

## Fall 1998 Newsletter

---

[Women's Contributions to Public Economics by Daphne Kenyon](#)

[On Becoming a Member of a Corporate Board of Directors by Olivia Mitchell](#)

[Strategies for a Successful Start at a Teaching College by Elizabeth Dunne Schmitt](#)

[The "E-Mentor:" A World-Wide-Web List of Resources for the Professional Development of Academic Economists by Linda Manning and Philip Thompson](#)

[Reflections from 1998 CCOFFE Participants](#)

[CSWEP Activities at the 1999 AEA Meeting](#)

[CSWEP Policy Regarding Sessions at the American Economic Association and Regional Association Meetings](#)

[Getting on the Program for the AEA 2000 Meetings](#)

---

Return to the [Newsletter Page](#)



**CSWEP  
Home**

## WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO PUBLIC ECONOMICS<sup>1</sup>

Daphne A. Kenyon - Simmons College

This article is one of a series on women's contributions to different subfields of economics.<sup>2</sup> In this article I take a different approach than in the rest of the series. Rather than enumerating the questions asked in the discipline of public economics and noting the papers written by women on these questions, I look at statistics which measure the degree to which women have achieved stature in the field. For example, I look at the number of editorial board members of major public economics journals who are women. Furthermore, I generate hypotheses regarding the patterns I observe. I hope this approach to looking at women's contributions will help generate an action agenda that can lead to a greater role for women in the field of public economics in the future.

The research methodology was straightforward. It involved identifying public finance texts, journals, and papers and counting the number of women and men, respectively. This task was made more difficult by two phenomenon. One is that it was difficult to determine whether certain individuals were male or female from their first names. The other is that certain publications have the custom of using initials rather than first names.

Public economics is the new name for the traditional field of public finance. At the core of the field are microeconomic questions involving the spending and taxing activities of governments. I follow the classification system of the American Economic Association (AEA) according to which public economics includes these subtopics: structure and scope of government; taxation and subsidies; fiscal policies and behavior of economic agents; publicly provided goods; national government expenditures and related policies; national budget, deficit, and debt; and state and local government and intergovernmental relations. A broader definition of public economics than the one I have used here might include the related fields of urban, health, and corporate finance.

How many women economists are in public economics and what proportion of public finance economists are women? It turns out that this is not a simple question to answer. First, the membership of the AEA excludes a large number of economists--probably 40 percent of professors at four-year colleges and universities alone (Siegfried 1998: 217). Furthermore, although the AEA membership questionnaire asks respondents to identify both their fields of specialization and their sex, only 61% of members identified their sex for the 1997 directory.<sup>3</sup> My examination of the 2,007 names listed under the subfield of public economics in the 1997 AEA Membership Directory leads me to conclude that there are between 265 and 592 women in the AEA specializing in public economics, or that from 13 to 29 percent of public finance economists in the AEA are women. The AEA's Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) keeps a roster of women in the economics profession by field. According to the 1997 roster, there were 326 women economists in public economics.<sup>4</sup> The CSWEP roster is by design a more comprehensive list of women economists than the AEA directory, but even this list will leave out female public finance economists who choose not to belong to either the AEA or CSWEP.

How visible are women at the highest levels of the field of public economics? A search of the Web pages of the top twenty economics departments in the country shows that senior women in public economics are very rare. Current information points to only two senior women in public economics in those top departments--Anne Case, a Professor at Princeton and Michelle White, a Professor at the University of Michigan. This is not surprising since senior women in the top twenty economics departments are rare in any field. The 1997 CSWEP Annual Departmental Questionnaire reported only 30 senior women in these economics departments (meaning full professors or associate professors with tenure). The CSWEP questionnaire also found that only 6 percent of the professors and 16 percent of the

tenured associate professors in the top 20 economics departments were women<sup>5</sup>.

None of the top three public economics journals--*Journal of Public Economics*, *Public Finance Review*, and *National Tax Journal*--has an editor or co-editor who is female. If one looks at the editorial boards of these journals, only 5 women, or 6 percent of the membership, is female. Julie Collins, Jane Gravelle, and Therese McGuire serve on the Editorial Advisory Board of the *National Tax Journal* and Suzanne Scotchmer is an Associate Editor of the *Journal of Public Economics*. Ann Friedlander is the only woman listed as a member of the Editorial Board of the May 1998 issue of *Public Finance Review*, but she passed away several years ago.

Other measures of the degree of women's academic stature or visibility at the highest levels include the following. None of the authors of articles in the prestigious *Handbook of Public Economics* is a woman<sup>6</sup>. The 1998 National Bureau of Economic Research "Family List" of affiliates in the public economics field included only 9 women, which constituted 12 percent of the list. These women are Anne Case, Julie Cullen, Nada Eissa, Leora Friedberg, Caroline Hoxby, Hilary Hoynes, Brigitte Madrian, Hilary Sigman, and Ann Witte. Of 15 public finance texts published since 1987, four are co-authored by women and a male co-author; only one (a readings book) is authored by a woman, Eleanor Brown. The women co-authors are Jacqueline Browning, Catherine Elliot, Marilyn Flowers, and Peggy Musgrave.

Not all female public economics professors work in economics departments. Highly visible senior women in academia with positions outside traditional economics departments include Helen Ladd, Sanford Institute of Public Policy, Duke University; Therese McGuire, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois; Olivia Mitchell, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; Janet Pack, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; and Susan Rose-Ackerman, School of Law, Yale University. Janet Pack is Editor of the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, an interdisciplinary journal which publishes a lot of applied public economics research.

There are a number of highly ranked senior women working in nonacademic public economics positions, many of them in Washington, DC. The most eminent is Alice Rivlin, Vice Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Others include Geraldine Gerardi, Director of Business Taxation Division, U.S. Department of the Treasury; Jane Gravelle, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Rosemary Marcuss, Deputy Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis; Marilyn Moon, Senior Fellow, The Urban Institute; June O'Neill, Director of the Congressional Budget Office; and Christine Wallich, Country Director, The World Bank. Alicia Munnell, now a professor at Boston College, recently served as a Member of the Council of Economic Advisors. Senior women in public finance outside of Washington, DC include Katherine Bradbury, Vice President, Research Department, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and Yolanda Kodrzycki, Assistant Vice President, Research Department, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

What about female-authored public economics working papers and articles, and the presence of women in public economics sessions at professional meetings? Turning first to articles published in the most visible public economics journals over the last three and a half years we find that 15 percent of *National Tax Journal* authors, 10 percent of *Public Finance Quarterly/Public Finance Review* authors, and 10 percent of *Journal of Public Economics* authors were women. The more applied and interdisciplinary *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* had 24 percent of its authors who were female over the same time period. A search for public economics articles in three prestigious journals was also conducted. Over the last three and a half years, there were many more public economics articles published in the *American Economic Review* than in the *Journal of Political Economy* or the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. Eleven percent of the authors of public economics articles in the American

Economic Review over this time period were women. We found no female authors of public economics articles in the *Journal of Political Economy* and the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* over the last three and a half years.

An often-cited series of working papers in economics is that of the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER). From 1995 through mid-year 1998, 10 percent of the NBER working paper series authors in the field of public economics were women. Public economics sessions at the annual meetings of the AEA had a greater proportion of participants who were women. Nineteen percent of all the participants of public economics sessions at the 1996, 1997 and 1998 AEA meetings were women. Female representation was less for AEA sponsored sessions (15 percent) than for sessions sponsored by the Society for Government Economists (28 percent). Women are more well represented at the annual meetings of the National Tax Association (23 percent of the participants at the 1997 meeting were women) and at the annual meetings of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (35 percent of the participants at the 1998 meeting will be women).

What are we to make of the apparent gender gap in the field of public economics? That such a gender gap exists can hardly be surprising given the statistics presented on the academic economics profession as a whole in the annual CSWEP Departmental Questionnaire and elsewhere (Kahn 1995 ). However, some of the patterns in the gender gap are illuminating. There is a fair amount of serendipity in the patterns of representation by gender. Women have apparently been able to have greater involvement in meetings of the NBER than on the editorial board of the *Public Finance Review* for example. Furthermore, it appears that the so-called glass ceiling is more constraining in top economics departments than in top departments outside of economics, and that the opportunities for advancement for women in public economics are greater in government than in academia. What actions might be taken in light of the statistics presented here? It seems that certain journal editors should be encouraged to be more inclusive in their invitations to potential editorial board members. In addition, any efforts to restrict sessions offered at the annual AEA meetings should be monitored. A decision to restrict the number of sessions offered by the Society of Government Economists, for example, would appear to have a particularly deleterious effect on women's opportunities to participate in the meetings.

---

## References

Albelda, Randy, *Economics and Feminism: Disturbances in the Field*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Prentice Hall International, 1997.

Kahn, Shulamit. "Women in the Economics Profession." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Fall 1995: 9:4, pp. 193-205.

Siegfried, John J. "Who Is a Member of the AEA?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Spring 1998: 12:2, p. 221.

---

<sup>1</sup>Many thanks to Olga Kissin and Lora Slomich who were able research assistants for this article. Thanks also to the Simmons College Fund for Faculty Development for partial funding for the necessary research assistance. I also benefited from helpful conversations with Therese McGuire at an early stage of this project.

<sup>2</sup> See Spring and Fall 1996 issues of the CSWEP Newsletter for Gal-Or and Slade's "Women's Contributions to Industrial Organization"; Fall 1995 for Connelly's "Women's Contribution to Economic Demography"; and Spring and Fall 1992 for Blau and Ferber's "Women's Contributions to Labor

Economics."

<sup>3</sup> *The American Economic Review*, December 1997, 87:6, p. 685. The number of AEA members in 1997 is from Siegfried, 1998: p. 221.

<sup>4</sup> Computed from The American Economic Association, *Women in Economics: The CSWEP Roster*, December 1997. According to another compilation, there were 206 women economists in the AEA specializing in public economics in 1993, and women accounted for 13 percent of the AEA membership specializing in public economics in that year (Albelda, 1997: 46).

<sup>5</sup> Preliminary results of 1997 CSWEP Annual Departmental Questionnaire, distributed to CSWEP Board on September 25, 1998. Seventeen of the top 20 economics departments completed the survey.

<sup>6</sup> *Handbook of Public Economics*, Vol. 1. Amsterdam: North-Holland (An imprint of Elsevier Science), 1985 and Auerbach, A. J. and M. Feldstein, eds., *Handbook of Public Economics*, Vol. 2. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1987.

A rectangular button with a dark background and light text. The text reads "CSWEP" on the top line and "Home" on the bottom line, both in a serif font.

---

Return to the [Newsletter Page](#)

## **On Becoming a Member of a Corporate Board of Directors** **Olivia Mitchell - The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania**

The call was from a well-known executive search firm, after final exams were over at Penn in May. The caller revealed little, other than the fact that my name had been mentioned as a possible Board member of a large publicly-traded firm in the insurance field. Would I be interested in moving the process a step further? With interest, I replied in the affirmative, depending on the company and what the time demands were anticipated to be. After all, exams were graded and the summer stretched out ahead.

Several days later, the CEO of a major insurance brokerage firm invited me to New York for further discussion. On scheduling the meeting, I immediately turned to intensive research on the firm - searching Lexis/Nexis and the web, analyzing the company's past several annual reports - with special attention to the footnotes! - and contacting colleagues who knew the industry and the other members of the Board. Since I teach insurance, I had a reasonably good idea of the burning issues facing the industry, as well as some of the upcoming challenges. But it became much more intense when the health of the company (not to mention my own legal liability) would be at stake!

The main queries I asked myself prior to our initial meeting was what contribution I could make to the firm, and whether joining the Board would impose any limits on my research and teaching agenda. Doubts were soon dispelled, since the company had long had a tradition of an academic on its Board, to add a dispassionate and forward-looking perspective to ongoing discussions. Indeed, my academic precursor had reached the mandatory Board retirement age, but he remained active in Board matters and soon became a trusted friend and colleague. The fact that I had written widely and expressed myself publicly on a range of private and public insurance issues did not appear to concern the corporate managers, nor the other Board members with whom I met. The prospects for the company were also positive: the CEO had done an excellent job of reversing some problems experienced prior to his arrival several years beforehand, and the strong Board was supportive of his efforts. Another issue I also became sensitive to, after talking with other faculty involved with corporate management, was that the key to an effective Board is whether a cooperative working relationship is established between inside and outside members. On this front I was soon satisfied.

Around the time of the shareholder meeting at which I was elected to the Board formally, I had the opportunity to participate in the Wharton/SpencerStuart Director's Institute. This is a valuable, and intense, three-day seminar for people joining or forming a corporate board. The session emphasizes hands-on experience, achieved by immersing participants in a hypothetical - but quite practical - case study. Its realism was driven home when I received the stack of required reading the night before the session began - it weighed about 15 pounds! The plot we faced on this case study unfolded as we "attended" a Board meeting of MegaMicro Inc., a fictional global company of \$2.5B in sales. The previous Board had acquired a large process-control firm, leaving it to us to merge (and downsize) the new Board, to handle an industrial accident at a plant first "reported" by CNN in real time during the meeting, to respond to a negative report by a financial analyst, and to structure the CEO's compensation and succession plan. Roles were played by experienced corporate CEOs and Board members in a simulated Board meeting along with sessions of the Audit, Compensation, and Nominations committees. After each session, participants offered fascinating critiques and commentary on decisions made and processes for coming to decisions.

Moving from the classroom to reality afforded me a crash course in a wide range of new issues - somewhat more time-consuming than anticipated, for sure, but much more engrossing. In the first few months, we examined and made several new acquisitions after intensive study and a detailed analysis of a wide range of issues. Then, around the end of the year, another company approached us with a purchase offer, one we eventually voted to accept. The winter holiday was consumed by meetings,

conference calls, and additional reading as the process of due diligence went forward. Casts of hundreds were involved, from lawyers to accountants to financial analysts. Eventually, it became clear that the shareholders' interests would be best served by the sale, so the signatures were applied to the final document, and the Board I had just joined came to its necessary end. It all happened rather quickly, sooner than I had anticipated, but undoubtedly at the right time for those in whose interest we acted.

What lessons did this academic economist take from an admittedly short but intense time on a corporate Board? First, there is a tremendous amount of work involved, particularly in a merger situation. Second, it is an exhilarating experience, one rich in stories for future generations of MBA students. Third, it prompted me to study the Wall Street Journal with an entirely new urgency! Fourth, it gave me an opportunity to "market test" ideas about executive compensation, pension design, insurance regulation, and global expansion, ideas that economists too often discuss only in the classroom. Finally, it introduced me to a creative, talented, and responsible set of colleagues who had strong opinions, argued them effectively, and came to a consensus collaboratively. It was simply fascinating.

A question I am sometimes asked is "how do I join a corporate Board?" The answer is that it is essential that you be recognized as a "player" in your field, with the ability to communicate with a wide range of people in government, business, and academia. It doesn't hurt to serve with nonprofit organizations; for instance, many former CSWEP Board members sit on corporate Boards. It also helps to be knowledgeable about and interested in the core business of the firm and in learning more about how it functions. But most crucially, a Board member is selected based on her professional and public reputation for collegiality and contributions to public and private debate, as well as her ability to work well with a wide range of people.

---

Return to the [Newsletter Page](#)

A rectangular button with a dark background and light text. The text reads "CSWEP" on the top line and "Home" on the bottom line, both in a serif font.

**CSWEP  
Home**

## **Strategies for a Successful Start at a Teaching College**

### **Elizabeth Dunne Schmitt - SUNY, Oswego**

I joined the economics department of SUNY Oswego in the Fall of 1995 as an assistant professor. Having gone straight through from my undergraduate degree to the Ph.D. program, this was my first full time job. Although I received some invaluable advice from my doctoral faculty advisors, much of it was geared towards success at a Ph.D.-granting institution. After three years on the job, I now have a new perspective on how to succeed at a 4-year teaching institution, and on this basis I offer advice to others starting out in an academic career at a teaching college.

New faculty at 4-year institutions face a unique challenge in finding a mix of teaching, research, and service productivity, that will lead to tenure. Of course the optimal mix will vary not only across institutions, but also across departments within the same institution. That is why it is so important to consult with the department chair and other senior faculty to develop a set of goals and expectations about what constitutes excellence in each of the three areas. I have been fortunate in this aspect, as my department has set down very clear guidelines and I undergo a review every semester.

Despite ongoing debates about what teaching evaluations really measure, colleges increasingly rely on student evaluations to gauge teaching effectiveness. For this reason it might be tempting for new professors to inflate grades in an attempt to achieve positive evaluations. However I strongly encourage new professors to consult with senior faculty about a grading scale and aim for an average grade point in the middle of the department distribution. Economics departments concerned about academic standards frown on a grading distribution that is "too high", while departments concerned about enrollments and retention frown on a grading distribution that is "too low". As for earning solid evaluations, I find that students, regardless of the grade earned, respond well to frequent feedback, scheduled review sessions before exams, and generous office hours. Students can be aggressive about arguing for a grade they did not earn, and I perceive that this is a more pervasive problem among female faculty. But clear guidelines, given in writing at the beginning of the semester, are a powerful tool to head off such conflicts.

It is always best to start a teaching position with a completed degree; indeed many schools require it. However, that is not always practical when graduate funding is limited. I did not defend my own dissertation at the University of Iowa until two years after taking my job, a fact that significantly slowed my research productivity. Most 4-year institutions expect some research productivity as a condition for tenure, though limited travel budgets and lack of peers in one's field can make research particularly challenging at a smaller school. I have found that it is essential to schedule blocks of time that can be devoted to research; otherwise it is too easy to let teaching duties and service commitments consume all the available time. I recommend attending one or two professional conferences each year. If small children make travel difficult, try to participate in an interdisciplinary workshop series at your school- feedback from colleagues outside of your field can still be helpful.

I have found that serving on college-wide committees is an excellent way to meet faculty outside of your department, but too many service activities in the early years can cut into research time. It is a good idea to pick one or two committees, and to politely yet firmly decline other invitations. Committees also vary substantially in the time commitment required, so try to maintain a balance.

As I now move into my fourth year at SUNY Oswego, I have no regrets about choosing to work at a college where teaching effectiveness is highly valued. With some careful planning and a lot of hard work, the early years can be productive ones, laying the groundwork for a successful career in the classroom, on the campus, and in the profession.



## **The "E-Mentor": A World-Wide-Web List of Resources for the Professional Development of Academic Economists**

**Linda M. Manning (University of Missouri-Rolla) and Philip B. Thompson (University of Missouri-Rolla)**

One widely accepted way to increase the chances of success of a new faculty member is the establishment of a relationship with a mentor, usually a senior faculty member, who serves as a trusted guide through the transition from graduate student to the tenure track and beyond. New faculty members need advice and support in a number of areas, including research and teaching techniques; finding and obtaining relevant career-related resources; the norms and expectations of the professorate in general and those of their specific campus; the institution's bureaucratic and political organization; protection from grave mistakes; and defense when the protegee's performance or character is publicly questioned (adapted from Blackwell, 1989, p. 13)

Each new economics faculty member should have a mentor, but all too often one is not available. This may be especially true for new female faculty, since only 8.4% of tenured full professors and 15.4% of tenured associate professors at U.S. Ph.D.-granting economics departments are females (Bartlett, 1998), and both parties may be reluctant to enter a male mentor/female protegee relationship. In order to help fill the gap when no actual mentor is available, and to provide assistance when one is available, we have constructed an annotated list of printed and electronic resources for new faculty. These include resources about teaching, research, service, and specific skills and knowledge that transcend these three basic areas. Compiling the list is an on going project, maintained and frequently updated electronically, and can be viewed on the World-Wide-Web at the following URL:

<http://www.umar.edu/~lindam/mentoring/mentor.htm>.<sup>1</sup>

The list includes only a fraction of the resources available - those we have found most useful in our own careers as either junior faculty or mentors. Some are specific to the experiences of economics faculty, while others are more general, but all of them give valuable information and insights to new faculty members. This list is divided into sections, each of which addresses a different facet of an academic economist's career.

A very important concern for new faculty is generating original scholarly works and obtaining financial support for research, and mentoring can have a significant influence on new faculty development in this area. We provide a list of resources about improving research skills, the article writing and review process, locating research and grant opportunities, and writing successful proposals.

Teaching is also important, and the list includes a variety of teaching-related items. These resources contain very little about what should be taught, but instead concentrate on the processes of teaching and learning: teaching techniques, the use of classroom technology, and the evaluation of teaching and teachers.

Next, although research and teaching are viewed (correctly) by most faculty as their primary professional responsibilities, it is crucial to establish the appropriate balance between these activities and service responsibilities. New faculty must understand both the opportunities and risks involved in order to make the most of service commitments. Further complicating matters, these professional tradeoffs must be made against a background of the new academic's personal life. Accordingly, sections of the resource list provide valuable insights for striking the appropriate balance among these basic professional activities as well as between professional and private aspects of life as an academic.

Since a primary goal of tenure-track members is to obtain tenure, and since expectations and processes

vary greatly across institutions and economics departments, the new faculty member must identify the steps to take (and those to avoid) in order to obtain tenure. Institution-specific characteristics of the tenure process may be obtained from colleagues and written procedures, and the resources appearing in this section of the list provide more general guidance concerning the process.

Finally, we also include in the resource list sections devoted to other topics of interest to academic economists, such as networking and issues for faculty who are not in tenure-track positions. The networking section includes a list of economics associations along with electronic resources, such as web-site information for many of the economics organizations worldwide that offer new faculty members support from and connections to colleagues with similar concerns and experience at other institutions.

In conclusion, although our resource list can serve as a self-help guide for new faculty in economics, it is by no means an adequate substitute for professional and personal support within an institution. It is instead complementary to the mentor. As we continue to build this list, we are mindful that the resources would also help faculty who want to become good mentors, and therefore recommend its use by university administrators and faculty who are committed to the success of new faculty members. An important goal of ours as we continue to compile the resource list is stimulating discussions among all colleagues interested in the challenges we face as faculty members, administrators, and professionals concerned about the vitality of the economics discipline.

1 We are very interested in hearing from readers who know about resources that ought to be included. The authors can be contacted by e-mail directly through the web-site.

---

#### References

Bartlett, R. (1998). Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. *American Economic Review*, 88(2) 532-535.

Blackwell, J.E. (1989, Sept-Oct). Mentoring: An action strategy for increasing minority faculty. *Academe*, 8-14.

---

Return to the [Newsletter Page](#)



CSWEP  
Home

A rectangular button with a dark background and light text. The text "CSWEP" is on the top line and "Home" is on the bottom line, both in a serif font.

## Reflections from 1998 CCOFFE Workshop Participants

My team (Experimental Economics) was wonderful! Our facilitator Barbara was incredibly helpful. Our senior mentor, Betsy Hoffman, was everything a mentee could ask. She had tons of useful advice on how to play the academic game (and even some insight into the administrative side of the academy). Her substantive comments on our papers were extremely useful and her procedural suggestions about how to get grants, how to get papers published, etc., really helped me in planning my activities.

Many of the junior women had known each other before the experience (I knew three out of the other four members), but at this session we offered and pledged our time and energy to reading and giving feedback on each others' work, giving professional advice and help when asked, and even offering personal support. By the end of the conference I felt I had four colleagues who were "on my side," (five, counting Betsy) who I could ask to read and comment on my papers and who would give me their honest (and valued) opinions.

The group has kept in touch via monthly e-mail updates; one or two paragraph descriptions of what we've each done in the last month which are compiled and sent out to all of us. In addition, we've sent each other our papers, and I have gotten really useful feedback from them.

By far the most valuable part of the workshop for me was the ongoing academic connections I've made with my group members and mentor. Their help with my papers in progress has been invaluable.



Rachel Croson  
January 1998 Participant

CCOFFE is for Tea lovers too! This I discovered while serving the past summer in China as a Faculty Exchange Scholar for my University (the University of Illinois at Springfield). The March 1998 CCOFFE workshop was a major catalyst behind my decision to organize seminars for small groups of female undergraduate students of the Economics Institute at Heilongjiang University in Harbin, China. Though my contract called only for delivery of lectures, the CCOFFE workshop instilled in me a sense of responsibility to independently create opportunities for female students of economics. After weeks of observing only male students at the campus' computer labs which I frequented, I drew from the inspiration of the CCOFFE workshop and mobilized weekend seminars on accessing Economics information using the Internet for female students. They were so thirsty for knowledge, that once I introduced them to a few technical tools, they were forging ahead and vigorously exploring Economics sites in cyberspace on their own. The CCOFFE workshop participants, particularly Professors Allen, Ferber, Pozo and Ziegert, established a momentum that I plan to capitalize on during my service as a Fulbright Scholar at Sofia University in Bulgaria in the Spring of 1999; I hope to once again share what I learned at the CCOFFE workshop with our promising female economists abroad. Thank you.



Nancy J. Scannell  
1998 Midwest Participant

Before I went, I was a little unsure about what the CCOFFE workshop would entail and how it would affect my work as an economist. Now, I'm happy to say that both the workshop and the subsequent contact with my teammates has been extremely helpful and rewarding. I came away from the workshop with a lot of useful advice, including some from Dan Newlon about writing a grant for NSF which I was able to use soon after (and I actually got the grant!). The benefits continued and maybe even increased after the workshop ended. My fellow team members and I email each other every month (and sometimes more frequently), we've read each other's work and given comments, and we've organized a session of each other's papers at the APPAM meetings. Altogether I think we've been a very successful group:

since January we've submitted several grants (and some have been funded), made significant progress in our research, had papers accepted, received a bunch of revise-and-resubmits, and participated in various conferences. For me the benefits of this workshop have been numerous: I not only have received a great deal of very valuable advice, but I've also gained a set of incredibly supportive colleagues across the country.



Lara Shore-Sheppard

January 1998 Participant

Thank you for organizing the workshop! It has made a real difference in my research. I am one of the experimental group members. After the conference, we have been emailing each other about our work and life once a month. We sent each other papers and work in progress for comments and always got very good and detailed comments. When I got rejection from journals I also got advice from team members on the possible outlets for the next submission. It feels great to have five other bright colleagues who really understand and care about what you are doing. This is one of the most beautiful things in my professional life. I love my team!



Yan Chen

January 1998 Participant

I really value the supportive relationship that my group from the CCOFFE workshop has maintained since last January. We have all especially benefited from the supportive mentoring of our group's senior faculty member, Kala Krishna. I'm sure we are all more confident as a result of the workshop and will be more successful researchers in the future. In addition, the workshop emphasized our need to be supportive of our fellow female economists.



Leslie Marx

January 1998 Participant

The CCOFFE workshop was a tremendous help in developing networking and grant-writing skills. Kala's tips, including the one on creating a mailing list for working papers that includes the references cited in it, and her constant encouragement to our team to publish and to present in conferences have proven very valuable to me. While our team consisted of diverse areas of specializations, we still keep each other apprised of our activities on a regular basis.



Rajshree Agarwal

January 1998 Participant

Since January, I've enjoyed a regular correspondence with my Team Four team mates and leader. It's been wonderfully encouraging to hear from them every month, with news of both personal and professional goings-ons. I think we've been very successful in our group efforts - there's been a lot of commenting on each other's research papers and grant proposals, and we've even organized our own "Economic Policies Affecting Employment" session at the upcoming APPAM conference in New York.



Sewin Chan

January 1998 Participant

I was a CCOFFE participant at the annual meetings last year. The workshop and my ongoing communications with other CCOFFE participants and facilitators has been extremely helpful. Several of my recent successes that have been enhanced by my learning from the experiences of other CCOFFE

participants include: paper revisions that have lead to publications, acceptances to NBER Summer Institute and AEA session, and a job change to the University of Minnesota, Department of Applied Economics.



Pamela J. Smith

January 1998 Participant

I have really enjoyed by CCOFFE experience. The workshop itself was quite useful, but the connection with my team has been the most rewarding. At the beginning of each month we correspond and share our successes, our problems, and our goals for the months ahead. I can't help but be motivated and inspired by the great things the women on my team are doing. The team's activities extend beyond the monthly email. To name just a few, our team has put together a session at the APPAM meetings, we read drafts of papers and grant proposals for each other, and help one another make connections with others in the field.



Jeanne Ringel

January 1998 Participants

---

Return to the [Newsletter Page](#)

**CSWEP  
Home**

**CSWEP Activities at the 1999 AEA Meeting  
January 2-5, 1999 - New York, NY**

**Business Meeting and Reception**

- Date: Sunday, January 3
- Time: 4:45 PM - 5:00 PM
- Location: Hilton/Clinton Suite
- 5:00 PM - 5:45 PM - First Elaine Bennett Award Announcement and Lecture  
A reception will follow in the Madison Suite until 7:30 PM.
- 5:45 PM - 6:00 PM - Announcement of the First Carolyn Shaw Bell Award

**Hospitality Room**

- Day: Sunday, Monday and Tuesday
- Time: January 3 and January 4 from 7:30 AM until 4:00 PM January 5 from 7:30 AM until noon
- Location: Hilton/Gibson Suite  
The hospitality room will be open on Sunday, January 3, and Monday, January 4, from 7:30 AM until 4:00 PM and on Tuesday, January 5 from 7:30 AM until noon. A complimentary continental breakfast will be available from while supply lasts. Beverages will be available in the afternoon from 1:30-3:30 PM.

**Women on the Run Fun Run**

- Day: Monday, January 4
- Time: 5:00 PM
- Location: Meet in the lobby of the NY Hilton and Towers to proceed on a course in Central Park. Participants must sign a waiver form.

**CSWEP Roundtable**

**Furthering Women's Careers in Economics: It Takes a Grant**

- Date: Tuesday, January 5
- Time: 10:15 AM
- Location: Hilton/Murray Hill A
- Panel includes: Robin L. Bartlett , Chair (Denison University), Andrea Ziegert (Denison University), Beth Allen (University of Minnesota), Rebecca Blank (Council of Economic Advisors), Joyce Jacobsen (Wesleyan University), Dan Newlon (National Science Foundation), Sewin Chan (Rutgers University), Usha Nair (Georgia Institute of Technology), Anne Piehl (Harvard University), Laura Razzolini (University of Mississippi), Gretchen Kalsow (University of Virginia)

## **CSWEP Gender-Related Sessions**

**Women in Academe**

- Date: Sunday, January 3
- Time: 2:30 PM
- Location: Hilton/Rendezvous Trianon
- Chair: Robin Bartlett (Denison University)
- Papers: Donna Ginther (Washington University) and Kathy Hayes (Southern Methodist University) "Gender Differences in Career Paths in the Humanities"; John M. McDowell (Arizona State University), Larry D. Singell (University of Oregon) and James P. Ziliak (University of Oregon) "Cracks in the Glass Ceiling: Gender and Promotion in the Economics Profession"; Emily P. Hoffman (Western Michigan University) "Faculty Gender Discrimination Revisited";

Andrea L. Ziegert (Denison University), Marci McCaulay (Denison University) and Robin L. Bartlett (Denison University) "Mentoring Women in Economics: Impact on Career Development and Self Confidence in Economics".

- Discussants: Anne E. Preston (University of Stony Brook), James Monks (Mount Holyoke College), Julie L. Hotchkiss (Georgia State University), Judith M. Fields (Lehman College)

### **Gender Differences in Valuation, Time Preference, and Risk Attitudes: Experimental Evidence**

- Date: Monday, January 4
- Time: 2:30 PM
- Location: Petit Trianon
- Chair: Catherine Eckel (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University)
- Papers: Kelly Brown (Georgia State University) and Laura Osborne Taylor (Georgia State University) "To Tell the Truth: Gender Differences in Actual and Stated Contributions to Public Goods"; Melonie Williams (US Environmental Protection Agency) "Gender Specific Discount Rates: Evidence from the Experimental Laboratory"; Hans Wolfgang Brachinger (University of Fribourg), Martin Brown (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich), Matthias Gysler (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich) and Renate Schubert (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich) "Financial Decision Making: Are Women Really More Risk Averse?"; Melanie Powell (University of Leeds) and David Ansic (University of Leeds) "Gender Differences in Risk Behaviour in Financial Decision-Making: An Experimental Analysis".
- Discussants: Rebecca Lizardis (Miami University), Catherine Eckel (VPI), Tom Rietz (University of Iowa)

### **Gender and Bargaining**

- Date: Tuesday, January 5
- Time: 8:00 AM
- Location: Hilton/Sutton Parlor Center
- Chair: Robert Pollak (Washington University)
- Papers: Lisa R. Anderson (College of William and Mary), Yana van der Meulen Rodgers (College of William and Mary), and Roger R. Rodriguez (Unidad de Apoyo Tecnico) "Some Cross-Cultural Evidence from Bargaining Experiments"; Nancy Buchan (University of Wisconsin) and Rachel Croson (University of Pennsylvania) "Gender and Culture: International Experimental Evidence from Trust Games"; Susan E. Fleck (American University) "Introducing Power in Household Modeling: A Dynamic NonCooperative Bargaining Approach"; Susan K. Snyder (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University) "Legal Change, Social Norms, and the Married Women's Property Acts".
- Discussants: Lise Vesterlund (Iowa State), Sara Solnick (U. of Miami), Carol Scotese (VCU), Robert Pollak, (Washington University)

## **CSWEP Non-Gender Related Sessions**

### **Immigration, Labor Markets, and Related Issues**

- Date: Sunday, January 3
- Time: 10:15 AM
- Location: Nassau Suite A
- Chair: Henry Farber (Princeton University)
- Papers: Rachel Friedberg (Brown University) "Does University Students' Choice of Field of Study Respond to High-Skilled Immigration?"; Deborah Cobb-Clark (Australian National University) and Sherrie Kossoudji (University of Michigan) "Did Legalization Matter for Women? Amnesty

and the Wages of Formerly Unauthorized Workers"; Tanja Blackstone (Naval Personnel Research and Development Center) and Lewis Smith (University of Mississippi) "The Effects of Immigration on the Employment of White, Black and Hispanic Females"; Linda Goldberg (Federal Reserve Bank of New York), Joseph Tracy (Federal Reserve Bank of New York) and Stephanie Aaronson (Federal Reserve Bank of New York) "Exchange Rates and Worker Adjustment: Evidence from Matched CPS Data"

- Discussants: George Borjas (Harvard University), Pinelopi Goldberg (Princeton University).

### **Career Dynamics**

- Date: Monday, January 4
- Time: 8:00 am
- Location: Sutton Parlor Center
- Chair: Joyce Jacobsen (Wesleyan University)
- Papers: Anne Preston (University of Stony Brook and Russell Sage Foundation) "Sex, Kids, and Commitment to the Workplace: Employers, Employees and the Mommy Track"; Anne Winkler (University of Missouri-St. Louis) and David Rose (University of Missouri-St. Louis) "Career Hierarchy in Dual-Earner Families"; Alison Booth (University of Essex and University of Amsterdam) and Marco Francesconi (University of Essex) "Career Mobility in 1990s Britain: Does Gender Matter?"; Sewin Chan (Rutgers University) and Ann Huff Stevens (Yale University) "Employment and Retirement Following a Late Career Job Loss".
- Discussants: Kristin Butcher (Boston College), Joseph Altonji (Northwestern University)

### **Public Policy and Institutions in the Labor Market**

- Date: Monday, January 4
- Time: 10:15 AM
- Location: Hilton/Clinton Suite
- Chair: Francine Blau (Cornell University)
- Papers: Tasneem Chipty (Ohio State University), Harriet Griesinger (Wellesley College), Magaly Queralt (Florida International University) and Ann Dryden Witte (Wellesley College, Florida International University, and NBER) "What is Happening to Families Receiving Cash Assistance? A Longitudinal Study of the Early Stages of Welfare Reform"; Marianne Page (University of California, Davis) and Joanne Spetz (Public Policy Institute of California) "Does the Minimum Wage Affect AFDC Caseloads?"; John Ham (University of Pittsburgh) and Lara Shore-Sheppard (University of Pittsburgh) "The Impact of Public Health Insurance on Employment Transitions"; Michael Baker (University of Toronto) and Nicole Fortin (University of Montreal) "Women's Wages in Women's Work: A US/Canada Comparison of the Roles of Unions and 'Public Goods' Sector Jobs".
- Discussants: Anne Beeson Royalty (Stanford University), Julie Hotchkiss (Georgia State University), Anne Piehl (Harvard University and University of California, Berkeley)

---

Return to the [Newsletter Page](#)



**CSWEP  
Home**



## **CSWEP Policy Regarding Sessions at the American Economic Association and Regional Association Meetings**

Adopted September 25, 1998

CSWEP sponsors six sessions of papers at each annual meeting of the American Economic Association. Three paper sessions are usually gender-related and the other three are in a topic area that changes from year to year. Two CSWEP board members, or a CSWEP board member and an outside person, are put in charge of organizing each set of sessions. In addition, CSWEP sponsors two or more sessions at the regional meetings (Eastern, Midwestern, Southern, and Western) each year, in each case to be organized by the CSWEP regional representative (and their committee, if they have one). One of these sessions is generally gender-related and the other is in a subject area of the CSWEP regional representatives' choosing. Sessions generally have three or four papers and two to four discussants.

In each of these cases, CSWEP puts out a general call for abstracts to be submitted. The papers presented in the sessions will normally be selected from the submissions. Sometimes an organizer will solicit additional presenters to strengthen the theme of the session. At least one author must be a member of the association sponsoring the meeting, if so required.

CSWEP's major objective in organizing these sessions is to create an opportunity for junior women to present papers at economics meetings. Another of CSWEP's objectives is to give junior women an opportunity to meet and receive feedback from leading economists in their field. Towards these ends, the presenters at any CSWEP-sponsored session will typically be junior women. The term "junior woman" usually refers to a woman who is untenured, or who has received her Ph.D. less than seven years ago, but could refer to a woman who has not yet presented papers widely. Co-authors may be of either sex and may be junior or senior. Junior men may author papers in the gender-related sessions.

Discussants and chairs at the CSWEP-sponsored sessions will often be senior women or men. Discussants may also be drawn from the pool of submitters who were not chosen for paper presentation slots. The session organizers generally each chair a session. Session chairs are responsible for writing a short report on their session for publication in the CSWEP newsletter.

Two additional objectives of these sessions are to encourage quality research, particularly in the area of gender-related topics, and in general to encourage junior women to publish their research. In direct furtherance of these goals, the organizers of the AEA sessions have the responsibility of choosing a subset of the presented papers for publication in the AEA Papers and Proceedings - generally three papers from the gender-related sessions and three papers from the revolving topic area sessions. Paper presenters are notified of this possibility and must submit a paper of appropriate length by a November deadline in advance of the meetings in order for the paper to be considered.

---

Return to the [Newsletter Page](#)



**CSWEP  
Home**

## January 2000 AEA Meetings CSWEP-Sponsored Sessions

CSWEP is sponsoring six sessions at the American Economic Association meeting in Boston, January 7-9, 2000. Three sessions will be on gender-related topics; anyone doing research with gender implications is encouraged to submit an abstract. Particular topics of interest include but are not restricted to research involving gender issues in economic history or thought or women in economic history or economic thought. There will also be three sessions in the area of public economics. While all research topics in the area of public economics are welcome, we are particularly interested in abstracts on the following topics: pensions/social security reform, externalities and the environment, and health care policy.

Send abstracts by February 1, 1999 to:

Robin Bartlett  
Department of Economics  
Denison University  
Granville, OH 43023  
Phone: (740) 587-6574  
Fax: (740) 587-6348.

Abstracts should also include:

- objectives
- background
- methodology
- results/expected results

Attach a separate cover sheet listing

- name
- affiliation
- mailing address, e-mail address, phone and fax numbers
- the new JEL bibliographic code

In compliance with the AEA, one author of each paper must be an AEA member.

Abstracts in other areas, or proposals for entire sessions, are invited to send their ideas to Professor Dale W. Jorgenson, Department of Economics, Harvard University, 122 Littauer Center, Cambridge, MA 02138-3001; please mark envelope "AEA Meetings 2000." One author must be an AEA member. The Association discourages multiple proposals from the same person (under no circumstances should more than two be submitted by the same proposer).

---

Return to the [Newsletter Page](#)

**CSWEP  
Home**