

**Pulling It All Together: What Have We Learned Today and What Should We Do Next?
October 30, 2014**

CECILIA ROUSE. I don't know. This is kind of a fun position because I think it really has been a phenomenal day. I completely agree with you, Janice. There's been a lot of energy. There've been phenomenal presentations. I won't do, I'll save the thank yous for the end. But I think it really has been a great day. But one of the things that I know Janice wanted to strive for and with Amanda in putting this together was that this wasn't going to be the end of the conversation, that we would come together today, all agree that this is a problem, see new data saying this is a problem, all agree this is a problem, and then go home and kind of ponder the fact that we learned that there's a problem or reaffirm that there's a problem. But we wanted it to be a conference that would be the beginning of a new conversation. And I kind of say new conversation because I think that we, as a profession, have sort of ebbed and waned in terms of our focus on it, but I think there's a moment now where there's increased interest in diversity, not just among the American Economic Association and economists, but in at least in the Academy at large and dare I say, you know, in the private sector as well. So in the public sector. So I think there's an increased interest in diversity across the country. So I think this is a great moment to have this conference. But it's really important that we leave here and say, "Well, what's next?" Because this is meant to be the beginning. And so that was kind of the role here was to summarize what we think we've learned, to see what you guys thought were the most important things that you learned today, and then for us all to think about what would be logical next steps. I've come up with an idea or two that are probably a little bit wacky, but I'm going to first tell you what you told me that you thought you learned.

So let me just tell you what I thought I learned in terms of the structure of the day. So first of all, at you know, I think, traditionally, we focused on the supply side of the problem and

that is real and so, for example, the summer, the AEA Summer Program is focused on addressing the supply side and we think that interventions there can and do make a difference, and we should continue to do that. So, and no one is suggesting that because we've had more of a focus I would say on the demand side here today that we should lose sight of the very real importance of making sure that students, men and women, and students of color get the skills that they need so that they can successfully join the economics profession. But we learned that I think that what was really novel here and I think what the literature has been very sort of really forceful in developing over the past several years is the demand side.

It's funny. I actually sat, I did a little panel, Princeton did a Coming Back Conference for their black alumni. I would make a quip about the number, but actually, it was pretty well represented.

[Laughter]

Well attended. It was very well attended. So Roland Fryer has been visiting Princeton with his wife. And so, instead of me just being up there, I roped him to, for making it a conversation, and as we were prepping, he's like, "Well, let's focus on the supply side because we know we can't do anything about the demand side." I'm like, "You know, Roland, I'm not sure I agree with that." And, but that's where he's motivated by his work to go back to doing a lot of work at the K through 12 level, if not earlier, because he really is focused on that.

But I think that what we learned today is that the demand side's hard. We can't, it's, you can't just do government regulation and say, "Thou shalt not discriminate." But I think the fact is with the really compelling data that we saw on implicit bias, which Joe Handelsman also reminded us has been around for 40 years, but continues to be true and it continues to be stunning, but that implicit bias is something that no, we wouldn't regulate that, but by coming up with ways for

people to be aware of it, we can start to nudge our way around it and I will talk about some of the ways that I think you guys really heard that we can nudge our way around it. I think Geoff Cohen also provided some very constructive ways to confront that's a, it's a, was a little bit more the demand meets the supply side. So ways that we, you know, the teacher interacts with the student or the manager interacts with workers. And, but we really, I think what was really new today was more on the demand side.

So what did you guys write back in terms of your cards? So first, I was working with Amanda. We thought that if we look into the hiring and evaluation space, I think it was very clear that the search effort at UVA I think was a very nice example of it. But the importance that search committees have very clear criteria for what they're looking for, that they understand what they're looking for, that they are standardized, so that they're not, "well, for the men, we're looking for this and for the women, we're looking for that. That the men are stronger at this, we're just going to switch it." But there are very clear standards and questions and characteristics that search committees are looking for and that those are established ex-ante is very important so that there is more of a level playing field as to how candidates are evaluated. That was something I heard and I think it seems it could be easily implemented in departments as they are hiring and even as they are screening students for graduate programs.

Requiring accountability. So this needs to come from the top, and I think that this is actually probably even the standardization of the search criteria can come from the top. But the point here is that university administration has to take it very seriously and has to insist on it. At Princeton, whether it works or not, I don't know, but at Princeton, when we look for, when we do our searches, we have to send in the names of all of the people who we, we have to give the numbers of men and women, and I think people of color, and we have to then give who, tell them

who we're going to interview and they look over every single list, and if there aren't enough women and people of color, you have to either explain that there was, why they're not there or you look at little harder in order to make that happen.

At the graduate level in terms of our students, they look every year. We're hauled in and we have to explain the diversity of our students in terms of our admitted applicants before the letters go out so that that list of students could be possibly rearranged if that's necessary. And sometimes it's by the Central Administration throwing some extra resources at departments in order to bring in some students of color or more female students. So I'm not going, I don't want to hold up Princeton as a poster child here, but these are the efforts that Princeton is taking because we are very interested in diversity, both of faculty and students.

So what you guys wrote back was, "Require accountability in the search and in students and, again, that that come from the top." Again, being motivated by Geoff Cohens' insights, wise criticism. This seems like something that we can share with our colleagues and could be more widely known. The first place it's going to go, and maybe it's already on your Wiki, Amanda. And for, you know, that's kind of low hanging fruit to say, "Look, don't lead with the 20 things that are wrong with the paper." Putting in a, this was, you know, this was a good start. Whatever you can bring yourself to say. It was a good start. I have a lot of things to say because I have high standards and I know you can meet them, and then you give them, and then you let loose. Or when you're giving feedback, now that I'm a manager, I actually have to do performance reviews. I'm, this is a great reminder for me to lead with the, "Look, you're, you know, doing a good job. I do have some things to say because I have very high standards. I need a great team and I know you can do it, but here are the things I need you to work on."

So it feels like we can share that insight and that feels like it's very low hanging fruit. Similarly, with the values and information, so I did pull out some cards, so like at a, from I guess this is from a small liberal arts college department chair, who shall be nameless, I guess. So for incoming students, introduce them to multicultural affairs orientation for them to, for careers in economics along the last, along the lines of Math x Econ at the New York Fed and the Board of Governors. You could do this with incoming college students as well for them to understand, "So, you do very well in math. You don't have to just go on to engineering or medicine. Hey, look at all the fun things you can do in economics." But also too, you could do more of the values affirmation with them as well. And then also just bringing in with the students, talking to them about the diversity of what people do in economics. It's not just going off to McKinsey. It's not just going off to finance. Although we value finance, too. But also, you can ask a lot of very interesting questions along another, other dimensions as well. And then introducing the values affirmation in the introductory courses would also be very beneficial and could make economics relevant.

Also, in terms of teaching, yeah, in terms of teaching, mentoring obviously came through. The CeMENT Program and DITE are just so powerful and there are so many ways to do that, even just at the micro level, setting up mentoring relationships between faculty and students all along. But just the importance of mentoring people, I think many people in the Academy in particular, many people who have gone on to the elite colleges or get their PhDs, we know they come from families where the parents have been to college, and they can get that kind of informal mentoring just by calling home to mom and dad or uncle or even an older brother or sister. But when you're the first generation going to college and you run into a bump in the road, you don't have anybody to call. So having somebody that has been through the process who you

can call and who you trust can be very important. So it's very important to have mentoring all along the pipeline, teaching, learning, and at grants all the way along, and including mid-career as we were reminded as well.

So, I'm going to make one other comment before I make a more global comment. So then the question, so then the Fed has specific issues, and I will, I'm going to turn my attention this way, David.

[Laughter]

So there were several people from the Fed who felt like the Fed could have better mentoring programs like something along CeMENT, more standardized hiring practices and having them determined ex-ante and what were some of the other things from the Fed? I think those were some of the main things. Right. Including mid-career as well. Okay, so then, but the issue is bigger than this. So these are all nice micro and I think they are very important nudges that I as a microeconomist, I think these add up to be something bigger. But how do you also generate systemic change? And I think there, who was it who said that you have to get economists to understand why diversity is in their self-interest? And I think it's not just economists that have to see this, I think as a society, we have to grow and understand that diversity is just better for all, better for us all. Even if it is harder. Even if you may not find the process quite as pleasant. We will all be better for it. And so I think that's the harder row to hoe, so one suggestion along those lines is the, we're going to call The Greg Price Memorial Funding Stream Hammer.

[Laughter]

Which is to really make funding, you know, this is from the federal government and federal places to make funding maybe not quite as strongly tied to it as Greg has articulated, but

the point is well taken, which is to say we pay attention to what is happening in terms of your diversity as we consider our funding decisions. And that is a decision that, that can be factored in as part of the decision-making process. As a small thing, for example, I was trying for this little talk I did with Roland Fryer, I wanted to get the fraction female across disciplines, but by discipline. Turns out, couldn't get it from federal statistics. So IPEDS will give you that writ-large, but they won't give it to you by discipline, which means I guess we don't care. Right. So universities pay attention to what is measured--

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Is statistical agencies, you know, behind confidentiality with, you know, worse than they used to be?

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Yep. In fact, having had this question, discussion multiple times with my bosses at NSF, econ is way ahead of most of my colleagues' disciplines in terms of the AEA's collective efforts to gather some sort of data.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. But the education department has it, bachelor's degree and beyond. They have--

AUDIENCE MEMBER. I said--

[Multiple voices.]

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Oh, I'm sorry. Faculty.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Faculty.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. I said an academic analytics.

CECILIA ROUSE. Yes, I did. I bought it from somebody.

[Laughter]

CECILIA ROUSE. I don't remember who. I did, but I did end up having to buy it and the data from 2011, actually. That was the most recent year or whatever, whoever I bought it from. It was the survey out of UCLA I think. Anyway, but the fact that people pay attention to what is measured and what people are paying attention to. So I think that that's a point well taken, that funding streams can matter.

We have to find a way to have an, a broader mind, so this was a comment that we need to be more open as a profession to other ideas than just the neoclassical model, more heterodox ideas because, again, it's that kind of diversity, so it's not just diversity on socioeconomic status or race or ethnicity or male/female, it's diversity along a lot of measures, which is what Scott Page is talking about, for example, which is you need everybody's different voice in the mix in order for us to make better decisions and to avoid, I don't know, you know, things like a collapse back in 2008. I don't know.

And so one, I'm just going to leave you with this last thought, which is so maybe this is little, but it's actually not a bad idea, which is that the AEA should adopt a resolution encouraging economics departments to adopt policies and practices supporting racial and gender diversity. Apparently, they've never done that. But again, it says sort of from the top, this is something we care about. And I think that's how we will start to get change when people have it at the front of their minds, when they're focused on the problem, that they acknowledge that there's a problem, and that they then start, get to be creative about ways to think about it. I don't know that we want to open for open question because I really do want to thank everybody who organized this conference. Can I do that first and then, should I do that first? I just want to say, okay, I'm going to do that because I don't want to forget.

So first of all, I want to ask the members of CSWEP who are here, if they could stand up, because I know there's some members of CSWEP. This is, you know, like these are the unpaid heroes of the AEA.

[Applause]

And then I actually didn't realize this, so I've been, I'm a currently co-chair with Gary Hoover of the, of CSMGEP, but there are several members of CSMGEP here, too. Could you stand up, including you, Marie, as head of our mentoring program? Lisa is doing double duty,

[Applause]

So--

[Applause]

Again, unpaid, but they really are trying to keep their eye on the ball. But I, last, I want to recognize Janice. So this whole idea was Janice's. Janice is a former member of CSMGEP. I'm going to take credit for that one. She's been focused on diversity issues at the Board of Governors for a long time indeed throughout the Federal Reserve System and she really wanted to do something big this year focused on this issue. And so I just want to say thank you for thinking of this, thank you for organizing it. I do need to thank David for supporting you in doing this. I'll give a small nod to Janet Yellen for also supporting you in doing this, and also for Amanda for supporting you in doing this, and I'm going to thank all the staff because one of the things I've learned as dean is that without the staff, nothing really happens.

[Laughter]

And so I want to thank all the staff and everybody who's made it happens, but really Janice, this was a fabulous idea, so thank you.

JANICE SHACK-MARQUEZ. Thank you.

[Applause]

CECILIA ROUSE. But we have 25 minutes to kill. Is that right?

JANICE SHACK-MARQUEZ. We have like ten minutes.

CECILIA ROUSE. We have ten minutes to kill before the--

[Inaudible]

JANICE SHACK-MARQUEZ. Well, so we have the wine and cheese is over in the Eccles building, so it'll take us a little while to commute across the street. So, but we can't have wine and cheese until 5:30 because that's when the business day ends.

[Laughter]

So there you go. That's the only explanation.

CECILIA ROUSE. And, you know, one last thing. I want to thank everybody who's here. I know there are a lot of department chairs here and other people who are just interested and care about the issue and I really want to thank you for taking the time to come and I look forward to working with you all for next steps.