

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

THE GENDER AND RACIAL DIVERSITY OF
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ECONOMISTS

Washington, D.C.
Monday, September 23, 2019

Introduction:

LOUISE SHEINER
Robert S. Kerr Senior Fellow and Policy Director,
Hutchins Center on Fiscal and Monetary Policy, The Brookings Institution

Overview:

JANET L. YELLEN
Distinguished Fellow in Residence, Hutchins Center on Fiscal and Monetary Policy
The Brookings Institution

Presentation:

DAVID WESSEL
Senior Fellow and Director, Hutchins Center on Fiscal and Monetary Policy
The Brookings Institution

Panelists:

MODERATOR: SUSAN M. COLLINS
Edward M. Gramlich Collegiate Professor of Public Policy and
Professor of Economics, University of Michigan
Nonresident Senior Fellow, Economic Studies, The Brookings Institution

AMANDA BAYER
Professor of Economics, Swarthmore College

JUDITH CHEVALIER
William S. Beinecke Professor of Finance and Economics, Yale School of Management
Nonresident Senior Fellow, Economic Studies, The Brookings Institution

KAYE HUSBANDS FEALING
Professor and Chair, School of Public Policy, Ivan Allen College of Liberal Arts
Georgia Tech

ELLEN MEADE
Senior Advisor, Federal Reserve Board

ZINA B. SUTCH
Deputy Associate Director of Outreach, Diversity, and Inclusion
Office of Personnel Management

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. SHEINER: We are going to get started. Good morning everyone.

Welcome to Brookings.

My name is Louise Sheiner. I'm the Policy Director of the Hutchins Center on Fiscal and Monetary Policy here at Brookings. And I'm really excited about today's event.

The lack of diversity in economics has gotten a lot of well-deserved attention recently, but most of the focus has been on academia. So, we thought it was important to bring economists in the policy world into the discussion, which is what we're doing today. And I'm glad you could all be here.

We're going to open today's discussion with some remarks from Janet Yellen, Former Fed Chair, and now a Scholar here at Brookings, who's got to talk about why this is such an important issue.

And then we are going to move on to a presentation that's going to summarize the findings of a report that we issued today about diversity among economists in the Federal Government. And then finally we'll have a panel discussion about ways we can make progress in ensuring that our profession offers opportunities for everyone, and reflects the very broadest set of perspectives and views.

So with that, I'm going to give you Janet Yellen. And I hope you enjoy this morning. (Applause)

MS. YELLEN: Thanks, Louise. It's a pleasure to welcome you to the Hutchins Center Conference on *Diversity Among the Federal Government's Economists*. We will discuss the progress of women and minorities in the field of economics with a particular focus on trends in the Federal Government.

Within the economics profession women and minorities are significantly underrepresented, and data compiled by the American economic associations, committees on the status of women in the economics profession, and the status of minority groups in the profession, show that there has been little or no progress in recent decades.

Women today make up only about 30 percent of PhD students, within academia their representation drops the higher up one goes in the career ladder. The share of PhDs awarded to African-Americans is low, and it has declined slightly in recent decades.

As David will shortly describe, the data collected for today's session showed that the representation of women and minorities in the Federal Government, including the Federal Reserve, is higher than in academia and has increased slightly in recent years. Encouraging findings, but there's much that can and should be done to improve the representation and success of women and minorities within the Federal Government.

Why does diversity matter? What makes it important for the economics profession to become work inclusive? The first reason is basic fairness. The American Economic Association surveyed its members last year to understand how economists view the professional climate in the field. The results were disturbing, to say the least. Only 20 percent of women, half as many as men, reported themselves satisfied with the climate in economics. Women feel less valued and less included socially.

Many feel that their talents are not fully realized, and all too many women and minorities have suffered harassment and discrimination during their careers, including both overt acts of abuse as well as more subtle forms of marginalization. To avoid harassment or disrespectful treatment, a large share of women report altering their behavior in ways that may be counterproductive for their career.

Along all dimensions of discrimination examined in the survey Asians, African-Americans, and Latinx economists report having substantially worse experiences than their White counterparts. Nearly half of African American economists report unfair discrimination based on their race, such a pattern of discrimination and mistreatment is unfair, it is unacceptable. Practices and patterns of behavior that are widespread in the profession are harming the progress of women and minorities, and they are diminishing their job satisfaction.

Beyond fairness, the lack of diversity harms the field because it wastes talent. Individuals with the aptitude and interest to contribute to the field are discouraged

from pursuing a career in economics. It also skews the field's viewpoint and diminishes its breadth.

Within the Federal Government diversity is especially important because diverse perspectives inspiring the best ideas and decisions translate into better service to the public. Moreover, diversity within the federal workforce promotes the mission that the government is supposed to serve.

Diversity is important in ensuring that the research that's done within economics appropriately reflects society's priorities. Women work in all areas of economics, but they tend to be attracted to fields that are more people oriented, like health, education, development and labor.

They gravitate somewhat less to macro-econometrics and finance. Women focus on issues of great importance that are under-studied by men. I'm particularly thinking about gender issues, such as the treatment of women who are more than half the world's population, the family, arguably humankind's most important institution, children who at some point in our lives includes everyone, and health care which also concerns all of us.

Many government and business decisions affect women and men, and people of different racial backgrounds differently. If economists are mainly of one gender or race they are likely to miss things that matter. Under-representation of women likely constrains the range of issues addressed, and limits our ability to understand familiar issues from new and innovative perspectives.

A recent paper shows concretely the importance of gender in determining patterns of research. It finds that female medical researchers produce greater medical advances for women. Patents with women inventors are significantly more likely to focus on female diseases and conditions. The findings suggest that the demography of inventors matter for what is invented.

Women and men often have significantly different approaches and views on issues that are important to public policy that makes it especially important to hear women's voices. Yet the AEA survey found that almost half of women in the profession report that

they have not asked a question or presented an idea at conferences for fear of being treated unfairly. That compares with 18 percent of men.

A recent survey found that male and female economists have significantly different opinions on questions pertaining to health insurance and the minimum wage. Relative to male economists, women are more supportive of government regulation, more concerned about inequality, and less likely to see labor market opportunities for men and women as equal.

The overwhelming preponderance of men in the economics profession, likely causes the profession's work to be biased towards results they find more appealing. The prevailing range of views among economists is likely to be biased by the relative lack of women and minority economists.

Research, including lab experiments, shows that diversity changes group dynamics and decision making, mixed gender groups display more intense mutual monitoring, and produce better outcomes in business-oriented scenarios. Diverse groups outperform in solving complex problems, and ethnic diversity appears to promote the liberation and disrupt conformity.

A study of Academic Research found that papers written by ethnically-diverse research teams receive more citations and a higher impact than papers written by authors from the same ethnic group.

My friend and former colleague, Christine Lagarde, often jokes that if Lehman Brothers had instead been Lehman Sisters there might not have been a financial crisis. (Laughter) I see much truth in this observation. Many studies find that women are more risk averse than men, and they are less likely to suffer from overconfidence.

For example, a recent paper by a group of Harvard researchers looks at gender differences in the openness of experts to the opinions of others. They find that among a group of expert faculty at seven U.S. medical schools, women updated their assessments more often than men in response to outside information, and women in male-dominated subfields were particularly likely to update.

The findings suggest that there are systematic differences in how even world-class experts self-assess their competence. These differences in self-assessment can lead to substantial gender and status disparities, and whose opinion ultimately matters in collective expert judgment.

Experimental evidence also suggests that markets with ethnic diversity are less likely to develop bubble type excesses. And an experiment in which participants traded stocks to earn money researchers randomly assigned participants either to ethnically homogeneous or ethnically diverse markets.

In the markets with ethnic diversity prices became more accurate relative to the fundamentals of the stocks as trading proceeded. But in the ethnically homogeneous markets pricing accuracy declined over the course of the simulation. Overpricing was common as traders were more likely to accept speculative prices.

Ethnically homogeneous traders were more prone to fall into group-think making big time errors and suffering larger crashes when bubbles burst, whereas, diverse groups were more likely to be skeptical and questioning of each other's views.

So, to conclude, diversity within the economics profession and in the Federal Government deserves to be top priority. And I look forward to today's discussion of what we can do to practically promote this objective. (Applause)

MR. WESSEL: Thank you. Thank you very much, Janet. Remind me not to follow Janet Yellen on the podium next time.

I'm David Wessel. I'm Director of the Hutchins Center on Fiscal and Monetary Policy. And I want to explain a little bit about what we found in our survey, and why we did it.

As has been noted, there's been quite a bit of focus recently in the economics profession about diversity or lack thereof, and lack of progress in increasing the percentage of women and minorities in the economics profession, but nearly all the focus has been on academia.

So, we decided that we could contribute to the conversation by focusing on

the public sector, particularly Federal Government agencies, and the Executive Branch, the research arms of Congress, and the Federal Reserve System.

As Janet suggested, diversity is at least as important in the public sector as in academia, if not more so. Now, the Federal Reserve and other Federal agencies do post a lot of data on the gender and racial makeup of their workforces, but they don't focus particularly on PhD economists, and that's what we wanted to do.

Now, that took some work. I want to particularly mention my colleague, Mike Ng, who was a Research Analyst here, who, with help from Jeffrey Cheng, and Haowen Chen, and Stephanie Cencula, and my colleague Louise Sheiner, managed to gather this data. One thing I've learned is that there's a reason that economists prefer to work with data that someone else has gathered for them.

We don't promise that this is complete, it's the best we could do. We used data from the Office of Personnel Management's website. We checked with a lot of the agencies, the Federal Reserve gave us their data. But we think it's pretty good. I guess you could ask why should we -- why is this important, why is it important to count?

I think it's hard to tell if you're making progress if you don't have any measures, and we've also learned that by simply asking agencies, and indeed asking ourselves at Brookings for this data, tends to provoke a conversation about diversity. Why don't we have more? Is it important? What can we do to change things? What are the successes, and what are the challenges?

My hope is that this will be one part of an ongoing effort. I think this is an important conversation and we will move slowly over time, but I think that the economics profession is past the denial phase, they recognize that there's a problem, particularly relative to STEM fields.

I want to make one observation about the pipeline which I'm sure will come up later in the panel discussion, although Kaye will tell me that she doesn't like the word "pipeline", so she can explain that herself.

It's very hard to hire women and minorities who have PhDs in economics if

the academia is not producing them. The fraction of PhDs going to women, about 32 percent has barely budged in 20 years. About 55 percent of undergrads are female but only 34 percent major -- 34 percent of econ majors are female, and that's a fraction that hasn't changed over time.

And in a statistic that I found startling, in 2017 there were 1,150 PhDs in economics granted in the United States. Of those 468 went to U.S. citizens or permanent residents, but of those 468 only 15 were Black people, only 15 PhDs in 2017 to Black people. Indeed, there were fewer PhDs given to Black people in economics in 2017 than there were in 1998, or 1999, or 2000, which is why I think it's particularly important for all of us who employ research assistants to think about the diversity of the profession as we proceed there.

So let me go over quickly what our report found. The first thing we learned is where the economists are in the Federal Government, and as you can see there, we found 2,111 economists in the Federal Government. If you weren't among them and you want us to record you on the data send me an email we'll add you to the list, 37 percent of them are at the Federal Reserve, about half of them at the Board of Governors here in Washington, and half at the Reserve Banks, the 12 Reserve banks around the country.

And as you can see the Departments of Agriculture, Treasury, Health and Human Services and Commerce, each have substantial numbers of economists with PhDs, well over 100 in each of them. So, this is, as Janet mentioned, an interesting thing. We looked at all the economists no matter who they work for in the Federal Government, and you can see that the proportion of women is 30 percent in the -- 30 percent of government economists are women, compared to 23 percent in academia.

And among minorities, which we define as Blacks, Asians, Native Americans and Hispanics, because that's the way we had to do the data, slightly more in government. In the report we break it down a little more. We sliced out the Federal Reserve in part because it's such a large factor in the labor market for economists.

The Board of Governors here in Washington has 402 PhD economists.

That's many more than even the largest academic economics department. And the issue of diversity at the Fed has been a concern of Congress, some outside organizations, although most of them have focused on the top leadership of the Fed and Fed banks.

And internally the Fed has been focused quite a bit on the diversity of the profession. So what you can see here is over time the fraction of women -- the fraction of economists who are women at the Fed, both the Board of Governors at the Reserve Banks, has been pretty stable about one in four. And the fraction of minorities has risen slightly.

In the report, which is online, and their copies out front if you want to see it, we have data on each of the Federal Reserve Banks, and it ranges quite a bit, 10 percent of the economists at the St. Louis Fed are female, versus 43 percent in Boston, at the St. Louis Fed 43 percent of the economists are minorities, versus 12 percent at the San Francisco Fed, and we have all that data and we've posted all of our data online.

As I mentioned earlier, those of us who worry about the diversity of the economic profession understand the importance of having a diverse pipeline, and of the 150 research assistants at the Federal Reserve Board last year, 39 percent were women -- I'm sorry this is 2017 data, this is the most recent we have, 39 percent were women, and 29 percent were minorities.

So then if you look at the rest of the Federal Government this is what you see. It varies quite a bit across agencies, and we have all that data in the report but for -- but here you can see the number -- the fraction of economists who are female has risen quite a bit over the last eight years, the fraction of minorities has risen as well.

It varies a lot by agencies as I said. At the Treasury for instance, which has nearly 150 PhD economists, 31 percent were women, 30 percent were minorities. At the Agriculture Department which had 184 economists when we counted, although I think moving their Economic Research Department to Kansas may mean they have fewer economists, 29 percent were women, and only 17 percent were minorities.

So, as I say, all this data is in the report. We are not trying to single people out as being good or bad, but we have learned along the way that asking an agency, "what

is the racial and gender makeup of your PhD economists?," this tends to provoke a conversation that might not have happened if somebody had not asked for the data.

And finally, once upon a time we had a fantasy that we were going to collect data on all the think tanks as well. One think tank was very cooperative, Brookings. (Laughter) Thank God. Brookings posted a lot of data about the work -- its workforce overall, but we broke out the economists.

As you can see, we're a relatively small employer. In 2018 there were 24 PhD economists in the economic studies and global development units here, of whom 29 percent were women, and 33 percent were minorities, and among the research, junior research staff, research assistants, and research analysts in economic studies, of the 28 of those you can see 43 percent were women, and 36 percent were minorities.

So, again this is our -- we think we did a pretty thorough job. We had a lot of help from a number of agencies, the Federal Reserve, and a number of other big employers, and we found the Office of Personnel Management's FedScope database to be very helpful.

But we're sure we missed some things, so we're very eager to hear from people, if there are some numbers we got wrong we want to know about it, because we think it's important to be accurate on this.

And with that, I'd like to invite Susan Collins of the University of Michigan Ford School, Former Dean, now an Economist there, and the members of her panel to come up. And Susan will introduce the panel. And we'll take questions at the end of her panel. Thank you. (Applause)

MS. COLLINS: As the panel is joining me up here on the podium, I just wanted to say we have a lot to talk about. And it's really an honor to be here to moderate this very distinguished panel.

I'm going to be very brief in introductions so that we can jump right to the discussion. And I wanted to remind you that you do have bios that are in your programs.

So, just starting right here, we have Amanda Bayer who is Professor of

Economics at Swarthmore; Judith Chevalier who is a Professor of Finance and Economics at Yale; Kaye Husbands Fealing, who is the Chair of the Department -- of School of Public Policy at Georgia Institute of Technology; Ellen Meade, who is Senior Advisor and Monetary Affairs at the Fed's Board of Governors; and last but not least Zina Sutch who is Deputy Associate Director of Outreach, Diversity and Inclusion at the Office of Personnel Management.

As our panelists talk they will give you a little bit more background about their perspectives. What I'd like to do is to begin, not with where we will spend most of our time, which is talking specifically about what kinds of interventions, what kinds of things they have experience with, and what lessons they learned.

In other words, what can we really do about this situation? But before we get there, I'd like to build on David's comments about the data, to invite our panelists who have been gathering other information that I think deepens our understanding of both the challenges and the opportunities. And I'd like to invite them to begin by sharing some of the lessons from those other data with us.

And so, Amanda, can I start with you?

MS. BAYER: Sure. So, in one of my functions, I'm a member of the AEA's Committee on the Status of Minority Groups in the economics profession. And one thing that we find consistently year in and year out is that diversity in the economics profession is more lacking than even in the STEM fields. And there has been collective attention now in the country about who is producing science and technology knowledge, and I'm very grateful for today's report and event for drawing attention to the question of who is producing economic knowledge and policy.

MS. CHEVALIER: Hi. So, I'm Judy Chevalier. I'm a Professor at Yale, as Susan said, but I'm also the Chair of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession for the American Economic Association.

As David mentioned, CSWEP has been doing a survey of the representation of women in the economics profession since 1972, so we have a long-time

series of data. And, you know, one of the reasons this work -- this joint work is important is because CSWEP's work has focused mostly on economics departments, but of course undergraduates and PhD students are the pipeline for all PhD economists.

And I think it's just important to recognize exactly what the data says, it's been alluded to here, but I just want to really emphasize it. We used to talk about the leaky pipeline as being one of the big sources of the problem that, you know, there are more women at the lower rungs of the profession than at higher rungs. And that's true, but that's really not the whole problem.

There are fewer women first-year graduate students in 2018 than there were at any time in the 21st Century. So it is this stagnation at the lower rungs of the profession and that, as David has pointed out, is true, it appears to be true for both women and for minorities. So we need to think about the role that the government can play in hiring economists, but also the role that the government can play in providing outreach to the next potential generation of economists.

MS. COLLINS: And we're going to come back and talk more about pipeline, outreach issues and specific interventions, but just to continue. If any of the other panelists would like to add more perspective from the data that they are aware of.

MS. SUTCH: Yes. I'm Zina Sutch, as I was introduced. And at OPM, one of my roles is to oversee all Federal agencies except for the Federal Reserve Board, and what we do is we definitely do ask the questions.

As David said, if you don't ask the questions you don't have agencies looking at themselves. And so just by merely asking the questions we are able to take a look at government-wide economists. One of the other things that I did, was I looked at all the economists, not just PhD, because I do believe that in the Federal Government, as was mentioned, we really want to build that cadre, and being a federal-wide government with all of the different agencies, we have different missions.

And so for us we really see a potential for movement, and for interest, and for that desire to grow into a PhD position. And if we look at all of our economist positions

and these include non-PhD, we get relatively the same data. For example, if we have approximately 35 females sitting in positions that are called economists -- which does not again -- make it all PhDs, and we have 26 to 27 percent of non-White.

So, that tells us that the numbers that David was sharing in the PhD environment are pretty similar to what we see across the board in all graduate levels.

MS. COLLINS: Great. Thank you. So, as you've already heard, there's been quite a bit of recent attention to this set of issues in academia. Our panel of course is focused on the Federal Government. And so before we start talking about specific programs, initiatives, interventions, I think it's helpful to have a sense of the ways in which the Federal Government might be different.

And so I wanted to invite our panelists, Ellen, maybe starting with you, to say a little bit about what makes this context distinct.

So, at the Fed we have, as you heard, slightly over 400 PhD in economic -- or economics or finance, mostly across four research divisions. We should also keep in mind though that we have many other employees in those divisions. So, the economists make up only about half of the total population in those divisions. So, we not only a culture that's really set by the economists in those divisions, but we also have people who are not trained economists.

Maybe they're computer scientists, or are financial analysts, or people with a library science background, and they are a more diverse pool already, both in terms of gender and minority composition. And they don't always feel included, equal as part of the population either.

So, we're dealing with an inclusion issue that goes along two lines. One is for economists being included, and the other is for the rest of the population in those divisions.

If I could go to turn now to some of the things that we've been doing, you know, the Dodd-Frank Act which establishes our Office of Minority and Women Inclusion, and Sheila Clark is here today from that office, and makes an annual report to Congress on

our efforts.

The research divisions have done a lot of work in recent years on outreach to local colleges, and universities, and high schools in this area, to promote financial literacy which is something that's required, or indicated by the Dodd-Frank Section 342. And we have been reaching out in order to make economics better known. You know, in high schools, bring students to be more aware of what the Federal Reserve is, and what it does, and what does it mean to be financially literate, and I can talk a little bit more about that in our later questions.

MS. COLLINS: Any other comments, Kaye, about what makes this context unique and special?

MS. HUSBANDS-FEALING: Well, I wanted to bring up a study that I've been doing with a colleague, Laurel Smith-Doerr, who is a Sociologists actually at UMass Amherst. And so we were looking at this project and using OPM data on pay, on how much -- on earnings. And what was really intriguing about how to use a data, and I think we can talk about all of these different data sets in these contexts, not only to look at the actual salaries and wages, but also to break that down by the types of organizations that exist within this framework, within the federal context, and also to look at the occupations within.

So, if we're going to design effective policies, effective incentives, and effective interventions, then we really have to get there specific to the types of organizations that we're looking at. What are the shares of women or the shares of minorities within those organizations, are there tipping points where practices are more inclusive, or appear to be less so, but then also thinking about the occupation so, for example, economics. So teasing out the data, not just looking at everything in the very aggregate format was really important to our study.

MS. COLLINS: So, when don't we move to some of the very specific kinds of interventions and the experiences that our panelists have had with them. There is actually a long list of things that members of our panel will talk about, and so what we've decided to do is to begin by talking about two broad areas.

The first one relates to the climate and the extent of inclusion. And I'll invite our panelists, as they talk about that, to be very explicit about what they mean. And then later we want to come back and talk more about this pipeline issue.

So, first starting with the climate and inclusion, who would like to -- who would like to jump in? Amanda?

MS. BAYER: I'll give some baseline information. So from the same American Economic Association Survey that Janet Yellen described to you earlier, we can look at the responses of the 480 U.S. Government employees, which represents about 8 percent of all employed, currently employed responders. And we see the same sorts of disparities by race and gender that we see in the overall survey, but overall U.S. Government employees report a fair and more inclusive workplace.

So that is good news, and as an example, 73 percent of White women report feeling valued at their place of employment if they are employed with the U.S. Government, as contrasting with 59 percent of all other White women employed economists who tend to be in academia. So, I can say more later. But let me pass the mic.

MS. COLLINS: Judith?

MS. CHEVALIER: I'll just mention one aspect of this same Climate Survey, because I think it points out one of the reasons why it's important for organizations to do climate, surveys and, you know, I think various governmental organizations could be looking to do climate surveys.

One of the things I think the climate survey helps accomplish is kind of creates common knowledge in the field. I think many people, before the climate survey, and maybe in this room before the climate survey might have thought, oh, I kind of know what it's going to say. But apparently not everybody would know what it's going to say.

So, one of the things in the climate survey, there are some questions about: do you think members of this group are respected and well treated by the profession? And, you know, men think women are well treated, White people think minorities are well treated, people with no disabilities think people with disabilities are well treated, people who are not

LGBT think that people who are LGBT are well treated, and not surprisingly members of those minority groups, you know, all report differently.

So, I think an important goal of the climate survey, is for people to see -- to establish common knowledge for people to see -- to establish common knowledge, for people to see, yes, there really is something, to get, as David said, beyond the point of deniability. And I think it's important for any organization that's of enough size, that they can manage such a thing anonymously to think about doing their own climate survey.

MS. COLLINS: So, the idea of data being informative but also a point of conversation, I think is one of the themes that comes up in many different contexts. Kaye?

MS. HUSBANDS FEALING: So, I like to add to this from my perspective as a Professor and someone who leads a school, and leads hiring many times throughout, you know, a given year. And so when we're talking about climate, often we're thinking in terms of: what share of women we have in a particular organization? Or what share of African-American? Or what share on Latinx, et cetera.

And we're thinking about thresholds. And we're thinking about, well, are we at 5 percent? Are we're at 20 percent? Or are we over 50 percent? And we're just looking at those shares to try to get a sense of, well, we think it's fair or not fair. That's what you have in your mind. Climate goes well beyond that concept of shares, and so first of all even if you're looking at shares you really need to look at representation ratios to be more accurate, in terms of what these thresholds are, and so even changing the way that the metrics are used important.

Beyond that, it is important for us when we're even in the hiring practices, right, because that's what leads to the data that we're looking at. It's important that we understand the types of research that various individuals will be undertaking. Dr. Yellen said so specifically in her opening remarks that we really do need to consider, well, what are the types of research that could be done in a given area.

So a project that I worked on, for example, the premise behind it was, well, if we're looking at funding of research, say, at the National Institutes of Health, or the National

Science Foundation, does it matter who makes the leadership decisions on what the budget should be going to in those particular areas, and therefore the types of research that's done, and therefore the outcomes that we're looking at.

So, I just want to go beyond just the numbers to really thinking in terms of what are the -- what is the essence, that's a fuzzy word, and I'm an economist, so I'm sorry, but well what is the essence of the work that's being done? Which populations get to make the decisions on what research is being done? That begins to produce a more inclusive climate.

MS. COLLINS: Thanks. So, other specific examples of some of the kinds of things that have made a difference, just to follow up.

MS. MEADE: Okay. So, at the Board we also have done climate surveys over the last four or five years, and taken away a lot of information from that, and as a result here are some of the initiatives that we're doing. We have people working on how to make meetings more inclusive so that everyone in a meeting gets a chance to speak.

If for instance a woman makes a suggestion in a meeting and it's not acknowledged, how we can make it so that everyone is heard. We've done a variety of training initiatives, DNI training, introductory DNI training, and more recently bystander training. We've had some work on how are assignments distributed. You know, we have assignments that are very, very interesting and high profile, and then we have other assignments that are very necessary for the work we do, but bring less attention to the individual doing them.

We have concerted efforts now to keep track of who is assigned certain tasks and how often so that we can make sure those are assigned fairly. We also have undertaken initiatives in the last recruiting year to make sure that the behavior in seminars gives the seminar speaker a chance to -- a chance to speak before being attacked maybe by aggressive questioning. So, we are trying to take into account these sorts of things.

And in addition, finally, we have introduced appropriate workplace behavior panels for our new employees, and this is for all new employees at the start of each

employment season, which is generally the fall. Just to make sure that people understand the nature of these issues, and the culture that they're entering, and what we're discussing today.

MS. COLLINS: Yes.

MS. SUTCH: And just to add. Across Federal Government, one of the things that we started to do is work directly with senior leadership at all of the different agencies, requiring them to go through awareness training about bias. And I think that that's something that sometimes people don't want to talk about that I actually walk around with a bias.

And then how that bias impacts your day-to-day decision making? And it sort of leads to what you're talking about, which is: how do I interact with others in a meeting? What are the micro messages that I might be sending? What are the subtle decisions that I make that are very subjective, and I'm not even putting in any kind of steps to make it more objective?

So we're asking all of our senior leaderships, so it goes right down to the supervisors, managers, the level of folks that are making decisions to ask themselves: what am I doing people-wise to increase my awareness of any biases that I might have? What am I doing process-wise to look at the systems that we have in place, the decision-making systems? How do we make them more objective?

And then what are the things that I'm doing to measure because we talk about data. Are we putting things in performance plans? Are we making sure that we don't just lean on the once-a-year Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey? But what are we doing on a quarterly basis within our teams at the micro level. And I hate to use that word "micro" because it means something different economists. But I'm not an economist.

So I'm sure it's like sending certain vibes out there. But anyway we're really trying to, and in the Federal Government when we go out to these agencies from OPM, we're telling them to step back and take a look, not just at the big decisions that are being made, but really come down to that people, personal level.

And the other area that we are really making a lot of headway with is employee resource, groups which I think bring a sense of community to folks, whether the employee resource group is based on an ethnic position, or how you see yourself, how you identify, or whether -- we are all leadership, so we're getting together as employees, and we're going to create this camaraderie, so that we can help the agency address some of the issues we see on a day-to-day basis.

And we are, right now we're actually initiating STEM employee resource groups, which no agency has yet. And I think that that will be able to bring people off all ethnic, and gender, and all sorts of disability status, even veteran, non-veteran, we look at that as well. Bringing them together at a non-leadership, non-employee, but just we're all here as STEM employees.

What are we seeing? What can we do differently? What can we advise our agency leadership to do in order to make things feel a little more equitable?

MS. BAYER: So, I'll just add to the couple of themes that have been identified already, the importance of counting, and the importance of awareness and common knowledge to, say, tying together some of these observations.

That diversity and inclusion we found is not a separable entity. It can't be packaged off into a department that does it, we all are responsible for increasing diversity and inclusion. It has to be integrated through every function and corner of a workplace. And another theme that we've found, and I've been working with the Federal Reserve Board, is the importance of a common vocabulary. A freeness to talk about these issues because we have been educating ourselves on what the issues are, and the disparities that are often caused, not intentionally, but through cognitive or procedural habits.

And so I've been just very grateful for the attention that many individuals and groups at the Federal Reserve have been paying towards these issues.

MS. COLLINS: Great. Kaye?

MS. HUSBANDS FEALING: I just wanted to underscore something that Zina said as well. I was on a National Academies Panel on looking at undergraduate

performance in STEM fields, and especially in the first two years and again we were about counting, we were about metrics.

One of the things we did in that study was to ensure that the aspect related to diversity, equity, and inclusion was not just in the last chapter before the conclusion. It was put into all the different chapters to ensure that the performance measures included aspects of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

So, I really liked what you said, that it is not just that we, you know, look at outputs, and the things that we typically want to measure as, you know, our productivity but we also include in that conceptualization of performance, equity, inclusion and diversity.

MS. COLLINS: Go ahead.

MS. BAYER: And I'll say that in an industry such as ours, you know, PhD economists are responsible for developing economic knowledge and defining what economics is. But that's why we need to make space, not only for new people, but for new ideas. We're not going to reap the benefits of diverse workforces if we think it's only about wearing skirts. You know, it's bringing new experiences, and new methods, and new ideas, and new questions to our workplaces.

MS. COLLINS: So, I mean filtering in many of the really compelling points that Janet Yellen made at the outset of this session, I think is also a theme here, that these - the whys are as important as the whats. And so while we can come back to talking about the issues related to climate and inclusion, I'd like to move on, to talk more about what can be done to increase the numbers of people.

It is, from an economist's perspective, there's both a demand side and a supply side, and so there are dimensions from what happens in a variety of different contexts, and that is something to keep in mind. And it's often said that the issue is that there's a pipeline that leaks, and so people leave at various stages.

And that's only one way to think about that. And so maybe I would call on Kaye first to give a broader perspective on how to think about increasing the numbers of women, and underrepresented minority groups, African-Americans Latinx, Native

Americans, and others. And then broaden out to talk about other specific initiatives that people have tried and the lessons they've drawn from them.

MS. HUSBANDS FEALING: Sure. So, conceptually we often do think in terms of a pipeline and, you know, it's a metaphor. It isn't an actual pipeline, but we think in terms of a pipeline, so we think of interventions in a really -- you know, in a linear fashion.

What can we do with the frontend to make sure we get something at the backend? How can we tap something in the middle? And it's very linear, it's very, you know -- oh, and you've seen that the diagrams of it, right. To say, well, here is the leak in the pipeline so we need to fix it here.

I've been working with Sam Meyers who's a Professor at the University of Minnesota's Humphrey School, and this is something that he has written about before we've written about together, pathways, not just pipelines, because the metaphor really does lead us to put the interventions along a really fixed path, one path. It doesn't really encourage us to get people into this pipeline, or sets of pathways, later on in life, in terms of training, or if you were a student who had a break within high school, or even before that, and didn't get the certain type of knowledge that was necessary to enter into this profession or others.

What are the pathways into this area of economics? And we've done it also for medicine, and in other areas as well. So, we so we just wanted to put that other concept on the table, of not just thinking about this metaphor of a pipeline, and therefore if we don't get you in high school you'll never be in here.

We have to really think about a variety of ways in which we can capture a variety of populations into this area. And you hear a lot about this with the future of work, you hear a lot about this when we were talking about veterans, so it's really important, I think, conceptually to get away from this concept of just the pipeline, and think about pathways.

The only other thing I'll add at this moment, and we'll probably come back in a minute, Susan said demand and supply side. And the supply side is usually, again, put into this metaphor of a pipeline and, you know, we're encouraging the different ways and

pathways into the profession, that's important on the supply side.

But what we were talking about just few minutes ago in terms of climate, that's on the demand side. When you end up in those positions, what do you encounter? How inclusive is it? How does it feel? How productive do you feel your work is to the entire organization? So, the demand side, elements also matter.

MS. COLLINS: Okay. Thank you. I think each of our panelists has thoughts, comments to contribute in this space. And so we wanted to leave a goodly amount of time to do that. Who else would like to jump in? Ellen, and then Zina?

MS. MEADE: So I already mentioned the program we call FedEd which is the Financial Literacy Program in local high schools, that program is led by our research assistants, who have gotten an ever-increasing number of schools that ask them to come every year and make presentations. It's been a terrifically successful program.

We also offer a statistical programming class at Howard University that's open to area colleges and universities. Our research assistants are also very important in this program as well as our financial analysts, we have a mentoring program for local colleges and universities, our RAs have, a couple years ago, began -- or approached the D.C. public school system to see whether they could teach AP macroeconomics in some public schools, and for the last two years have offered AP macro, or facilitated, or helped out with a class that was already being offered.

And in fact, in the last year when the teacher went on maternity leave in January our RAs took the class of 20 students through to the AP and 19 of them scored a 3 or better on the AP Macro Exam.

We've revised our recruiting practices for economists and RAs to make the interview questions more standardized, and to make more of a systematic approach to how we deal with those interviews and panels. And some of the students who've been part of the statistical programming class have come onto the Board as interns, or as RAs, and we have revised our internship programs, so that if we have a highly qualified intern, we're able to make them an offer to come back as a research assistant.

So these are all ways that we feel, and it's been quite active and there are a lot of people who are very interested in participating in these programs, and do, and that I think is a very successful piece for us.

MS. COLLINS: Zina?

MS. SUTCH: And interestingly enough, the Federal Government, government-wide, we have the Pathways Program, so good use of that word, and that allows for students who are still going to college can come in the summer and do a job for the summer, and add up hours, and after a certain number of hours they are then eligible for conversion into career positions.

And what's interesting is when we say the word pathways it truly is pathways because the student who is coming in will get a chance to sit in different jobs. They don't sit in one job and that's it, they don't have to make a decision when they walk in the door that this is going to be my career path. They are going to explore the different pathways, and I think what that does, is first of all it excites them about being public servants, because they can see the energy and the passion of the people around them.

But it also gives them a chance to know what it's like to work for Department of Agriculture, or know what it feels like to work for commerce, and if you're an Econ Major you get exposure to both, both of those areas, and I think that that really does create that cadre of people that feel like coming into the Federal Government is important work.

The other things that we do is one of the things that we've just recently done, under this administration, is we authorized a new direct hiring authority for various scientific positions across Federal Government, which means that agencies can go out and directly hire without going through the standard competitive process that we have in place.

And what that will allow us to do is never mind getting the people that we want, but we're getting it quickly. We don't have to go through the entire process the way it used to be for these specific science positions, and economists are one of those positions that they've identified.

The other thing that we're looking at is proposing a regulation on a special

occupational pay system, and that will differ from the general schedule system which has a lot of limit, and we will become more competitive for those positions. And I hate to say that word because I know everyone thinks that we're all competing for the same talent, but I believe there's enough talent to go around.

MS. COLLINS: Did you want to jump in again?

MS. CHEVALIER: Oh, yeah. Maybe mention two things. First, actually a number of people have asked me about, oh, I'm thinking of starting something for high school students, how should I go about and do that? And I say emulate FedEd to the extent that you can. So we know that there's research Claudia Goldin has led some research showing that having a woman professor for intro economics makes women more likely to pursue the major.

And we can kind of imagine that that's probably true for a variety of things. If you're a first-gen student having a teacher who, you know, expresses that or, you know, any way in which a teacher, you know, reflects something about a student's diversity is probably helpful for them in continuing in the field.

And of course not every economics class can achieve that. One thing Amanda Bayer and David Wessel has helped with, that we've been working on, and I think government economists will eventually play a big role in this, is we are creating a video series where we're curating videos from other places. And there of diverse economists talking about their research and we've tagged them to parts of the intro curriculum.

So the idea is if I'm talking about human capital, maybe I would like to show my students -- or assign to my students, De Norske talking about college education, and so I think, you know, government economists kind of disproportionately have cool jobs that do cool things. So it would be great to think about ways in which the government can, and government economists can participate in not just things where they go to schools, because as we know that's hard to scale, but ways in which their messages can be out there in a way that's scalable and friendly.

And then, sorry, I'm just going to mention one other quick thing. At CSWEP

one thing that we've been very involved with for a number of years, thanks to the support of the National Science Foundation early on, is mentoring programs. And we have a number of mentoring programs. We have one which is a very intensive two-day workshop. We have a version for economists in research-oriented positions, and economists in positions with dual responsibilities of research and teaching.

And we have government economists who participate in those programs, it would be great to get more government economists participating in those programs and, you know, to the extent that people are interested in replicating these programs for different groups. We actually have a meeting at the AEA, a joint panel of CSWEP and STEM Gap of mentorship entrepreneurs who are going to be talking about programs they've started, how they've started programs. And we're trying to welcome people who are interested in starting something up for, you know, groups of economists to come and have dialogue with us.

MS. COLLINS: Would you like to weigh in as well?

MS. BAYER: Yes, sure. So information is not spread evenly, not across high school students about what the various majors are, and might involve once they get to college, and not across job seekers as they try to discern what places to submit applications.

So a couple colleagues and I ran an experiment recently, Syon Bhanot, and Fernando Lozano and I reached out to nine different colleges and universities in the country, and got in 3,000 incoming college students, and sent them a bit of information about economics. And we focused on women and racial and ethnic minority students, and we saw an amazing response, that once they had a bit more information, a bit more accurate information about what economists do, they were much more likely to take and complete courses in economics.

And so that shows that if we think explicitly about addressing information gaps we can draw in a more diverse group of students. The Federal Reserve has an Outreach Specialist who goes out to colleges and universities across the country to help more advanced students, say college seniors, know about job opportunities in the Federal Reserve System, but also to help newer college students decide what courses they might

want to take, what math classes they might want to enroll in, to prepare for the jobs as research assistants, or ultimately economists.

And I think this also, besides the information point, make a more general point that it's really important to question your own assumptions and habits, because economics professors aren't in the habit of telling incoming students about their work. We're in the habit of letting people find us if they want to find us.

MS. SUTCH: If I could also just add one more thing. I love what you just said because it made me think about the fact that we and -- when we think about underrepresented groups often we find those students that are generally underrepresented are first-generation college students, and navigating that is very difficult.

So that information, and that awareness we really need to work a little bit harder at connecting and creating mentoring programs for first-generation college students, and not to overlook community colleges, and some of the guidance that we're giving our federal agencies, because we've got agencies all across the nation, is to connect at that community college level as well, become mentors there, create that that information kind of highway to these places.

One of the things that OPM is doing is we are reaching out and working with career counselors at community colleges to make them aware of what the different types of fields are, and especially in STEM and economics, to create that information highway for them as well. So I just wanted -- I didn't want to overlook the fact that those are two areas where we can increase the representation of underrepresented groups, and maybe do a little bit more with our outreach.

MS. COLLINS: So, just to pull some of the many thoughts together. They've both been some examples of outreach -- of interventions that are scalable, and that might not be particularly expensive, but would be available to a wide range of people. There are also -- and the information ones are, you know, kind of squarely in that group.

there also are some kinds of interventions that are much more one-on-one, and much more individualistic, and it's really a combination of those things that our experts

are talking about that they have seen be helpful and valuable in this space.

And so for increasing the numbers we've talked about outreach types of initiatives, we've talked about hiring procedures, we've talked about mentoring, and I wonder if our panelists have any other things they wanted to add, either in one of those or in another type of intervention in that space, before we open up for questions from the audience.

Anything else? Kaye?

MS. HUSBANDS FEALING: I will add something that's very different, and that is to make sure that we train leaders to be able to carry these interventions out. A lot of the work that you see, and I guess I'm talking more top-level about a combination of the research, and the practices. And we see that it takes somebody in that place to make the decision that this is something that's going to happen, and put practices in place into -- you know, incentives in place, mentors in place, other people in place, to ensure that that you actually do get the increase in terms of participation of women, minorities, persons with disabilities, and so on.

And so I just didn't want to miss that part about what everybody is saying that there is a leader in place. There is somebody in place it actually wants to see that, and we need to grow more of those leaders so that it becomes something that is done throughout the different organizations that we're describing.

MS. MEADE: I like to pick up on that point. I think that's absolutely right. We have a tremendous amount of energy now at the Fed around a lot of our initiatives, and involving a broad range of staff, but it wouldn't be there without leadership that helped to put the climate, in the right place.

And in that case, I'd like to acknowledge Janet Yellen's role in -- there was a National Summit on diversity in the economics profession that was held at the Fed in 2014. And then our 2016 to 2019 Strategic Plan included a workforce pillar that talked about inclusion and collaboration and hiring diverse talent.

I think without that kind of language, and without the support from the very top, and that also included David Wilcox, who was a Head of the Research and Statistics

Division, who initially maybe shepherded a group of interested staff. And that interested staff group is very large today. But without those sort of leadership efforts I think it's very hard to make the kind of progress that we've talked about.

MS. COLLINS: Just one other point from my 10 years as Dean of the Ford School, one of the things that I noticed which is very much in line with the comments that were just made, is that very often what becomes public is a problem, something that happened that perhaps wasn't handled the way that it might have been handled.

And what often does not become public, and it's not talked about is things that are going really well, and so the power of finding examples of things that then encourage other people to say I could do that, I could be involved in that, to develop momentum as opposed to focusing so much of the conversation around these really important issues, around something that perhaps didn't go the way that it might have gone. And so that balance in thinking might be helpful as well.

Any final comments, or shall we just open up to our audience? Wonderful. So, there are microphones, and what I'd like to do is to collect a couple of questions or comments to the panel before turning back to them. I'll ask anybody who would like to ask a question or make a brief comment if they would first introduce themselves. That would be great.

So, maybe if we have some microphones up here? We have a lot of -- we'll take a group right in here, and then we'll move further back. So, we'll start with these three right here. Please introduce yourselves, and then I'll move further back, and then over to that side.

MR. KNUTSON: Hi. Good morning. This is Ted Knutson. I'm a contributing writer for Forbes. A question for the panel: what difference would it make if there was more diversity with Fed economists? How were the numbers sort of crunched be crunched differently? And, you know, a lot of what is presented to the public is on the basic, you know, the economy is good, the economy is bad. How would the Fed probably present, you know, that would kind of be different to the public if there was more diversity? And as

Janet Yellen said, you know, the lack of diversity can skew perspectives.

MS. COLLINS: Hand the microphone that way. Yeah. Thank you.

MS. SAHM: Hi. Claudia Sahm, with the Board of Governors. I mean I could answer that question, but I'll let you all do that. (Laughter) And so I wanted to ask my question about how we should think about dealing with backlash to diversity and inclusion, and I'll give two specific examples. I know of several job market candidates and underrepresented groups that have been told, you are so lucky to be on the market this year, everybody wants to hire from these groups.

And I also have a colleague who in recent years, on the day of her promotion had someone come in her office and say, you're so lucky the Board wanted to promote women this year. So, what do you say? Like what should they be saying back, and how do we support -- how do we broadly support groups that hear stuff like that?

MS. COLLINS: Right behind you.

MS. MARCUS: Thank you. Rosemary Marcus. I'm here for the National Association for Business Economists. And we have a new diversity and inclusion initiative, started for the same motivations as yours. And we focus on and have memberships that are newly to the field of economics, and throughout their whole career, but we focus on new people, economics and business, finance, economic-ish applications.

So, we have exactly the same kind of concerns you do. And part of what we see and what we wonder about is, where do the people go when they look at the dreary PhD pipeline? Do they come to finance? Are they some people who -- a lot of people work in business, however, we have reason to believe that it's not a bed of roses, we think that our membership also faces these kinds of constraints.

So we will begin by counting, and we will do a report, and we would be privileged to have what we can tell you about women and minorities in the economic profession, especially new people in the finance profession, and how they fare. So, we will look to everything you're doing, and thank you for what you've done so far.

MS. COLLINS: Thanks. Anyone want to respond to any of those questions

or comments?

MS. MEADE: So, as to question of what different economic analysis, I don't think we've done a gender study of which forecasts are more accurate. You know, women forecasters about some men forecasters. (Laughter) I think in an issue where we have employees already at the Board, I think there is a serious issue about how are assignments allocated, and I spoke of that earlier.

I think to the question of an interesting, more diverse participation in the field itself, we could only know the effects of that once the field is more diverse, and we see what topics that maybe we're ignoring now or giving insufficient attention to, come up.

MS. HUSBANDS FEALING: I'd like to hit that a little bit and then the next one. I think one of the things that you may not be able to ascertain initially are the ultimate outcomes, but the way decisions get made within organizations can change, so it matters on what you're looking at and what you're trying to measure. I've been working on a study, the one that accompanies the Pay Gap Study. Also we did interviews of very high-level women scientists that lead agencies.

Trying to understand: are you just really going after something different in terms of your goals? And we didn't actually find that as much as we found that the way the organization of work is done is a bit different than if a man were in the leadership of that particular organization. So it's something that's to be determined, right.

But you're not just looking for the output you're also looking about how work is organized, which could also lead down the road to more efficiency. I think that the backlash question is an interesting one. It's something that we were asked when I was working on another study about under-representation. And the question was, well, if you fix the under-representation, so get it from, you know, decimals to closer to one. That means someone is actually going from three, to two, to one.

So what does that mean for those individuals? And the answer is, if we could actually grow the organization, grow the outputs, now I will talk about outputs, those are shares of something larger and more productive, so people will benefit from that.

The other thing I tell individuals that have come, say to the Academy, and they wonder, you know: why am I here? How did I get here? And they're told something like, well, you are a diversity hire, or something like that. My answer is, look your talent that we needed to have here, and also you belong here.

And so it isn't about how one got there or anything like that, it isn't that the standards are any different. It is that you brought into network of looking for really talented individuals. And then when you're there, when you're actually in the organization, just know that you belong. And that is what I say to individuals who come to me that feel marginalized, once they've gotten into the organization. And wonder well, you know, this is what I hear buzzing, this is what I hear being said. And my response is: you belong here.

MS. SUTCH: Yes. If I could add, I don't know whose question I'm answering, but um I think it's important whatever I'm going to say. The Census Bureau I believe issued some kind of statement that by 2043 we're going to be a minority-majority. And what that means is that we are going to have a -- we're going to look different as a country, which means all of our organizations will have to look different in order to meet the needs of our citizens.

And from the Federal Government perspective, we have to pay attention to the fact that that balance that Kaye is talking about it will work itself out. The other output, or the organizational performance, there's a lot of research out there right now that shows when you have, when you're in like the top quarter of ethnic diversity in your management and leadership teams, you outperform others in your industry.

So I think that that is out there and available, that data. It may not necessarily be here, or just in the economic area, or in the Federal Reserve, but there is evidence out there. One of the things when we think about diversity is that everyone is -- makes up a diverse population, and we need representation from all segments of society.

And so the backlash, the way that -- you know, the way that we approach it is more of, let's focus on what it is that you really want to accomplish, and do you have the right people in the right positions to be able to maximize your organization's performance.

And the only way to do that is by having the diversity of perspectives and thoughts, and then also having that inclusive environment to be able to outperform or over-perform.

MS. COLLINS: So, two quick points to build on what was already said. There's lots of data out there, and who is part of the team that is figuring out which things to highlight matters, and so there I think are different emphases in terms of labor market statistics, and what things to discuss and to highlight that are likely influenced by who is deciding on what to say.

On that other comment, I just have to jump in, you know, with someone with more gray hairs. I don't think that those comments are necessarily any more common now than they always have been, but perhaps they're more discussed.

And so from a personal perspective, I think that what is often most helpful is not necessarily what you say in that moment, but taking the time when someone who might be concerned about how well-respected they are among their colleagues, when they do a really good job make a point of calling that to public attention, and supporting them.

And so I think it's more about the ongoing relationship that creates the climate in which people feel like they're valued, and they are respected, and they belong. Than necessarily in, you know, a quick moment knowing exactly the right thing to say, right. I think that's not so much the focus, it's the ongoing relationship.

There were a number of comments kind of in the back, in the in the middle, right in there. So, maybe we take three or four of those, and then do another round.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Bill Cunningham, Creative Investment Research. When I went to Howard Undergraduate Econ in the '80s, there was this program that the Ford Foundation had for bringing Black people into the economics field. I don't know if they still do that, just curious about that. That was early 1980s, basically the field has failed Black people so I'm curious as to -- if there any efforts that specifically focus on Black people, number one.

Let me respond to that comment over there because --so when I was at Chicago some guy in the middle of the class said that, you know, you're only here because

you're Black. Gary Becker stopped the class and said, this guy is here because he's better than you are, you know, with respect to economics. I never had another issue with him, never had another issue.

MS. COLLINS: And there are a lot of comments -- or people who would like to comment, and I'll invite you to be brief. Thank you.

MR. BODDUPALLI: Hi. Aravind Boddupalli, Tax Policy Center. I had two questions. I'll make them short. One, what is the sort of internal organizational resistance that you faced when designing awareness trainings, bias trainings, or diversity inequity interventions? And two, I think a conversation on racial diversity would be incomplete without talking about immigrants. Now by design the Federal Government, I think, has fewer immigrants or non-citizens than academia or think tanks. Your thoughts on that.

MS. COLLINS: Thank you. And just right across the aisle from you.

MR. HENRY: No, I'll wait for his answer first.

MS. COLLINS: Well, we're going to collect a few so that many people get in.

MR. HENRY: Okay. My name is Dr. LaVaughn Henry, and I've had a career in and out of government in Federal Reserve, FDIC and Congress. And you said something I felt really attuned to that being mentoring and outreach, and wanting to know how to get involved in that initiative.

MS. COLLINS: So back to the audience, and I'll invite everyone to be succinct. Yes?

MS. BAYER: So, I want to draw your attention to a couple of AEA initiatives, so there is again this American Economic Association Committee on the status of minority groups in the economics profession, and please visit their website. There are a number of programs that you all can get involved with in mentoring young economists, or students, and you can also reach out with new ideas as well, so that's a good nexus.

In addition, the American Economic Association will soon be releasing a set of best practices to create some common knowledge about what professional conduct

should be in the profession, and there will be ample opportunity for all of us to contribute through those suggestions.

MS. COLLINS: Can I just jump in quickly, the AEA does still have a summer program, summer pipeline program -- I shouldn't perhaps call it that -- it has been in existence since the mid-1970s and they have offered it every year, it's currently at Michigan State University, and I believe the next site is (crosstalk).

SPEAKER: Is right there, Lisa is the -- (crosstalk) Right there.

MS. COLLINS: Oh, right here, wonderful. And so if you'd like more information, Lisa Cook, who is the Director, is with us. Great to see you.

MS. HUSBANDS FEALING: So, I wanted to just say, my father was actually in the first year of that program 1973, Marcus Alexis lead at Berkeley. I was in 1979 at Northwestern when Marcus Alexis led it there. I was in it in '78 and my cousin was a TA in it. In 1981 I was at Yale, and my daughter was just in it at Michigan State.

So that is a great program, and I'm being taped probably, but I will say it is wonderful pipeline program, indeed, despite the fact that I definitely like to promote pathways, but it is something where that program is not just training, but it is mentorship as well.

It does have long-term effects. When I was applying to graduate school Marcus Alexis was able to write a really terrific recommendation the year after I was in the program in '79, in 1980 I got my summer employment because of the folks that came to the program as well. So, these types of programs that have some longevity supported by the National Science Foundation, as well as the Fed, I think, maybe also supports that program.

MS. CHEVALIER: They have a (crosstalk) relationship.

MS. HUSBANDS FEALING: Yeah. And so there are these existing programs that really have proven to be very productive for the students that come through them but then we have to do our jobs when we are in our own institutions to make sure we reach out to these very individuals and interview them and hire them, and continue to mentor them along the way.

MS. COLLINS: Ellen, quickly. And then we'll go back to the audience.

MS. MEADE: On the question of training and how do you make sure everybody takes it. You know, it is really important if you're doing this training to make sure everyone does participate, because it does help to develop this common language that Amanda was talking about earlier. And I think it also then generates, as a by-product, conversations across staff to talk about, you know, after the training is over, to talk about what you heard, and its importance.

So, the way we do it, is we make it mandatory, and that has to be supported from the leadership who says, you must attend this training.

MS. SUTCH: And if I could just answer the gentleman with the first question, because I think he was kind of looking at me I'm thinking, right. I was going to go like, who's behind me. I know we are running out of time. I did not -- so far from OPM when we go out and work with agencies we have not really experienced any resistance. One of the reasons I think that is the case is because just a couple years ago, we changed the way we approached diversity and inclusion across Federal Government.

We decided we were no longer going to go to agencies and work directly with just their DNI, or diversity and inclusion practitioners. We said, from now on if you want us to come and support you, and help you, and provide you with guidance we need your senior, top senior leadership in the room, and they need to be given that initial training about what it means and why it's important.

And we start with the question of: why? And we present them with all the research on why inclusive cultures with diverse perspectives and, you know, reflecting the nation that we serve is going to resolve, or give them the results that they're looking for within their organization. And once we bring that awareness to the top senior leadership, and we talk about holding people accountable in their performance plans, and we start making this a topic that's discussed across the entire strategic plans that you're looking at, and not just the silo of DNI.

That top leadership, when they get on board, it trickles down, and all of a

sudden everyone is talking the talk, everyone is nodding, they understand each other, the culture starts to be created where diversity and inclusion is no longer, you know, not talked about or discussing bias, or micro behaviors, or micro affirmations, all of that is not talked -- it's now becoming part of the discussion. And senior leaders become more comfortable having that dialogue.

MS. COLLINS: So let's move over to that far side over there? Is there a microphone over there? Wonderful. So maybe we'll take four questions there.

MS. SMITH: I can't believe I got the microphone. I'm Chantal Smith. I'm in the fourth year of a PhD Program at Howard University. And I was privy to work with Dr. Cook this summer, at the AEA Summer Program. My question is as I've been to the program, here in D.C., which is an excellent place to be an economic student, by the way.

And I've been exposed to different government agencies, I interned at NOAA this past spring, I took the Fed-R class. I've met a lot people in the Federal Reserve. And one of the things that I was at a lost for was that it's -- when you talk about working for the government your work needs to be focused on the mission of that particular organization, right. So when you look at the mission of the Federal Reserve where their mission statement -- with the mission statement of NOAA, and it's hard for a lot of people, and me, until I got to talk to them, to understand like where my work fits in there.

So I might be interested in one thing, and the Federal Reserve would be like, that's great, you know, but how does this contribute to the mission of what the Fed is about. So when I look at things like, that is like okay, well, then does that mean if I came to work here will my work not be of any value or use. Am I just doing it just to be doing it? Or how does it fit in -- like how do you -- how do you approach people who maybe want it to fit in, but there's not a place for it yet? I guess is my question.

MS. RAMIREZ: Hi. I'm Katherine Ramirez from Ohio State University. I'm a PhD student and I'm about to graduate, and something that I feel have not been mentioned that affects me, or many PhD credit students, in their leaking pipeline or pathways is motherhood and age. So once we're about to graduate there is this idea of

support, or lack of, motherhood, and we're in this age of, oh, there's the biological clock. So what are your thoughts of this topic and what are the supports for PhD students, or early-career mothers?

MS. KOVNER: Hi. Anna Kovner, from the New York Fed. I had one comment and one question. The comment is just to encourage, if there's more work being done on this topic, to look at the RAs. We did a similar project in New York and we found we were able to bring up the share of women RAs from a sort of mid-'20s to mid-'40s, and that they were accepted into economics grad schools at the same, if not higher rates, than the sort of past pool of RAs. And so having a better understanding of how we can influence the population that way I think is very valuable.

My question is for the non-government participants in the panel. If you could get the government, the Fed, to do anything on this type of program, what is it you wish that we would be doing?

SPEAKER: That's a good question.

SPEAKER: Mm-hmm.

MS. COLLINS: And is there one more just in that area? Okay. So let's go back to the panel.

MS. CHEVALIER: Okay. So maybe I'll say a little, tiny bit about motherhood, and a little bit about what I might ask the government to do. I think I've actually been pretty explicit about things I might ask the government to do. So, let me say, I think really more transparency about the -- what economists do in the government, and finding ways to get that message out there as an outreach.

And I think this is actually related to your question about, I didn't understand how my work would fit in if I went to the Fed. And finding mechanisms to do it where, you know, it can be really broadly disseminated. That is I think something I would love to see the government be more active in.

I think that, you know, you raised an interesting question about motherhood. I mean I'm sure you're aware of recent research that's kind of discouraging about the effects

of parent leave policies disproportionately being very helpful to men and not as helpful to women. So I think that's -- you know, I think that's a real challenge for both -- any pathways, you know, academic or government in that, you know, we really need to find ways to support parenthood and to support men participating in parenthood that aren't -- that aren't the ones we've tried.

You know, as economists we always think experimentation is good. I think there was a lot of experiments -- I think the sort of gender-neutral, tenure clock stoppages that they attempted in academia were an experiment. I think they're an experiment that we now have data on, and it wasn't that successful an experiment. And, you know, I don't have great answers, but I think we clearly need to start over with new ideas.

MS. COLLINS: Kaye and then Ellen.

MS. HUSBANDS FEALING: Sure. I'm really glad that you put that back on the table about having a family, and I hear it from women in my Department, but also men in my Department about that balance. And it is something that I can't say I have a nice, tidy answer for, but the leaves are important, having conferences where there's childcare available. I know the American Economic Association has done that for years. They then considered it again, and then they kept going, and that was an important piece.

There are things like that that we can do. In my own Department or at Georgia Tech, there are things that we tried to do as well, but I don't have the answer for that one, except to have your family. And I think it's really important to continue to put it back on the table for us to come up with things that are much more productive for men and for women, and for women and for men, because I do hear it from --

I had a male assistant professor asking me a similar question recently about how to schedule leave and will that affect the way, you know, decisions are made about progress in the field. And so I'm hearing this on both sides, and it's something that we really need to get at, because I don't think we have that fully figured out.

MS. COLLINS: And so some of these issues may be a little different in a government context than in academia. And so, Ellen, I don't know if you wanted to weigh in

on that.

MS. MEADE: So, I also think it's a wonderful question and we do need to address it. The Fed's made a lot of progress on this issue since when I had my children I was at the Fed in the early part of my career and left in '99 and then came back in 2011. And in '99 there really wasn't a lot of flexibility. There had been a policy that had just been introduced called Paternity Leave for non-birthing parents who happened to be men, and now today what we have is a lot of flexibility I would say around using your leave or, in particular, taking unpaid leave time.

But the government still does not have a parental leave policy. So your cobbling together bits of sick leave, and annual leave, and unpaid leave in order to deal with this issue. So I think there is a lot of flexibility within the Fed, but there isn't a policy of parental leave that would then pay you for that time.

MS. COLLINS: So these conversations can be helpful and important for moving ideas forward. Anyone else wants to weigh in on these topics. So we have just one minute left, and I'm going to invite any of our panelists if they have a final thought, a lesson that they've taken, a takeaway from all the experiences they've had that they wanted to share. Any final thoughts?

MS. HUSBANDS FEALING: One thing I would say is that it isn't a one-size-fits-all set of interventions, and we've heard a lot. And Susan has already gone through a number of them, and so it's really important to continue this conversation and to hear about from you, what are the issues that we need to be working on.

MS. COLLINS: So I would just say that how wonderful it is to have such a vibrant and engaged audience, that the more of us who can be working on these really important issues and moving them forward, the better. So I hope we all continue to stay in touch about them.

I want to thank all of you for coming and joining us. Also thanking our panel for all of their thoughts and comments. Each of them has really a font of -- a variety of other types of expertise that's relevant that we didn't have time to get to.

And thank you very much both, Janet Yellen for the really wonderful, compelling examples of why this is important and why we should care, and for Brookings, David and Lise for organizing this. So, thank you. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2020