Table 9 we study the association between the gap and intergenerational mobility. The unconditional correlation between these two variables is equal to -0.0293, indicating that a one-standard deviation lower gap is associated with a 2.9 percentage-points increase in intergenerational mobility (9.9 percent, panel (a), column 9, significant at 1 percent). This correlation, however, becomes smaller and indistinguishable from zero when we control for school observables, reaching -0.0047 when we include the full set of controls (column 9, panel (b), p-value equal to 0.15).

**Summary**  Our findings indicate that a lower education-innovation gap at the school level is associated with more innovation and improved academic and economic student outcomes. The lack of experimental variation in the gap across schools prevents us from estimating a causal relationship. Yet, our results are robust to the inclusion of controls for a large set of school and student characteristics, indicating that these correlations are unlikely to be driven by cross-school differences in spending, selectivity, major composition, or parental background. These findings point to a potentially important role for up-to-date instruction on innovation and the outcomes of students as they exit college and enter the labor market.

### 7 Soft Skills in Course Content

By definition, the education-innovation gap focuses on the novelty of a syllabus with respect to its academic content. Recent works, though, have shown how content might not be the only thing that matters for students and have instead highlighted the importance of skills for students’ later life outcomes. In particular, soft skills—defined as non-cognitive abilities that define how a person interacts with their colleagues and peers—are increasingly in high demand in the labor market and
associated with more favorable outcomes (Deming, 2017).

Supported by this evidence, we now examine differences across syllabi in the extent to which they cover soft skills. We do so by focusing on each course’s evaluation scheme. Specifically, we consider a course to be more soft-skills intensive if the assignments portion of the syllabus has a higher share of words such as “group”, “team”, “presentation”, “essay”, “proposal”, “report”, “drafting”, and “survey”. In the average syllabus, 33 percent of the words in the assignment portion of the syllabus refers to soft skills (Table 1, panel (a)).

The measure of soft-skills intensity is negatively correlated with the education-innovation gap (with a correlation of -0.14, Figure 5, panel (a)). Cross-school differences in the skill intensity of the courses display the same patterns we found for the education-innovation gap: The prevalence of soft skills is higher in schools with higher expenditure on instruction and salaries, increases with school selectivity, and is larger for schools with a higher median parental income and with a lower share of minority students (Figure AVIII, panel (a)). Soft skills are also more prevalent among courses taught by more research-productive instructors (Figure AIX, panel (a)).

In closing, we examine the relationship between soft-skills intensity and student outcomes. Controlling for the full set of school observables used in Tables 8 and 9, a one-standard deviation higher soft-skills intensity of a school’s courses is associated to a 1.2 percentage-point higher graduation rates (2 percent, Table AIV, panel h, column 1, significant at 1 percent); a 1.7 percent higher mean income (column 2, significant at 1 percent); and a 1.2 percent higher chances of reaching the top income quintile for students with parental income in the bottom quintile (18 percent, column 9, significant at 1 percent).

Taken together, these findings indicate that differences across and within schools in course content are not limited to the extent to which content is up-to-date, but also extend to the skills that are trained. We interpret this as additional evidence for the importance of accounting for differences in content across courses, in order to fully appreciate the heterogeneity of educational experiences for students at different schools.

8 Alternative Measures for The Education-Innovation Gap

In spite of its desirable properties, our measure of the education-innovation gap has some limitations. For example, the gap penalizes courses that include old and new content, relative to courses that include exactly the same new content but no old content. Being devised to measure the “average” age of content, the gap is also unable to distinguish courses with extremely novel content...
among those with the same gap. Lastly, the gap only captures the similarity of syllabi with academic publications. Especially in some fields, a course with relatively old academic content could still be novel in other dimensions, for example if it teaches recent technological innovations described in patents. teaching skills in high demand in the labor market.

In this section, we probe the robustness of our results using alternative measures of a course’s content, designed to address these issues.

**Presence of Old Content** The education-innovation gap measures the presence, in a syllabus, of new content relative to older one. Consider two syllabi which both cover the same frontier research in a given field; the first syllabus is shorter and only contains this new content, while the second one is longer also contains older one. Our measure would assign a lower gap to the first syllabus compared to the second, even if both do an equal job in terms of covering frontier knowledge.

To address this limitation, we construct an alternative metric which measures the share of old knowledge of each syllabus, defined as one minus the ratio between the number of “new words” in each syllabus (defined as knowledge words that are (a) in the top 5 percent of the word frequency among articles published between \( t - 3 \) and \( t - 1 \), or (b) used in articles published between \( t - 3 \) and \( t - 1 \) but not in those published between \( t - 15 \) and \( t - 13 \)) and the number of all new words. The correlation between the share of old knowledge and the education-innovation gap is 0.22 (Figure 5, panel (b)), and our main results carry through if we use the former as a measure of novelty of a syllabus’s content (see panel (b) of Figure AVIII for the correlation with school-level characteristics; panel (b) of Figure AIX for the correlation with instructors’ research productivity; and panels a and b of Table AIV for the relationship with student outcomes).

**Right Tail of Academic Novelty** The education-innovation gap captures the “average” novelty of a syllabus. It is possible for two syllabi to have the same gap when one of them only covers content from five years prior while the other covers mostly material from fifteen years prior, but also a small amount of material from the previous year. To construct a measure that captures the presence of “extremely” new material in a syllabus, we proceed as follows. First, we draw 100 “sub-syllabi” from each syllabus, defined as subsets of 20 percent of the syllabus’s words, and calculate the corresponding education-innovation gap. We then recalculate the average gap among all sub-syllabi in the bottom 5 percent of the gap distribution of a given syllabus. We refer to this as a “tail measure” of novelty.

The tail measure is positively correlated with the education-innovation gap, with a correlation

---

28 Our results are robust to the use of the top 10 and one percent.
of 0.67 (Figure 5, panel (c)). All our results hold when using the tail measure as a metric for syllabus novelty (see panel (c) of Figure AVIII, for the correlation with school-level characteristics; panel (c) of Figure AIX for the correlation with instructors’ research productivity; and panels c and d of Table AIV for the relationship with student outcomes).

**Gap with Patents** The education-innovation gap is defined using new academic publications as the frontier of knowledge. For STEM fields, knowledge advancements are also documented in the form of patents. To incorporate this information in our analysis, we construct a version of the education-innovation gap for STEM courses that uses patents in lieu of academic publications. This measure is positively correlated with the standard education-innovation gap (Figure 5, panel (d)). In addition, our main results carry over when using the patent-based gap (see panel (d) of Figure AVIII, for the correlation with school-level characteristics; panel (d) of Figure AIX for the correlation with instructors’ research productivity; and panels e and f of Table AIV for the relationship with student outcomes).

Taken together, these results indicate that our main conclusions on the content of higher-education courses across schools and its relationship with instructors’ characteristics and student outcomes are not dependent on the specific way in which we measure up-to-date content.

### 9 Conclusion

This paper has used the text of HE course syllabi to quantify the distance between the content of each course and frontier knowledge. Our approach centers around a new measure, the “education-innovation gap,” defined as the textual similarity between course syllabi and knowledge from older vintages, relative to newer ones. We constructed this measure applying NLP techniques to a novel dataset, containing the text of 1.7 million syllabi and 20 million academic publications.

Using our measure, we document a set of new findings about the dissemination of frontier knowledge across HE programs. Across and within schools, significant differences exist in the extent to which frontier knowledge is offered to students. More selective schools and those with more resources offer courses with a smaller gap. Since these schools enroll a lower portion of socio-economically disadvantaged students, access to updated knowledge is highly unequal across students from different backgrounds. Instructors play the largest role in shaping the content of the courses they teach. Among all instructors, those who are more research-active are more likely to teach courses with a lower gap.

Our data also indicate that the education-innovation gap is strongly correlated with students’
innovation and labor-market outcomes. In schools offering courses with a lower gap, students are more likely to graduate, earn a PhD, and produce patents; they also earn more once they enter the labor market. Taken together, our findings indicate that the education-innovation gap can be an important metric to quantify how frontier knowledge is produced and disseminated and could help shed new light on the way in which schools and instructors impact students’ lives. A careful analysis of the causal impacts of a low-gap education on students’ later life outcomes represents a fruitful avenue for future research.
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Figure 1: Validating The Education-Innovation Gap

(a) Gap and Average Age of References Included in The Syllabi

(b) Gap by Course Level

(c) Change in Gap as Old Words Are Replaced with New Words

Note: Panel a) shows a binned scatterplot of the education-innovation gap and the average age of a syllabus’s references (required or recommended readings), where age is defined as the difference between the year of the syllabus and the year of publication of each reference. Panel b) shows the mean and 95-percent confidence intervals of the gap by course level, controlling for field-by-year effects. Panel c) shows the change in the gap for a subsample of 100,000 syllabi, in which we progressively replace “old” words with “new” words.
Notes: Point estimates and 95-percent confidence intervals of coefficient β in equation (5), i.e., the slope of the relationship between each reported variable and the education-innovation gap controlling for field-by-course level-by-year fixed effects. Each coefficient is estimated from a separate regression, with the exception of selectivity tiers (Ivy Plus/Elite, Highly Selective, Selective) which are jointly estimated. Endowment, expenditure, and share minority refers to the year 2018 and is taken from IPEDS. Estimates are obtained pooling syllabi data for the years 1998 to 2018. Standard errors are clustered at the school level.
Figure 3: Event Study: The Education-Innovation Gap Around An Instructor Change

Notes: Estimates and confidence intervals of the parameters $\delta_k$ in equation (6), representing an event study of the education-innovation gap around an instructor change and controlling for course and field-by-year fixed effects. Observations are at the course-by-year level; we focus on courses with at most two episodes of instructor changes. Standard errors clustered at the course level.
Figure 4: Gap by Job Titles

Notes: Mean education-innovation gap by job title, along with 95-percent confidence intervals. Means are obtained as OLS coefficients from a regression of the gap on indicators for the job title of the instructor, as well as field-by-course level-by-year fixed effects. Estimates are obtained pooling data for multiple years. Standard errors are clustered at the school level.
Figure 5: The Education-Innovation Gap and Alternative Measures of Novelty: Binned Scatterplots

(a) Soft-skills intensity

(b) Share of new knowledge

(c) Tail measure

(d) Gap with patents

Notes: Binned scatterplots of the education-innovation gap and four alternative measures of novelty of each syllabus: a measure of soft skills intensity, defined as the share of words in the assignment portion of a syllabus which refer to soft skills (panel (a)); a measure of new knowledge, defined as the share of all new words contained by each syllabus (where new words are knowledge words that are (a) in the top 5 percent of the word frequency among articles published between \( t-3 \) and \( t-1 \), or (b) used in articles published between \( t-3 \) and \( t-1 \) but not in those published between \( t-15 \) and \( t-13 \) (panel (b)); a “tail measure,” calculated for each syllabus by (a) randomly selecting 100 subsamples containing 20 percent of the syllabus’s words, (b) calculating the gap for each subsample, and (c) selecting the 5th percentile of the corresponding distribution (panel (c)); and the education-innovation gap calculated using the text of all patents as a benchmark, instead of academic articles (panel (d)).
Table 1: Summary Statistics: Courses, Instructors, and Schools

**Panel (a): Syllabus (Course) Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>count</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education-innovation gap</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Words</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>2226</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>2796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Knowledge words</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Unique knowledge word</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft skills</td>
<td>1,703,863</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1,706,319</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel (b): Instructor (Professor) Research Productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>count</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever Published?</td>
<td>332,064</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Publications per year</td>
<td>135,364</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Publications, last 5 years</td>
<td>111,404</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Citations per year</td>
<td>135,364</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>105.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>17.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Citations, last 5 years</td>
<td>111,404</td>
<td>172.46</td>
<td>887.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>54.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Grant?</td>
<td>332,064</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Grants</td>
<td>58,136</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant amount ($1,000)</td>
<td>54,462</td>
<td>4.023</td>
<td>19,501</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>3,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel (c): Students’ Characteristics and Outcomes at University Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>count</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median parental income ($1,000)</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>97,917</td>
<td>31,054</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>93,500</td>
<td>109,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share parents w/income in top 1%</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share minority students</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rates (2012–13 cohort)</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2003–04, 2004–05 cohorts)</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>45,035</td>
<td>10,235</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>43,300</td>
<td>49,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational mobility</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission rate</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT score</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>1104.4</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>1011.5</td>
<td>1079.5</td>
<td>1182.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Summary statistics of the variables used in the analysis.*
Table 2: Selection Into The Sample: Share of Syllabi Included in the Sample and Institution-Level Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel (a): Share and Δ Share, Correlation w/ School Characteristics</th>
<th>Share in OSP, 2018</th>
<th>ΔShare in OSP, 2008-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Expenditure on instruction</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Endowment per capita</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Sticker price</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Avg faculty salary</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Enrollment</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Black students</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Hispanic students</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>(0.145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Asian students</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>(0.214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share grad in Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>(0.168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share grad in STEM</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share grad in Social Sciences</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share grad in Business</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-stat</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel (b): Share and Δ Share, By School Tier</th>
<th>Share in OSP, 2018</th>
<th>ΔShare in OSP, 2008-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Plus/Elite</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Selective</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Private</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Public</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-stat</td>
<td>3.677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The top panel shows OLS coefficients (“means”) and robust standard errors (“SE”) of univariate regressions of each listed dependent variable on the corresponding independent variable. The bottom panel shows OLS coefficients (“means”) and syllabus-clustered standard errors (“SE”) of a regression of each dependent variable on indicators for school tiers. The dependent variables are the school-level share of syllabi contained in the OSP sample in 2018 (columns 1-2) and the change in this share between 2008 and 2018 columns (3-4). The F-statistics refer to multivariate regressions that include all the listed independent variables, and test for the joint significance of these variables.
Table 3: Decomposing the Variation In The Gap: Schools, Years, Fields, Courses, and Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Partial $R^2$</th>
<th>Partial $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course level</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table shows a decomposition of the adjusted $R^2$ of a regression of the education-innovation gap on all sets of listed fixed effects into the contribution of each set of fixed effects. This is done using a Shapley-Owen decomposition, which calculates the partial $R^2$ of each set of variables $j$ as $R^2_j = \frac{R^2 - R^2(-j)}{K/(K-j)}$ where $R^2(-j)$ is the $R^2$ of a regression that excludes variables $j$. Column 1 includes course fixed effects; column 2 only includes course level fixed effects. We use adjusted $R^2$ in lieu of $R^2$ to account for the large number of fixed effects.
Table 4: The Education-Innovation Gap Around An Instructor Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor change</th>
<th>All Fields (1)</th>
<th>Business (2)</th>
<th>Humanities (3)</th>
<th>STEM (4)</th>
<th>Social Science (5)</th>
<th>Basic (6)</th>
<th>Advanced (7)</th>
<th>Graduate (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After change</td>
<td>-0.1021***</td>
<td>-0.1009</td>
<td>-0.1417***</td>
<td>-0.1060***</td>
<td>-0.0289</td>
<td>-0.0897**</td>
<td>-0.0875*</td>
<td>-0.1152***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0244)</td>
<td>(0.0683)</td>
<td>(0.0464)</td>
<td>(0.0399)</td>
<td>(0.0416)</td>
<td>(0.0456)</td>
<td>(0.0450)</td>
<td>(0.0374)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (Course x year)</td>
<td>379482</td>
<td>36325</td>
<td>105316</td>
<td>152974</td>
<td>95223</td>
<td>125493</td>
<td>112206</td>
<td>137721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Courses</td>
<td>126343</td>
<td>11775</td>
<td>35947</td>
<td>45982</td>
<td>31805</td>
<td>43530</td>
<td>35395</td>
<td>46213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field x Year FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OLS estimates; one observation is a course in a given year. The dependent variable is the education-innovation gap. The variable After change is an indicator for years following an instructor change, for courses with only one instructor and at most two instructor changes over the observed time period. All specifications control for course and field-by-year fixed effects. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the course level. * ≤ 0.1, ** ≤ 0.05, *** ≤ 0.01.
Table 5: The Education-Innovation Gap and Instructors’ Research Productivity: Publications and Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel a): #publications</th>
<th>All Fields (1)</th>
<th>Business (2)</th>
<th>Humanities (3)</th>
<th>STEM (4)</th>
<th>Social Science (5)</th>
<th>Basic (6)</th>
<th>Advanced (7)</th>
<th>Graduate (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>-0.0219</td>
<td>0.0485</td>
<td>-0.0815**</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>-0.0641**</td>
<td>-0.0099</td>
<td>-0.0277</td>
<td>-0.0308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0178)</td>
<td>(0.0472)</td>
<td>(0.0328)</td>
<td>(0.0367)</td>
<td>(0.0291)</td>
<td>(0.0298)</td>
<td>(0.0324)</td>
<td>(0.0300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd quartile</td>
<td>-0.0151</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>0.0309</td>
<td>-0.0418</td>
<td>-0.0207</td>
<td>0.0224</td>
<td>-0.0366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0298)</td>
<td>(0.0729)</td>
<td>(0.0462)</td>
<td>(0.0425)</td>
<td>(0.0531)</td>
<td>(0.0543)</td>
<td>(0.0471)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>-0.0045</td>
<td>0.0596</td>
<td>-0.0387</td>
<td>0.0953*</td>
<td>-0.1057**</td>
<td>0.0374</td>
<td>-0.0115</td>
<td>-0.0356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0302)</td>
<td>(0.0712)</td>
<td>(0.0563)</td>
<td>(0.0459)</td>
<td>(0.0574)</td>
<td>(0.0540)</td>
<td>(0.0462)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th quartile</td>
<td>-0.1103***</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
<td>-0.1184</td>
<td>-0.0638</td>
<td>-0.1817***</td>
<td>-0.0448</td>
<td>-0.0927</td>
<td>-0.1711***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0376)</td>
<td>(0.0894)</td>
<td>(0.0797)</td>
<td>(0.0699)</td>
<td>(0.0621)</td>
<td>(0.0742)</td>
<td>(0.0698)</td>
<td>(0.0551)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel b): #citations</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>0.0288</td>
<td>-0.0097</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.1068**</td>
<td>-0.0469</td>
<td>0.0438</td>
<td>0.0543</td>
<td>-0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0248)</td>
<td>(0.0667)</td>
<td>(0.0636)</td>
<td>(0.0437)</td>
<td>(0.0361)</td>
<td>(0.0427)</td>
<td>(0.0450)</td>
<td>(0.0409)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd quartile</td>
<td>0.0194</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.0106</td>
<td>0.0827*</td>
<td>-0.0413</td>
<td>0.0271</td>
<td>0.0276</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0282)</td>
<td>(0.0675)</td>
<td>(0.0682)</td>
<td>(0.0499)</td>
<td>(0.0431)</td>
<td>(0.0508)</td>
<td>(0.0508)</td>
<td>(0.0448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>-0.0658**</td>
<td>-0.0464</td>
<td>-0.0919</td>
<td>-0.0355</td>
<td>-0.1056**</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>-0.0965</td>
<td>-0.0961**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0324)</td>
<td>(0.0775)</td>
<td>(0.0782)</td>
<td>(0.0584)</td>
<td>(0.0491)</td>
<td>(0.0625)</td>
<td>(0.0600)</td>
<td>(0.0477)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th quartile</td>
<td>-0.0713*</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>-0.1090</td>
<td>-0.0151</td>
<td>-0.1305**</td>
<td>-0.0200</td>
<td>-0.0497</td>
<td>-0.1385**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0412)</td>
<td>(0.0946)</td>
<td>(0.1056)</td>
<td>(0.0722)</td>
<td>(0.0655)</td>
<td>(0.0799)</td>
<td>(0.0775)</td>
<td>(0.0601)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N (Course x year) 579622 60953 156970 195375 150731 209190 170946 199228

# Courses 153392 15156 43067 51873 39169 55444 43320 54557

Course FE Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Field x Year FE Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

Note: OLS estimates; one observation is a course in a given year. The dependent variable is the education-innovation gap; the independent variables are indicators for quartiles of the number of publications (panel (a)) and citations (panel (b)) of a course’s instructors in the previous five years. The omitted category are courses with instructors with no publications or citations. For courses with more than one instructor, we consider the mean number of publications and citations across all instructors. All specifications control for course and field-by-year fixed effects. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the course level. * ≤ 0.1, ** ≤ 0.05, *** ≤ 0.01.
Table 6: The Education-Innovation Gap and The Fit Between Instructors’ Research and Course Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Fields</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fit w/top course (sd)</td>
<td>-0.0877**</td>
<td>0.1638</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>-0.0756</td>
<td>-0.0845</td>
<td>-0.0637</td>
<td>-0.1428*</td>
<td>-0.0611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0398)</td>
<td>(0.0997)</td>
<td>(0.1728)</td>
<td>(0.0559)</td>
<td>(0.0656)</td>
<td>(0.0832)</td>
<td>(0.0790)</td>
<td>(0.0558)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (Course x year)</td>
<td>54591</td>
<td>3293</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>35859</td>
<td>12626</td>
<td>16743</td>
<td>16224</td>
<td>21139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Courses</td>
<td>17077</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>11166</td>
<td>3923</td>
<td>5208</td>
<td>4833</td>
<td>6883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field x Year FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OLS estimates; one observation is a course in a given year. The dependent variable is the education-innovation gap. The variable Fit w/top course is a measure of fit between the instructor’s research and the content of the course, defined as the cosine similarity between the instructor’s research in the previous 5 years and the content of the course with the smallest education-innovation gap among all courses in the same topic across all schools. All specifications control for course and field-by-year fixed effects. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the course level. * ≤ 0.1, ** ≤ 0.05, *** ≤ 0.01.
Table 7: The Education-Innovation Gap and Instructors’ Research Resources: NSF/NIH Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Fields (1)</th>
<th>Business (2)</th>
<th>Humanities (3)</th>
<th>STEM (4)</th>
<th>Social Science (5)</th>
<th>Basic (6)</th>
<th>Advanced (7)</th>
<th>Graduate (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one grant</td>
<td>-0.0453***</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>-0.0649</td>
<td>-0.0316</td>
<td>-0.0596*</td>
<td>-0.0476</td>
<td>-0.0324</td>
<td>-0.0567*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0199)</td>
<td>(0.0571)</td>
<td>(0.0400)</td>
<td>(0.0367)</td>
<td>(0.0330)</td>
<td>(0.0327)</td>
<td>(0.0370)</td>
<td>(0.0336)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (Course x year)</td>
<td>581995</td>
<td>60953</td>
<td>156970</td>
<td>195375</td>
<td>150731</td>
<td>210121</td>
<td>171867</td>
<td>199735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Courses</td>
<td>153809</td>
<td>15156</td>
<td>43067</td>
<td>51873</td>
<td>39169</td>
<td>55594</td>
<td>43474</td>
<td>54663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field x Year FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OLS estimates; one observation is a course in a given year. The dependent variable is the education-innovation gap. The variable At least one grant equals one if the course’s instructor (or at least one of the course’s instructors in case of multiple instructors) has received at least one NSF or NIH grant. All specifications control for course and field-by-year fixed effects. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the course level. * ≤ 0.1, ** ≤ 0.05, *** ≤ 0.01.
Table 8: The Education-Innovation Gap and Innovation Measures: Share of Undergraduate Students Who Enroll in Grad School and Total Nr of Patents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel (a): no controls</th>
<th>All (1)</th>
<th>STEM (2)</th>
<th>Health (3)</th>
<th>Business (4)</th>
<th>Social Science (5)</th>
<th>Humanities (6)</th>
<th>Nr Patents (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gap (sd)</td>
<td>-0.0044** (0.0018)</td>
<td>-0.0010 (0.0022)</td>
<td>-0.0074** (0.0033)</td>
<td>-0.0003 (0.0005)</td>
<td>-0.0124** (0.0051)</td>
<td>0.0054 (0.0076)</td>
<td>-26.8006 (16.6213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean dep. var.</td>
<td>0.0265</td>
<td>0.0452</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0335</td>
<td>0.0228</td>
<td>129.7813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>65755</td>
<td>14714</td>
<td>9218</td>
<td>12698</td>
<td>14657</td>
<td>14468</td>
<td>1715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel (b): w/ controls</th>
<th>All (1)</th>
<th>STEM (2)</th>
<th>Health (3)</th>
<th>Business (4)</th>
<th>Social Science (5)</th>
<th>Humanities (6)</th>
<th>Nr Patents (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gap (sd)</td>
<td>-0.0046** (0.0021)</td>
<td>0.0002 (0.0019)</td>
<td>-0.0066** (0.0030)</td>
<td>-0.0003 (0.0005)</td>
<td>-0.0101** (0.0046)</td>
<td>0.0061 (0.0074)</td>
<td>-21.8882* (12.5836)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean dep. var.</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>0.0461</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0342</td>
<td>0.0228</td>
<td>131.0248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>47723</td>
<td>10673</td>
<td>6656</td>
<td>9243</td>
<td>10645</td>
<td>10506</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OLS estimates of the coefficient $\delta$ in equation (9). In columns 1-6, the variable Gap (sd) is a school-by-macro field-level education-innovation gap (estimated as $\theta_{s(i)}$ in equation (8), separately for each macro-field), standardized to have mean zero and variance one. In column 7, Gap (sd) is estimated at the school level pooling data from all fields. In columns 1-6, the dependent variable is the share of undergraduate students at each institution who attend graduate school (from the NSF Survey of Doctorate Recipients, year 2000); in column 7, it is the total number of patents filed by students at each school, from Chetty et al. (2020). All columns in panel b control for control (private or public), selectivity tiers, and an interaction between selectivity tiers and an indicator for R1 institutions according to the Carnegie classification; student-to-faculty ratio and the share of ladder faculty; total expenditure, research expenditure, instructional expenditure, and salary instructional expenditure per student; the share of undergraduate and graduate enrollment and the share of white and minority students; an indicator for institutions with admission share equal to 100, median SAT and ACT scores of admitted students in 2006, and indicators for schools not using either SAT or ACT in admission; the share of students with majors in Arts and Humanities, Business, Health, Public and Social Service, Social Sciences, STEM, and multi-disciplinary fields; and the natural logarithm of parental income. Columns 1-6 control for year effects. Column 1 also controls for macro field fixed effects. Bootstrapped standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the school level. * $\leq 0.1$, ** $\leq 0.05$, *** $\leq 0.01$. 
Table 9: The Education-Innovation Gap and Student Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel (a): no controls</th>
<th>Grad rate</th>
<th>Income (College Scorecard)</th>
<th>Income (Chetty et al., 2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap (sd)</td>
<td>-0.0513***</td>
<td>-0.0555***</td>
<td>-0.0645***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0068)</td>
<td>(0.0104)</td>
<td>(0.0106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean dep. var.</td>
<td>0.5692</td>
<td>0.3694</td>
<td>0.2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15683</td>
<td>3793</td>
<td>3566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># schools</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel (b): w/ controls</th>
<th>Grad rate</th>
<th>Income (College Scorecard)</th>
<th>Income (Chetty et al., 2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap (sd)</td>
<td>-0.0073**</td>
<td>-0.0067</td>
<td>-0.0083*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0030)</td>
<td>(0.0041)</td>
<td>(0.0050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean dep. var.</td>
<td>0.5816</td>
<td>10.8281</td>
<td>10.7605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11471</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># schools</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OLS estimates of the coefficient $\delta$ in equation (9). The variable Gap (sd) is a school-level education-innovation gap (estimated as $\theta_{x(i)}$ in equation (8)), standardized to have mean zero and variance one. The dependent variable are graduation rates (from IPEDS, years 1998-2018, column 1); the log of mean student incomes from the College Scorecard, for all students (column 2) and for students with parental income in the bottom tercile (column 3); the log of median income from the College Scorecard (column 4); the log of mean income for students who graduated between 2002 and 2004 (from Chetty et al. (2020), column 5); the probability that students have incomes in the top 20, 10, and 5 percent of the national distribution (from Chetty et al. (2020), columns 6-8); and the probability that students with parental income in the bottom quintile reach the top quintile during adulthood (column 9). Columns 1-4 in panels a and b control for year effects. All columns in panel b control for control (private or public), selectivity tiers, and an interaction between selectivity tiers and an indicator for R1 institutions according to the Carnegie classification; student-to-faculty ratio and the share of ladder faculty; total expenditure, research expenditure, instructional expenditure, and salary instructional expenditure per student; the share of undergraduate and graduate enrollment and the share of white and minority students; an indicator for institutions with admission share equal to 100, median SAT and ACT scores of admitted students in 2006, and indicators for schools not using either SAT or ACT in admission; the share of students with majors in Arts and Humanities, Business, Health, Public and Social Service, Social Sciences, STEM, and multi-disciplinary fields; and the natural logarithm of parental income. Bootstrapped standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the school level. * $\leq 0.1$, ** $\leq 0.05$, *** $\leq 0.01$. 