

**Panel on Current AEA Initiatives
October 30, 2014**

GREGORY N. PRICE. OK. Good afternoon colleagues and welcome to our panel on current AEA initiatives. I'm Gregory Price from Langston University. Just a few housekeeping things here, I'm going to spend no more than five minutes on each of my presenters here, or 10 minutes. Now, what I would like to point to is I just want to point your attention to another program that I think is also important. And I see Nancy Lutz here from the Nat Science Foundation. I would like to carve out five minutes for her if she's willing to talk about the NSF-sponsored Diversity Initiative for Tenure in Economics, which is also an important program and none of the PIs are here but it's--I believe the PIs are Sandy Darity at Duke, Rhonda Sharpe as being directed now by Omari Swinton at Howard University and Darrick Hamilton. Now, it's also another important component of the pipeline issues because when you look at the 106 universities that offer PhDs, if you ask how many blacks are on faculty, typically there are none. The typical PhD-granting faculty has no blacks at all on faculty, OK? Now, if you net out--if you take out those who are in the tenure track and ask what about tenured black faculty? Well, the answer still is zero but the standard deviation gets even larger, right? So, there's an absence, there's a relative absence of black tenured faculty and other underrepresented groups on our nation's PhD granting institutions. And that has been persistent for the past 100 years basically, OK? So, the DITE program is an important component of how to address that as well to, to get under represented minorities not just on the tenure track but tenured as well. So, I would like to carve out at least five minutes for Nancy Lutz to tell us something about DITE that I cannot convey as well too. So, that's the process here. We're going to spend 10 minutes on each and I will start here, I'll start here on my left--

DONNA K. GINTHER. No, I go last.

GREGORY N. PRICE. You want to go last?

DONNA K. GINTHER. Yes.

GREGORY N. PRICE. OK. We'll follow the program here. OK, we'll follow the order on the program, OK.

[Inaudible Remark]

GREGORY N. PRICE. Yes, you can. OK. Yes, yes, Nancy, OK, OK. All right, let's proceed, OK.

CHARLES M. BECKER. OK?

GREGORY N. PRICE. Yeah.

CHARLES M. BECKER. Well, since we've been talking about diversity, I guess one of the major efforts of the economics profession has been since 1974, we've had this longstanding program to increase minority representation in the profession through the American Economic Association Summer Minority Program or Summer Training Program or Summer Program, AEASP. It's, it prepares undergrads for doctoral programs as its primary mission officially in economics but also in related disciplines. We've had about a thousand participants in the past quarter century. Actually, we've had in the past 40 years. This year is the 40th year because we missed one year. It's five to nine weeks long. It's, it includes a research project typically these years and recent years has classes in mathematics, typically econometrics, microtheory, some variations on this, occasionally macroeconomics. It's not cheap but on the other hand, by the standards of, I guess, Washington, DC, it's also not that expensive. We've had, first I should mention since it's been raised here, we do have an alumna in the CIA of the program, we, I can't tell you who because we'd have to, none of you would survive. But in effect, it's a boot camp and that's the way it's been run pretty consistently. Indeed, as I listen to others and trying to

think about what I've done wrong during my years teaching and there's a lot of mea culpas here that I won't get into because it is being filmed, but we do, we have had a disproportionate share I think of people who've been athletes or, I've also tried to recruit vets. And I think in part, one of the, without knowing why, just that these groups seem to do reasonably well and survive boot camp. Well, in part, perhaps because they've already been through boot camp and they're used to being criticized more or less mercilessly. And are used to seeing majority, you know, white people criticize and they're used to seeing everyone criticized and yelled at so that they realize when this happens that this is not an individual specific or race specific phenomena, it's just these economists are just not warm and fuzzy creatures and so it's easier to tolerate. At Duke University, since Cece was there, we have taken advantage. Duke was a host for four years and I think it's been instrumental in changing the culture of the institution. So, for those of you at other schools that hope to be host of program at some point, I strongly commend it. I was looking around this year, I was only on admissions for a very small part of this, so this is not mostly me, even though I'm, but we have, of our master's program, incoming students this year, we have 28 Americans of whom seven are students of color. This doesn't include, in addition, we have African and a couple Mexican, other Latin American students. So, diversity is sort of taken for granted. We have minority students, alumni and alumna of the doctoral program. We recently hired an AEA Summer Program alumna as an assistant professor on tenure track. It's, we also have an African--African-American tenure track faculty member. So, it really, Duke is not the Duke that, you know, that Cece described for, in her years.

[Inaudible Remark]

There's a list of the various hosts. There's a long slide presentation and I think you all can either download it or can write to me and I'll send the slides to you. There's also, these sorts of slides also come from Cece Rouse's menu trends and my paper on, the AEA paper on the Summer Program and its effects. So, basically, what we did in that paper was to do a survey of the, a web-based survey of the alums. And we also asked, we also recruited both a snowball sample and we have full information on the applicants to the, the programs when it was hosted at Stanford, University of Colorado at Denver and Duke since it moves from one school to another every three to five years. Hopefully, they'll, this turnover will slow down a little bit in the future. And so, we give the people a \$25 incentive and we ended up with a 41 percent response rate of 443 applicants, 328 alumni.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. What's a snowball sample?

CHARLES M. BECKER. Snowball sample. So, what we do is we ask people to designate other people like them who they knew as undergraduates who might, who could have but did not apply. So, people who look very similar to them. Since we did, we couldn't identify easily ourselves but we're asking this, the initial sample of alums, to identify other people who would be comparable. The annual distribution is given there. Obviously because we had data from Stanford, Colorado and Duke, our respondents especially those not alums are, we have more recent alums who are responding and just because they all have email and are checking their social websites constantly. And then we have the non-alumni data from this era, the era. So, we end up with two samples, a balance sample, when we, that just compares the Stanford, UCD and Duke group, and then a pre-2003 balanced sample, which obviously--which didn't include Duke in the last year on UC Denver mostly because when we want to look at outcomes, the more recent, students in more recent years will not necessarily have completed doctoral

programs. Our intention is to assess whether or not, you know, this program that cost half a million to three quarters of a million dollars a year for 40 years, actually has any impact. As economists, the sort of thing we would want to know if this were any other program but since it's our own, we just take it on faith until now. Oh, and you can't read that. I can't even read it. But what this does is in the paper, it tells you about the characteristics of the group. The comparison group and the treatment group were not terribly different. There are some differences.

Obviously, the people who chose not to come tended to be slightly weaker but not dramatically. I actually went back and looked at outcome performance for the students who did show up according to our ex, to especially my and the committee's ex ante rankings for when the program was--[inaudible] you when it was at UC Denver. And this is a mea culpa, it turns out there our predictions are not that great as to who would, our ex ante rankings and their ex post performance. It's not zero. There are people who are real stars, we did a little better picking. But the average, so the run of the mill student, the cutoff line was determined not based on so much, on our, that we ran out of good applicants. But rather because we just, we ran out of funding. In fact, one year I sent out a frantic note saying look, I've got a ton more and, a whole lot more information, you know, I got a whole lot of great app, people we would like to admit we don't have enough money can use, you know, the foundation, your foundations can you help, the answer was no. And so we had, you know, we, but the cutoff line was, so, they're not, the treatment control groups don't vary enormously in this. And then the last year, I spent all the money we had, so we had an unusually large group which diluted the quality a little bit. If we look at the cumulative effect based on treatment control groups and these slides are a little bit out of order, but if we look at the estimated treatment effect take on completing the economics PhD and assume that the estimate and the pre-2003 balance sample is similar in other years, big

assumption, there were a total of 529 economics doctorates conferred to minorities between 1995 and 2011. And our estimate is that about 20 percent of that is due to the summer program effect. So, it's not 80 percent, but it's also not trivial, about 100 additional PhDs due to the summer program or about six to seven additional people per year. Yes?

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Can you define how minority is [inaudible]?

CHARLES M. BECKER. We--

[Inaudible Remark]

CHARLES M. BECKER. These are, minority is defined as people who are historically disadvantaged in the American context. This was, I mean, I'm sure it's changed from, the definitions has changed a little bit from year to year. But generally, that would mean African-American are predominantly the sample, the population as a whole started out overwhelmingly African-American, depends on the host. It is typically somewhere between 50 and 75 percent African-American, most of the rest are Hispanic, a few native Americans, a few Hawaiians, native, people who are historically disadvantaged, the Hmong, includes a couple of people who are granted refugee status. But essentially, this is not, people are not identified generally by race but by their American context. Issues with this, well, it's not a randomized control trial. We haven't gone that far yet. And there are some, there are a bunch of other problems. Greg Price and I, the program changed a lot overtime. Greg Price and I have done a study where we looked at the impact of the second year. It matters but only some programs have had a second year. The objectives vary from host to host, the content vary from coast to coast, host to host as well. We also although we find out, find an effect which you can't read, but it's up there or it got wiped out. Anyhow, it's in the longer slides. Everything matters. The impact from the impact of the intervention leads to an increase of 20 to 40 percent in people applying, completing economics

majors, going to graduate school, applying to graduate school, applying to PhD programs, going to PhD programs and slightly less completing PhD programs. The problems we face is that we don't know exactly what, in addition to the other problems I mentioned, this is a black box and it's not the same over time. There's a lot of possibilities as what could matter I think engender for future research is to try and disentangle that perhaps by having multiple hosts. Thanks.

[Applause]

MARIE T. MORA. All right. Good afternoon everybody. I wanted to thank the organizers of this summit for inviting me and actually just putting it together, this is very exciting. I'm very excited that it's here at the Federal Reserve Board as well as being hosted by the American Economic Association. I think this type of summit is long overdue. To some extent, a lot of us are speaking to the choir because we've been talking about these issues, complaining about these issues for such a long time. But what's really thrilling is to have the other people here at the Fed and people watching us online to participate as well. So, thank you and thank you for organizing this. I was here, I'm here to talk about the American Economic Association's mentoring program, which is a program that is currently funded with generous support from the National Science Foundation. We're very appreciative of that. I took over as director in August of 2013. It's a program that's been around since the mid-1990s, in fact Cece Conrad was one of the founders of the program. Going into, part of the issue and again, this is one of the main programs of the AEA's Committee on the Status of Minority Groups of the Economics Profession, whereas the summer training program has been around for now 40 years, one of the issues that came up is that when students go through, they complete the program, they get into graduate school, I mean, that's part of the goal. But then, once they're in graduate school, how is that that we're able to help ensure that they successfully complete the programs?

Some of the surveys that we've looked at in terms of recent graduates, I think it was last year or the year before, there were only 26 PhDs that were awarded to Hispanics either permanent residents or US citizens and only 15 awarded to blacks who are US citizens or permanent residents. And I think that particular year, it was either zero or one to Native Americans. So, if we lose just one or two out of the PhD student population, we're losing significant numbers in terms of our actual pool. So, our program primarily focuses on black, Hispanic and Native American economics PhD students. Although as Charlie said, there are some cases where we have other underrepresented groups, but it's primarily black, Hispanic and Native Americans. And we have recently expanded the program to include newly-minted PhDs. They are matched with mentors in the field. We try to find mentors who have the same research interest and if possible, live in the same city, that is not always possible. The purpose of the program also facilitates a lot of networking between senior economists and students at all pipeline stages. In fact, one of the things that we have been very proud about, something that has been extremely successful over the past several years is that we host an annual summer pipeline conference. This conference is traditionally hosted at the site of the summer training program. And the idea is that the undergraduate students get to participate in the program with the graduate students. Now, the last couple of years until this summer, there were some, I guess some scheduling issues with respect to the undergraduate students participating only some of the events that weren't really, they weren't really forced to participate in the entire conference. This year, I worked very closely with the current director of the Summer Training Program to ensure that the undergraduate students were fully involved with our conference and it worked out great. I mean, I think there are a lot of people here who participated in that conference. There were a lot of synergies that we were able to tap in to. In fact, we had about 100 participants from around the

country. This was the mentees, we have our PhD students, we have their mentors, we have our senior level economists, we have the undergraduate students, we have the participants from DITE, that's the Diversity Initiative for Tenure in Economics. So, the DITE program, and I know Nancy is going to talk briefly about that as well, but it's also another very important program in terms of taking people who are basically matching up mentors with newly-minted PhDs who are in tenure track positions. And so, we had the newly-minted PhDs and their mentors and it was just, it was like, an extremely exciting conference. We plan to continue to build on the synergies by having the different groups come together. We all have the same goal, and that is to diversify the economics profession. But the way we do that, we need to make sure that these programs are not operating in isolation. We need to make sure that they are working together and again, I love that idea, the pathways, it's not one-size-fits-all and we certainly learn from each other. We do have some funding for the students in terms of travel and research funds that are awarded on a competitive basis that will allow them to visit with their mentors, to work on research to meet up with them on conferences. The funds are oriented toward those activities which will increase the probability of producing high quality journal articles and other scholarly outputs. So, moving forward, we do need to collect more data. Again, I'm fairly new to the program. We need to get more data on the research outputs. We have some but one of the things is once the students are out of the program, we haven't really followed up too much with them and I'm glad that Cece is doing that, looking back at some of the students who have, were in previous waves of the program and also to try to keep track of who has dropped out and who has stayed in and what was the difference, why is it that people were dropping out and that's going to be something that I would like to do moving forward. So, I was, I have been told to keep this

short and I think we're going to spend more time answering questions. So, that was all I had in terms of describing the program. So, thank you.

[Applause]

[Inaudible Discussions]

DONNA K. GINTHER. I'm Donna Ginther. I've been at the University of Kansas. I'm going to talk about the CeMENT mentoring program. This is joint work, is published in the AER May Papers and Proceedings in 2010. It's joint work with Fran Blau, Rachel Croson, and Janet Currie. And before we begin talking about CeMENT, I want to share some new data to put economics in the context. So, if you see, this is economics, we're in blue right here. This is psychology. This is engineering. The percentage of PhDs that are female forever was, I mean, in the 30s and we've crept up to 35 percent now. But if we look at the percentage of tenured and tenure track faculty, we're, you know, right about 20 percent compared to psychology which is at 50 percent and social sciences are at 40 percent and life sciences are at 30 percent. So, we're behind the curve in terms of gender representation in academic fields. These are the 2013 CSWEP data, very similar patterns. CSWEP started collecting its own data back in the 1970s because the answers to the AEA survey weren't adequate to really capture what was going out for women and there is evidence that a professor's gender may affect whether or not a person pursues a degree in economics, you've seen that before. Neumark and Gardecki find that female dissertation chairs reduce students' time to completion. My students are hoping that's the case, so we got three on the market so if you want to hire them. And then there's a previous literature that shows that women left networks, mentors. And so, in 1998, we had the first CeMENT mentoring program. And Nancy Lutz has a distinction of being the person who has been to every mentoring conference. So, she can tell you all of the intricacies.

[Inaudible Remark]

DONNA K. GINTHER. You do--You weren't in '98?

AUDIENCE MEMBER. I wasn't in '98. I heard all about '98 from Katherine [assumed spelling] but I went to a regional in '98 and then at the national.

DONNA K. GINTHER. Oh, OK. OK. But she's been out to all the CeMENT workshops. All right. This is a two-day mentoring boot camp. The first time we did this in 2004, people complained because we didn't schedule bathroom breaks. We had, a colleague of mine from philosophy came from the, she's a philosopher, she started a mentoring program like CeMENT for philosophy. They need it. And she complained that we didn't do any work-life balance because we didn't have time to exercise. I mean, we'd literally pack the meeting full of activities. The workshop participants are arranged into groups based on field, four to five participants, we have one to two mentors. Then you switch time between talking about a person's individual research and then panel discussions by the senior women talking about what it's like to be a woman in the economics profession. And the topics include, these are our topics, research and publishing, grants, that's why Nancy is there, professional exposure, teaching, the tenure process and work-life balance. The participants love it. They feel, you know, it's a transformative experience. In some cases, groups are so cohesive that, you know, they go to each other's weddings and other cases, not so much. But people generally have really positive feelings about the workshop, and we also do random assignment. We get about 80 participants, 80 to 100 applying and then after, you know, sort of matching them into research-intensive type jobs including jobs from the Federal Reserve Board or Banks, then they're randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. We selected more treatments than controls and we continue with the random assignment because we're continuing to study. The preliminary results had been so

persuasive that we went from going every other year to starting this year going every year because the demand for this conference has been so high. So, we get vitas from the treatment and control groups. The problem, and Karen Pence can attest to this because she was one of our controls way back when, the controls are mad at us so they don't want to talk to us. You know, it's sour grapes, so they don't talk to us. So, you know, EconLit is a wonderful thing and that's how we sort of capture or update our information about people who are in the control group and not the treatment group. The treatment group still stays in touch with us. So, these are our preliminary sort of comparisons. These are the 2004 through 2006 waves of the trial. And they were very similar, but the treatments were more likely to have children, more likely to be at the top institutions and have top publications, and less likely to believe they'd be in academia 10 years hence, and that's because cohort two drew from, you know, high ranking universities. So, we had people who were, you know, in some cases didn't really need the mentoring were in the program. But no significant differences between the treatments and controls in years one through three and then we did these regressions and we show, and this is in the paper, that our treatment groups published more papers, they published more papers in top journals and they're more successful at getting federal grants. So, this is one set of regression results. Another set of regression results showing the same. The five-year cohort again you see top tier publications, 20 percentage points. Total publications, almost three more papers for the treatment group. So, amazingly successful at the inputs that are required to have a successful academic career. We control for individual fixed effects and if you look at the five-year treatments, very similar results and, you know, positive results in terms of getting federal grants. So, this program works. CeMENT has been so successful that it's gone international. The American Philosophical Association not international but they're doing it. And if you read the New York Times last year,

philosophy has a huge gender problem. The Chinese Women Economist Network has a mentoring, summer mentoring, conference. The Japanese Women Economist Network brought Terra McKinnish who ran the CeMENT workshops after I ran them. And she did CeMENT in Japan. And my colleague, Elizabeth Asiedu at the University of Kansas is from Ghana originally. She was so impressed that she went out, formed her own nonprofit, the Association for the Advancement of African Women Economists and has run two mentoring programs in Africa for African women economists. So, we've really had a significant effect. I do a lot of research on the biomedical workforce. There's problems with race and success rates and NIH grants. NIH has spent lots of money creating a national mentoring network in part because of this research. So, it has had a large positive externality on academic science. All right, do we still need it? And the short answer is yes. This is work that I do with Shu Khan. We updated our 2004 Journal of Economic Perspectives paper. Using the SDR 2008, women are 12 percentage points less likely to take tenure track jobs, 12 percentage points less likely to get tenure and 23 percentage points less likely to become full professors. Not good numbers. We have a paper coming out in the next day or so, either tomorrow or early next week in Psychological Science in the Public Interest about academic science. Economics is the only different, only discipline where observable differences between women and men have worsened in terms of publications, salary gaps and job satisfaction. Before I go into that, this is the slide I talked about earlier about the association between GRE scores and percentage female and you see that negative linear trend. So, the issues confronting economics are pre-market. So, there are not enough women with mathematical skills. There's also the issue that women who are good at math tend to be good at lots of things and so, may not find economics as interesting. So, it may be a cultural effect. So there's the pre-market, and then there's what happens in America. So,

these are average publications in the previous five years for assistant professors. This is the gap in economics in 1995 when we had data. And this is 2008 and we see the gap has grown, it's the only discipline where the gap has grown. And one of the things I think that is the elephant in the room about academic careers and diversity in academic careers is the publication process in economics. It takes longer to publish an article in economics than any other discipline. And when you publish an article in economics, you have an uninvited coauthor which is your referee. And you do, right? So, there are issues that are [inaudible] and then we have our disciplinary culture which I call a bias against bias, right? So, that if you do find these differences, the hurdle for publishing your results becomes a little higher than if you don't find the differences. This is full professor salaries. Here's the ratio of male to female full professor salaries in 1995. Here it is in 2010, 75 cents on the dollar. Now, this could be sorting, right? I'm not controlling for anything but the fact that this is the only discipline where the gap is growing is very troubling. And finally, there's job satisfaction. I had a student doing subjective well being. Here is a significant difference in 1997. Here it is in 2010, the men have gotten happier, the women have gotten unhappier in a decade. What's up with that? So, do we need CeMENT. I think the answer is yes. So, we have additional cohorts. We hope to follow the earlier cohorts through the tenure hurdle to see what they're looking like at mid-career. The initial results are very promising. Having women mix with other women who are senior, who've been successful seems to work. It improves the outcomes and the inputs for successful academic research careers. One of the deficits in this paper is we don't know why, we don't know why it works. Is it just the role model effect? Is it a networking effect? Is it getting the unwritten rules of how to be successful as an academic? One of the things that I've realized, you know, I didn't realize when I was mentored in 1998, but I realize now is that being an academic is a really hard job. And having

the liberty to choose what to work on and when to work on it can, either you can be wildly successful because you can, you're very good and disciplined at your time or you can squander your time and not getting anything done. My final thought is that economics would benefit from continuing the CeMENT intervention and it would be interesting to see in the next few years what comes of sort of the career hurdle of tenure. Thank you.

[Applause]

NANCY LUTZ. Hi. So, if you don't know me, I'm Nancy Lutz. I'm a program director at the National Science Foundation for the economics program. I usually introduce myself to groups of economists, if you don't know me, the short version of my job description is I'm now Dan Newlon. Dan works for the AEA and I am in what was previously Dan's seat. It's probably the easiest thing to explain what I do because NSF is staffed with a group of permanent career employees, which I now am. I've left academia and people who are here in two-year visits like Greg Price for example and Barbara Craig who are here have both done that. Greg asked me to say something about DITE and I didn't have any warning, so obviously there are no slides. This is going to be very short. DITE stands for Diversity Initiative for Tenure in Economics and it is a program run out of Duke, the award is to Duke. The PIs are Sandy Darity and Rhonda Sharpe who is, if I remember correctly off the top of my head, currently visiting at Bucknell this year and Omari Swinton at Howard is currently taking a lead in directing and running the program. Like CeMENT, DITE is an intervention that is aimed at tenure track faculty and academic jobs with a focus on a number of things including what, how do you figure out what does it take to get tenure. It's a somewhat different intervention than CeMENT. CeMENT works on a paired mentor-mentee, excuse me, CeMENT works on a shared mentoring concept where actually people are not individually paired with mentors, they're with their groups of junior women who

are encouraged to build horizontal mentoring relationships within their research group. DITE has a little more of a focus on upward, downward, more traditional mentor-mentee relationship, although that varies with the participants and exactly what people's interests are. CeMENT has something of a one-shot flavor. The cohorts come on in for the two-day intervention and then afterwards basically, how involved they are with each other is up to the participants and seeing each other at the AEA cocktail parties, maybe the only thing some people do. DITE tends to focus more on multiple meetings both during, it's a summer program but it includes meetings at the AEA meetings and other check-ins during the year. And most people are part of DITE through several years, whereas people do not go to CeMENT two years in a row. NSF is supporting, actually NSF either has supported or does currently support everything you heard about today. So, the ADVANCE program which you heard about earlier and the economics program provided the initial funding for both the COFFEE program that preceded CeMENT and CeMENT. CeMENT is currently funded by the AEA and is not funded by NSF. All of the other programs are currently supported by NSF. Yeah?

[Inaudible Remark]

NANCY LUTZ. There is an award for the summer program. Have you talked to New Mexico?

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Oh, that's true.

NANCY LUTZ. There is a, sorry Cece, I didn't mean to put you on the spot, I didn't try to phase it quite that way. It was a late, right, it was, people talked a little bit about what funding looks like and how that works. The nasty fact of life if you applied to NSF for funding is we are only going to give you funding over fairly short time frames. You are going to have to write proposals. And you do compete over and over again with everything else that comes on in. It's

especially tough in an environment where budgets aren't growing. We think that this is really important but one reason why I'm always happy to see other funders step up is because it lets the PIs focus more on growing the program and less on writing proposals every three years. But given NSF's institutional constraints, that is absolutely necessary obviously for funding from us under our policies and regulations, OK? So, if you have any questions, either I can try to answer about DITE. I am obviously not the world's biggest expert on DITE and a lot of other people here have been directly involved with it and are probably better to answer certain questions than I am. Otherwise, if you want to talk about why NSF funds these and that kind of thing, we can talk about that, too. Thanks.

[Applause]

GREGORY N. PRICE. OK. Thank you Nancy. OK. We have time for questions.

[Inaudible Discussions]

AUDIENCE MEMBER. [Inaudible] program, it's been a really great thing to the people who have access to it but one of the issues [inaudible] is that this a program designed for people who've already gotten placement into R1 or R2 institutions. And those aren't the only women in the profession. So, I would really like CeMENT to have a bigger idea of where mentoring might be necessary. Women at the Board--

DONNA K. GINTHER. That's--Excuse me, that's not accurate. We do have regional for teaching intensive CeMENT. We don't follow those people.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Yeah, I guess there is a program. I think the idea that teaching intensive is appropriate for everyone, that's not at a research one school is the issue. One of the biggest problems we've seen in the publication statistics is that women don't get published at the same rate as men and that's not just people at R1 institutions. There are expectations of research

at many other kinds of educational institutions and I would like to see it be broadened that it's not the, the regional focus is quite different than the national meetings.

DONNA K. GINTHER. OK. We do, in the national mentoring workshop, we do include people who have research intensive careers. We've had people from RAND, from BLS. I've encouraged people from the Federal Reserve Banks to apply. Anybody who is doing, so for the national workshop, anybody who's got, research as one of the criteria, you know, is being a primary determinant of whether or not you get to keep your job is encouraged to apply.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. This is just a followup, so there are several large institutions where research is as important as teaching and I know that first amended criteria is that your tenure decision depends on research, but I believe that perhaps, not, I don't know if you are considering liberal arts where research is a very important requirement for tenure for the AEA CeMENT. Not for the national CeMENT or the region.

DONNA K. GINTHER. So, we've had people at the National Mentoring Workshop from Williams. People from Oberlin in the past. I mean, I ran a program, you know, seven or eight years ago so I don't know what the makeup is right now. Kosali Simon at the University of Indiana is running it for the 2015 workshops.

NANCY LUTZ. I can talk to the last group. So, one of the tricky things from my perspective as an outsider, because even though I've been, even though I've been to CeMENT over and over and over, you know, because it's an easy thing for me to attend, I'm going to the meetings anyways, is the women who are selected have been randomized. The focus is primarily on research, although there are sessions on balancing teaching, we have had people from Williams and other selective liberal arts colleges. My own take not as a member, not as somebody who's involved in the CeMENT team, is that the success of the regionals, which at

one point were seen as an option for people who were at more teaching-oriented institutions, as you all know, there is a huge variation among those. There's probably room for a liberal arts college version of CeMENT. As an outsider, I will say that none of the PIs are getting any money, none of the people who run this get any money whatsoever for doing it. The AEA funds go to pay hotel and little bit of hotel room money.

[Inaudible Remark]

NANCY LUTZ. Does the organizer, money get now? So, one of the questions would be, is somebody interested in taking that on and making that happen? I'd love to see this kind of program expanded to everybody who wants to go but they're also pretty intense, they're also pretty demanding of time both for the organizers and for the people who show up and do the mentoring, so.

DONNA K. GINTHER. Yeah. In terms of the organization of the mentoring, so when I ran the conferences, I spent a semester of my time spanning the profession to try to find mentors to convince them to spend five days at the ASSA meetings because they were there to interview all these people and then they had to spend an extra two days. It's a difficult sell. And then we give them our, you know, supreme thanks, a hotel room, and a three-year membership to the AEA--

AUDIENCE MEMBER. And a couple of dinners.

DONNA K. GINTHER. And a couple of dinners.

[Inaudible Remark]

DONNA K. GINTHER. Yeah. The ones that we've had at the Federal Reserve Banks are good. Yeah. All right, that was my innovation to co-opt the Federal Reserve Banks to have the, to host. So, it's a lot of work to do this. It's, you know, you have to be passionate about it in

order to do it. Also, you know, speaking of mentoring, I know at one point in time, there was a CSWEP in Washington, DC group--

AUDIENCE MEMBER. There still is.

DONNA K. GINTHER. There still is? And they've met here at the Board and I think that that was a really great innovation. Linda Goldberg knows more about it than I do, but these opportunities to form networks I think are very valuable. That's my hypothesis. I'm not, you know, I don't have the data to back it up yet, but we could.

NANCY LUTZ. Yes. So--

DONNA K. GINTHER. Go ahead.

NANCY LUTZ. My hypothesis which, since I'm not a labor economist, I can insist on with no data whatsoever, is that at least for CeMENT, the crucial intervention is not the intervention with senior mentors, which is where we tend to focus on. It's actually horizontal relationships inside the research groups. I think the thing that makes for the most success that I've seen in terms of PIs who later come on in to NSF are people who are in groups with other young women economists and they are mutually criticizing each other's research, they're doing this wise criticism thing with each other. So, it is not a vertical relationship, it's a horizontal relationship that I think is probably the most valuable part of it.

DONNA K. GINTHER. I think that's accurate with respect to CeMENT. I think the horizontal member, the relationships that you form within the profession, they become coauthors, they become, you know, like Rachel Croson is dean at UT Arlington, the School of Business. Another person in her group is chair of her department. So, they've all sort of, you know, developed in their career together, they're still very close to one another and I think that's

sort of having someone that you can talk to about the challenges that are unique to being, you know, one of the few in the profession or is a very useful thing to have.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Yeah. So, I just wanted to, Linda Goldberg. I'm on the Board of CSWEP. I'm at the New York Fed. I just wanted to point out two other areas where some of these interventions might be useful. One is that something like 40 to 50 percent of at least the women PhDs go into non-academic positions. And so there's a real opportunity to think about what could be done to support those types of women and to, even those in the research positions as well as non-research positions, but do they encounter the same kinds of issues that are showing up in the academic data? Here in Washington, there was an innovation for, among some women to try to set up a network. CSWEP has now put into place some instruction, some guidance for local groups that want to form their own networks. They could either do it as part of CSWEP in which case, they have to follow closely some of the mandates and rules of CSWEP or they can apply for some funding to support their activities. And this group in Washington is doing this on an event by event basis. The other opportunity, so in addition to the non-academic direction, the other opportunity for more direction and interventions is mid-career mentoring. So, it's not just at the junior level or I'd say, mid-career interventions, not just at the junior level where these things are potentially useful. Mid-career, there are a number of studies of issues that are encountered and actually, for CSWEP at the next, at the meetings in January for the first time, we're experimenting with a mid-career mentoring breakfast and bringing in some motivational discussion and setting that up by tables because there are all sorts of transitions where different types of issues arise. So, I'm wondering if you have any suggestions or thoughts on the types of interventions that might be targeted at these two different groups.

DONNA K. GINTHER. Are you addressing that question to me, Linda? OK. Anyway, so I've shared some of my ideas with Marjorie McElroy at CSWEP about the mid-career. I think that, you know, one of the things I tell my undergrads is that we never stop figuring out what we want to be when we grow up and I think that's true of everybody, that our careers evolve and, you know, what was important to me ten years ago is not important to me today in terms of career satisfaction. And, you know, we have this view of a linear path in academia and, you know, my career is anything but. And so, I think that you really, we need to sort of have a conversation and this is for men and women, about sort of what, how to figure out what an optimal career looks like. And I have a colleague who's contemplating leaving academia. When I did that in 2000, you know, people were, it was like a funeral that, oh my goodness, you're going to the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, you're falling off the face of the earth. And then I get an offer from the University of Kansas and I got, "Oh, you're going to Kansas. You're falling off the face of the earth." I mean, you know, we've got to, you know, have a dialogue about what a career is and own our career instead of letting our career own us. And I think that's a kind of message that needs to be imparted to any people at their career stage.

MARIE T. MORA. And I'd like to just briefly address the point about the non-academic jobs. With our mentoring program, that's one of the reasons why we open it up to the newly-minted PhDs. The point is we don't want the mentors just to disappear once they graduate. They should be able to help them as they start their careers whether it's in academia or in non-academic positions.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Oh, before we hear from Cecilia's concluding remarks, I'd like to make a few points here. First of all, I want to warmly commend Janet Yellen for organizing this conference. I think it is extremely important that she, the first female Chairman of the

Federal Reserve Board, has taken on very seriously the responsibility to pursue the dual mandate for the Federal Reserve and also to use her influence to address this issue in the American economics profession. Let me give you very briefly, a little sense of history. This issue was raised by African-American economists in 1969 at the American Economic Association meetings in New York and it was the discussions that black economists initiated in that year led to the organization of the National Economic Association and challenging the American Economic Association to address the issue of diversity. The American Economic Association responded by supporting the summer institute that was conceived by our dear friend now departed, Marcus Alexis. It's been a long time over 40 years since we've gone forward to try to, the CSWEP was organized, that is the committee on the conference of minorities. And then there was a committee on women and there's the Hispanics organized and there is now an African association, we have all sorts of diversity in the program now. But none of the efforts that were undertaken by the American Economic Association ever moved down to the departments of economics in this country. I'm from Philadelphia. The first African-American to earn a PhD in economics was Sadie Mossell who earned her PhD at the University of Pennsylvania in 1923. She was never able to get a job in economics and so she went back to the Penn Law School, got a law degree and pursued a distinguished career in law. The University of Pennsylvania, Department of Economics, I'll name them, has had one African-American member of the faculty, Gerald James, who left there in 1974 to take a job at Yale where he got tenured. He's still a member of the faculty. I was hired by the Wharton School in 1969 after earning the PhD at Penn. My classmate in that program, Alassane Ouattara is now the President of Cote d'Ivoire. We marched down the aisle together at convention hall when our PhD degrees were conferred. He did a hell of a lot better than I did in the profession. But I will say this, there is,

there have only been three African-American members of the faculty of any university in the Philadelphia area in the last half century. Philip Jefferson is now at Swarthmore, Temple University had Walter Williams for three years, he's now at George Mason, they've never hired another one. There is not another African-American who has, economist who has taught at the University of Pennsylvania other than myself. I took emeritus status two years ago and my appointment was not in the economics department, it is in the Wharton School. The economics department is in the faculty of Arts and Sciences. The point that I'm making is this, none of this will work unless the departments of economics see it in their interest to diversify this profession. And if one pursues a career in economics, you don't have to be in an economics department. You can be in a school of business, you can be in a school of public policy, outside the field as was mentioned a minute ago, you can be in a bank or in a corporation as an economist. But the point is that unless the profession takes an interest, in seeing that this field is diversified, this nation will be harmed. Why is it important to have more African-Americans and Latinos and women in the economics profession? I'll tell you one reason, because discrimination, discrimination halts the economic growth of this country. Janet Yellen knows that, that's why she's hammering on income inequality. If we want this country to be great, I'm not making a speech, well, it's just a short statement, we have got to see that the economics profession is more diversified so that it is a reflection of all of the great abilities that this country has to offer and listen to the statement that was made by Cece earlier and you see the benefit of this. So, I'm very happy to see the Fed taking the initiative on this. I just hope that you carry it through and also encourage your regional banks to bestir themselves in their different communities to work on diversity too. Thank you very much.

[Applause]