

**REPORT ON THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF MINORITY GROUPS IN THE ECONOMICS
PROFESSION (CSMGEP)
December 2008**

The Committee on the Status of Minority Groups in the Economics Profession (CSMGEP) was established by the American Economic Association (AEA) in the early 1970s to oversee a “pipeline program” to increase the representation of minority groups in the economics profession and to monitor the racial and ethnic diversity of the profession. This report begins with recent data on the numbers and proportions of minorities studying economics at the undergraduate and graduate levels; it also reports results from a recent survey of minority faculty in economics departments. It then presents updated information on the three components of the Pipeline Program the CSMGEP oversees: the Summer Program, the Mentoring Program, and the Summer Fellows Program. Finally, it summarizes the Committee’s activities this past year.

Data on Minority Economists and Those in the Pipeline

In this report we summarize data collected by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation’s *Survey of Earned Doctorates* (made available through the WebCASPAR database) on the numbers of bachelor’s and doctoral degrees awarded in economics to U.S. citizens and permanent residents by race and ethnicity. In addition, we report on the annual survey data from the *Universal Academic Questionnaire* (UAQ) of the American Economic Association on the numbers of economics faculty, again by race and ethnicity in 2007.

As shown in Table 1, between 1995 and 2006 there were between 16,000 and 23,000 bachelor’s degrees in economics awarded to U.S. citizens and permanent residents annually (temporary residents comprise more than 2,000 bachelor’s degrees each year). Throughout this 10 year period, the percentage of these degrees awarded to African Americans decreased slightly from 6.7 percent of degrees in 1995 to 6.1 percent of degrees in 2006. The percentage of bachelor’s degrees awarded to Native Americans has remained fairly constant at about 0.4 percent (there were about 69 bachelor’s degrees awarded to Native Americans in 1995 and about 113 awarded in 2006). In contrast, the percentage of degrees awarded to Hispanics has increased from 4.9 percent to 6.3 percent.

Table 1. Percentage of Bachelor's Degrees in Economics Awarded to Minority Students, 1995-2006

Year	Total	African Americans (%)	Hispanics (%)	Native Americans (%)
1995	17,393	6.7	4.9	0.4
1996	16,108	6.3	5.2	0.4
1997	15,871	5.8	5.2	0.4
1998	16,461	6.0	5.2	0.4
1999	NA	NA	NA	NA
2000	17,709	5.9	5.5	0.4
2001	18,548	5.9	5.6	0.4
2002	19,920	6.1	5.4	0.3
2003	21,820	6.1	5.4	0.4
2004	22,758	6.2	5.7	0.5
2005	22,961	6.0	5.9	0.4
2006	22,571	6.1	6.3	0.5

Sources: Tabulated from National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS). Data derived from Department of Education/National Center for Education Statistics: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Completions Survey by Race (WebCASPAR Database System); only U.S. citizens and permanent residents are included.

The percentage of degrees awarded in economics to minorities, as a group, remained roughly constant – albeit with a very slight increase – at between 12 and 13 percent between 1995 and 2006 (see Table 2). Other academic fields have shown much more substantial increases in minority representation. The percentage of degrees awarded to minorities in science and engineering increased from 13.5 percent in 1995 to 17.6 percent in 2006; the percentage of degrees awarded to minorities increased from 16.6 percent to 20.1 percent in all social sciences (which include economics). In total, the percentage of degrees awarded to minorities during the same time period increased from 14 percent to 18 percent when all fields are combined.

Table 2. Percentage of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in All Fields to Minority Students, 1995-2006

Year	Econ. (%)	All Fields (%)	Total Science & Eng. (%)	Math (%)	Psychology (%)	All Social Sciences (%)
1995	11.9	13.9	13.5	11.6	14.9	16.6
1996	12.0	14.7	14.1	12.3	15.8	17.5
1997	11.5	15.2	14.7	13.4	16.9	18.5
1998	11.5	15.7	15.3	14.1	17.6	18.8
1999	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2000	11.8	16.6	16.5	14.0	19.4	19.5
2001	11.8	16.9	16.8	13.5	19.6	19.4
2002	11.8	17.0	17.0	13.3	19.7	19.6
2003	12.0	17.3	17.2	12.5	19.8	19.4
2004	12.3	17.5	17.4	11.6	20.2	19.4
2005	12.3	17.7	17.5	12.5	20.6	19.9
2006	12.9	18.0	17.6	12.4	20.6	20.1

Sources: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS). Data derived from the National Science Foundation, WebCASPAR Database System, based on data from the National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS Completions Surveys by Race; only U.S. citizens and permanent residents are included.

Moving along the pipeline, the total number of doctoral degrees awarded in economics declined from 514 in 1993 to 399 in 2006 (see Table 3). The number of minorities who were awarded these degrees remained relatively constant between 1993 and 2005, and even increased to 47 in 2006. Consequently, the percentage of doctoral degrees awarded to minorities in economics has grown in recent years, although the level remains low. The trends by race and ethnicity are similar. The percentage of doctoral degrees in economics awarded to African Americans declined from 4.5 percent (or 23 students) in 1993 to 2.7 percent (i.e., 11 students) in 2003; however there has been a subsequent rebound to an average of 4.7 percent between 2004 and 2006 (or 17-18 students). At the same time, the percentage of degrees awarded to Hispanics increased from about 3.1 percent in 1993 to 4.2 percent in 2003, although the number of degrees awarded to Hispanics has remained constant at about 16 to 17 students. Between 2004 and 2006 the percentage of degrees awarded to Hispanics maintained an average of 5.2 percent (or about 20 students). The percentage of degrees awarded to Native Americans ranges from 0 to 0.5 percent (or between 0 and 2 students).

Table 3. Percentage of Doctoral Degrees in Economics Awarded, 1993-2006

Year	Total	Total Minority	Minority (%)	African American (%)	Hispanics (%)	Native Americans (%)
1993	514	39	7.6	4.5	3.1	0
1994	566	39	6.9	4.1	2.7	0.2
1995	626	41	6.6	4.0	2.2	0.3
1996	608	43	7.1	3.6	3.3	0.2
1997	590	48	8.1	3.7	4.2	0.2
1998	583	50	8.6	4.0	4.6	0
1999	543	50	9.2	5.2	3.9	0.2
2000	501	45	9.0	4.4	4.4	0.2
2001	464	33	7.1	2.8	3.9	0.4
2002	426	29	6.8	3.1	3.8	0
2003	408	29	7.1	2.7	4.2	0.3
2004	401	35	8.7	6.0	2.8	0
2005	385	38	9.9	2.6	7.0	0.3
2006	399	47	11.8	5.5	5.8	0.5

Source: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS). Data derived from the National Science Foundation, WebCASPAR Database System, based on *Survey of Earned Doctorates/Doctorate Records File*; includes only U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

Table 4 shows how the percentage of doctoral degrees awarded to minorities (i.e., African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans combined) changed between 1993 and 2006 in selected other fields. As noted above, whereas the percentage of doctorates awarded to minority students in economics had been falling between 1993 and 2003, there has been a steady increase

since 2004 reaching 11.8 percent in 2006. Similar increases are evident in all science and engineering fields, psychology, and all social sciences combined (which include economics).

While presenting these data as percentages helps to control for changes in the total number of economics students, it can also mask the fact that the absolute numbers of minorities remain very small. In 2006 there were only 47 doctoral degrees in economics awarded to minorities: 22 to African Americans, 23 to Hispanics, and 2 to Native Americans.

Table 4. Percentage of Doctoral Degrees in Other Fields Awarded to Minority Students, 1993-2006

Year	Econ. (%)	All Fields (%)	Total Science & Eng. (%)	Math (%)	Psychology (%)	All Social Sciences (%)
1993	7.6	8.3	6.5	4.2	8.3	10.1
1994	6.9	7.9	6.2	4.0	8.6	9.0
1995	6.6	8.3	6.4	2.9	9.7	9.5
1996	7.1	8.7	7.0	3.1	10.6	9.4
1997	8.1	9.1	7.5	4.5	10.9	9.6
1998	8.6	10.0	8.2	6.8	12.1	11.1
1999	9.2	10.9	8.9	4.6	12.8	12.0
2000	9.0	10.8	9.0	5.4	13.1	11.5
2001	7.1	10.9	8.8	6.8	12.0	12.1
2002	6.8	11.8	9.5	6.5	13.2	12.8
2003	7.1	12.0	9.5	6.8	12.6	13.2
2004	8.7	12.2	9.9	7.1	14.0	12.3
2005	9.9	12.1	10.1	8.5	12.7	13.3
2006	11.8	11.9	10.2	7.3	14.3	14.0

Source: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS). Data derived from the National Science Foundation, WebCASPAR Database System, based on *Survey of Earned Doctorates/Doctorate Records File*; includes only U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

Finally, we report the number of minority faculty in academic institutions (Table 5).¹ Overall, among the 277 departments that responded to the UAQ Survey in 2007, minorities represented 4.8 percent of the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, which compares to 4.6 percent last year and 5.1 percent two years ago. Minorities comprised roughly similar shares of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the economics departments of PhD-granting institutions (4.3 percent) and Master's degree-granting institutions (4.7 percent), but this year a slightly higher share of the tenured and tenure-track faculty at bachelor's degree-granting institutions (5.6 percent).² Note, however, that the distributions for Blacks and Hispanics differ. For example, there were 56 full-time tenured or tenure-track Hispanics in PhD-granting institutions and 17 in Master's degree-granting institutions, compared to only 25 African Americans in PhD-granting institutions and

¹ We thank Charles Scott for providing the data separately for Blacks and Hispanics.

² PhD-granting institutions are those that award the PhD as the highest degree; master's degree-granting institutions award the master's as the highest degree; and bachelor's degree-granting institutions award the bachelor's as the highest degree.

11 in Master's degree-granting institutions. There were roughly equal numbers of Blacks and Hispanics at bachelor's degree-granting institutions.

Overall, approximately 50 percent of full-time tenured or tenure-track economists are at PhD-granting institutions and 34 percent at bachelor's degree-granting institutions. Blacks with such positions are underrepresented at PhD-granting institutions (only 32 percent of full-time tenured or tenure-track Blacks are at such institutions) and over-represented at bachelor's-degree-granting institutions (45 percent). In contrast, 54 percent of full-time tenured or tenure-track Hispanic economists are at PhD-granting institutions, although 35 percent are also at bachelor's-degree-granting institutions.

The distribution across the ranks also differs by race and ethnicity. Overall, 49 percent of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty are full professors, 24 percent are associate professors, and 25 percent are assistant professors. This compares to 25 percent, 34 percent, and 36 percent respectively for Blacks; and 26 percent, 24 percent, and 47 percent for Hispanics. While both Blacks and Hispanics are underrepresented among full professors, there are signs of progress in the pipeline, particularly among Hispanics.

There is a ratio of 12 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members to 1 full-time non-tenure-track faculty member among all reporting departments. This ratio is only 7 to 1 for Blacks but 15 to 1 for Hispanics. Similarly, while, overall, there are 5.7 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members for each part-time (either tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure-track) faculty member, the ratio is 4.5 to 1 among Blacks and 4.9 to 1 among Hispanics. Thus, there is evidence that Black economists are disproportionately relegated to these less prestigious positions, although not so for Hispanic economists.

We note that these figures, while suggestive, must be interpreted with caution. First, the response rate to the survey is quite low, at approximately 25 percent. As such, the data may not be representative, particularly if departments with greater (or fewer) numbers of minority faculty are more likely to respond. Second, one cannot distinguish non-response from legitimate zeros. The missing values are assumed to be true zeros which would lead us to understate the extent of racial and ethnic diversity in economics departments. Finally, while we would very much like to draw conclusions about the "leakiness" of the pipeline by comparing the data in Tables 1 through 5, we caution that because these data were collected by different organizations, they are not directly comparable. Specifically, the data on students include citizens and resident aliens whereas the data from the UAQ on faculty also include those who are neither citizens nor resident aliens. As such, the denominator in the proportion of minority faculty likely represents a faster increase relative to the numerator creating downward bias in minority representation at the faculty level.³

³ We are grateful to John Siegfried for point out this measurement issue.

Table 5: Numbers and Distribution of Faculty by Type of Institution and Race/Ethnicity (2007-2008)

	Number of Institutions in Sample	Full-time Tenured or tenure track					Full-time	Part time	
		Full	Associate	Assistant	Other	Total	Non-tenure track	Tenured/ Tenure track	Non-tenure track
Ph.D. institution	82								
<i>Total</i>		1,039	353	473	17	1,882	185	24	189
<i>Black</i>		6	8	11	0	25	4	0	1
<i>Hispanic</i>		14	13	29	0	56	4	0	8
M.A. institution	44								
<i>Total</i>		272	160	145	18	595	67	51	164
<i>Black</i>		4	7	5	1	17	3	1	6
<i>Hispanic</i>		6	3	2	0	11	0	2	2
B.A. institution	151								
<i>Total</i>		538	378	316	33	1,265	132	122	152
<i>Black</i>		9	11	12	3	35	4	4	5
<i>Hispanic</i>		7	9	17	3	36	3	4	5
All Institutions	277								
<i>Total</i>		1,849	891	934	68	3,742	308	171	482
<i>Black</i>		19	26	28	4	77	11	5	12
<i>Hispanic</i>		27	25	48	3	103	7	6	15

Notes: Racial and ethnic representation includes U.S. citizens and permanent residents only. Includes faculty on leave during 2007-08, but excludes visiting appointments. A person who is full-time at the institution but only part-time in the economics department is considered full time. Non-responses to racial and ethnic diversity could not be distinguished from blanks representing zeros; thus all blanks were treated as zeros. Therefore, racial and ethnic representation may be under-represented.

Source: Universal Academic Questionnaire, 2007.

Pipeline Program

Concerns about the underrepresentation of members of historically disadvantaged ethnic and racial groups led the AEA to establish a program 30 years ago to improve the “pipeline” of minority economists: the Summer Program (now known as the Summer Training Program). Since then, the AEA has also recognized that it is important to actively support and encourage students throughout graduate school. Consequently, the CSMGEP created the Mentoring Program (which was formerly known as the “Pipeline Project”), for students accepted or enrolled in a PhD program in economics. Since its inception, eligibility for the program has also been extended to new PhDs. In addition, two years ago the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) and CSMGEP joined together to create a Summer Fellows Program that allows senior graduate students and junior faculty to spend a summer in residence at a sponsoring research institution. The Committee refers to the three programs (and any others that might be developed) as the AEA’s Pipeline Program.

The Summer Training Program

This year the Summer Training Program had its inaugural session at the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB); Professor Douglas Steigerwald serves as its director and Stephen Trejo (University of Texas at Austin) and Darrick Hamilton (Milano – The New School for Management and Urban Policy) serve as associate directors. With the move to UCSB came a number of important changes to the program including attempts to increase the number of qualified Hispanic applicants, to focus more clearly on research and professional development, to improve mentoring, and to coordinate efforts regarding feedback and assessment.

Interest in the Summer Training Program remains strong. UCSB received 70 qualified (i.e., complete) applications from which 34 percent were admitted. (In contrast, in 2007 the Summer Training Program admitted nearly 50 percent of qualified applicants; the difference due to more available slots and a smaller pool of qualified applicants from which to draw). Table 6 shows the sex and race/ethnicity of the qualified applicants. Note that approximately 43 percent of the applicants were African American and 31 percent Hispanic. Further, nearly two-thirds were male. Importantly, nearly 49 percent of these applicants came from non-research I universities, including Historically Minority-Serving Colleges and Universities (HMCUs) such as Jackson State, Morgan State, and the University of Texas Pan American.

Table 6
Summer 2008 Applicants

	Female	Male	Total
African American	14	16	30 (43%)
Hispanic	5	17	22 (31%)
Other	6	12	18 (26%)
Total	25 (36%)	45 (64%)	

Table 7 shows the sex and race/ethnicity of admitted students to the program over time.

Table 7
AEA Summer Training Program Admitted Student Composition: 1993-2008
Annual averages, excluding all other ethnicities

	Stanford 1993-1995	Texas 1996-2000	Colorado-Denver 2001-2003 Duke 2004-2007	Santa Barbara 2008
<i>African American</i>	14.3	9.2	19.8	11.0
Female	5.3	4.4	9.6	6.0
Male	9.0	4.8	10.3	5.0
<i>Hispanic</i>	10.3	8.8	10.8	12.0
Female	4.0	3.0	4.2	1.0
Male	6.3	5.8	6.7	11.0
<i>% Female</i>	<i>37%</i>	<i>41%</i>	<i>44%</i>	<i>30%</i>
<i>% Hispanic</i>	<i>42%</i>	<i>49%</i>	<i>35%</i>	<i>52%</i>

Last year the program offered admission to 24 students of whom one declined to attend. The program hosted 16 students at the Foundation Level (those who have just finished their sophomore year in college and have only taken one year of calculus and intermediate economics) and seven students at the Advanced Level (those who have completed at least their junior or senior year in college). This reduced number of participants is partly a result of reduced funding at the time of admissions, although the number of students admitted to the Advanced Level will be increased to 10 next year. Of the 23 admitted students, there was a decrease in the percentage of African American students and a small increase in the percentage of Hispanic students. All of the students were from disadvantaged backgrounds and received funding.

As noted in prior Annual Reports, to date there has been only one formal attempt to assess the success of the Summer Program at achieving its objective of increasing minority representation in doctoral programs in economics and related fields.⁴ A much larger effort to assess the program is now underway, involving CSMGEP Chair Cecilia Rouse (Princeton University), Gregory Price (Morehouse College), former AEASP project coordinator Sue Stockly (now on the faculty at Eastern New Mexico University), and former Summer Program director Charles Becker (Duke University). Further, Doug Steigerwald, the current Summer Training Program director, is already attempting to assess the short-run impacts of the program at UCSB and is collecting data that will allow longer-run follow-up of both successful and unsuccessful applicants going forward.

In the meantime, we turn to student responses regarding their interest in economics before entering and after completing the program, graduate school attendance rates, and test score gains on a standardized test in economics to judge its effectiveness. We note that as the program has only been in effect for one year at UCSB, the sample sizes are extremely small but nonetheless

⁴ In "The Causal Effects of Participation in the American Economic Association Summer Minority Program" (*Southern Economic Journal*, July 2005), Gregory Price finds that Summer Program alumni were more productive in academic terms than comparable non-alumni economists.

the results encouraging. For example, as in previous years, student responses from 2008 indicate that the program increases interest in attaining a doctoral degree in economics. Before entering the program, 63 percent of respondents thought they were “very likely” or “certain” to enter a PhD program in economics; after the summer, that percentage had increased to 87 percent. More generally, 50% of respondents were more likely to enter a Ph.D. program in economics. This increase is comparable to that from previous years. We highlight, however, that these estimates are based on an exit survey with only eight responses.

As another measure, the students at UCSB were administered a standardized test in economics known as the TUCE (Testing Understanding and Comprehension of Economics) both before and after entering the program. The TUCE is widely known as a tool to test value added in undergraduate coursework. Although the program is not designed around the material covered in the test (the program prepares students for graduate coursework), the test may still serve as an overall indicator of knowledge of economics. The test was administered to students during orientation (prior to the first day of class) and again on exit (after the last day of class). Of the 22 students who completed the program, the average test score gain (out of a possible 36) was 1.9. Given a standard deviation of 4-5, this represents a gain of about 40 percent of a standard deviation. Perhaps at least as important is the measure of students who score at the elite level in the exam (a score of 30 or higher). Only one student scored at this level on entry, while three additional students scored at this level on exit.

Finally we note that six of the seven (86 percent) Advanced Level students in 2008 expect to progress to a PhD, compared to 10 of 13 (or 77 percent) in 2007. More concretely, recent PhDs or those “on the job market” (who expect to finish shortly) give a good sense of the program’s achievements. Recent high profile outcomes include:

- Rodney Andrews '00 (BS, Georgia Tech; PhD, University of Michigan 2007); current position: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Scholar in Health Policy Research, Institute for Quantitative Social Science, Harvard University
- Emily Conover '02 (BA Wellesley College; PhD, University of California – Berkeley 2008 expected)
- Stephen Culpepper '01 (BA, Bowling Green State University; PhD, University of Minnesota 2007); current position: instructor, Department of Education, University of Denver
- Melissa Knox '02 (BA, University of Nevada Las Vegas; PhD, University of California – Berkeley 2008 expected); position: post-doctoral scholar, University of Washington
- Paul Paez '02 (BA, University of Colorado at Denver; PhD, University of New Mexico 2008 expected)
- Omari Swinton '01 (BA Florida A&M University; PhD Duke University 2007); current position: Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Howard University
- Valerie Rawlston Wilson '97 (BA, Hampton University; PhD, University of North Carolina 2007; current position: economist, National Urban League Policy Institute);

Those projected to complete in 2009 and enter the January 2009 job market include Marcus Casey '01-'02 (Illinois), Adriana Espinosa '01 (Berkeley), Wesley Gray '02 (Chicago – Finance), and Luis Torres '03 (Colorado).

The cost of the Summer Training Program was approximately \$470,000 in 2008; the two major expenses were faculty and staff salaries and student scholarships. The major funding came from UCSB (\$176,000), the AEA (\$170,000), and others (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, The Moody's Foundation, the National Science Foundation, and RAND; for a total of \$150,000). In addition, Textbook Publishers contributed about \$9,000 in in-kind support. The University of Texas-Pan American and North Carolina A&T University helped disseminate information about the program as well. We emphasize that funding from the AEA provides the structure that underpins the entire Summer Training Program. Without AEA funding, the program would not exist. While AEA funding covers some administrative and recruiting costs, largely through support for the Associate Directors, the main use of AEA funds is to support students. For 2008, AEA funds supported the entire cohort of Foundation students. That said, one of the goals is to develop a funding system that would place the program on a firmer funding basis. We have begun to coordinate with the National Science Foundation (NSF), in an effort to have the NSF serve as a banker for ongoing contributions to the program. Simultaneously, we have begun working with the Federal Reserve System to reach out to the regional banks as additional sources of support.

The Mentoring Program

The Mentoring Program, which is aimed at those starting or completing doctorate degrees in economics and new doctorates, matches African-American, Latino, and Native American economics PhD students with mentors in the field. It also facilitates networking between minority economists and students at all stages of the educational and professional pipeline. Participants must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents. That said, the Pipeline Conference is the primary activity of the Mentoring Program. The Conference is held each summer during the Pipeline Program's Summer Program, thus for the first time at UCSB. This year, 22 graduate students attended as did 21 professional economists/new professors and 17 mentors. The Conference included the presentation of the following academic papers:

- "Whoa Nellie! Empirical Tests of College Football's Conventional Wisdom," Trevon Logan, The Ohio State University;
- "LATE for School," Juan Carlos Suarez, University of California, Berkeley;
- "Preferential Trade Agreements on Latin America," Gustavo Barboza and Sandra Trejos, Clarion University of Pennsylvania;
- "Do Daylight-Saving Time Adjustments Impact Human Performance?," Doug Steigerwald, University of California, Santa Barbara;
- "The Value to Legal Status," Todd Sorensen, University of California, Riverside;
- "The Emerging Contingent Labor Force: An Analysis of Temporary Workers," Leslie Wallace, University of California, San Diego;
- "Till Laws Do Us Part: Changes in Divorce Laws on Divorce Rates in Mexico," Nellie Lew, University of California, Santa Barbara and Trini Beleche, University of California, Riverside;

- “Aid and Agency in Africa: Explaining Ethiopian Households: 1994-2004,” Nzinga H. Broussard, University of Michigan;
- “Gender Bias in Criminal Sentencing,” Ron Oaxaca, University of Arizona;
- “Domestic Terrorism and Economic Activity: Evidence from African American Patents, 1870-1940,” Lisa Cook, Michigan State University;
- “Obstacles to Faculty Diversity: What We Know About Diversity and Career Paths,” Rhonda Sharpe, University of Vermont, Jeremy Fuller, and Omari Swinton, Howard University

As usual, participants rated the conference quite highly. For example, a graduate student attached this message to one of the surveys:

I have gained significantly from participating in the Pipeline Conference. The conference brings high caliber economists together which results in high and intensive professional thinking. In addition, learning from the experiences of others has proven pivotal to my professional development. The networking is also extremely relevant as it provides opportunities to engage in an exchange of ideas, topics, and actual participation in other conferences as a result of the invitations extended by other Pipeline participants. For example, in the last two years I have been able to develop two papers as a direct result of Pipeline interaction.

The Mentoring Program also provides funding for collaborative research projects between mentors and mentees. The awards range from \$750 to \$1,500 and the funds can serve a variety of purposes. For example, they can be used to cover the transportation and lodging costs that allow graduate students to travel to their mentor’s location and spend several days working on the project, or cover the costs of data and supplies.

An important component of the Mentoring Program is the sakai.rutgers.edu website that interconnects all mentoring program participants, and serves as a tool for disseminating information. This site has allowed us to disseminate over twenty opportunities for research, grants, job openings, and other initiatives.

The cost of the Mentoring Program is about \$40,000 per year, the majority of which is used to fund the annual Pipeline Conference. The program is currently funded by a new two-year grant from the NSF.

Summer Fellows Program

The Summer Fellows program – jointly administered with the CSWEP – aims to increase the participation and advancement of women and underrepresented minorities in economics by providing a summer in residence at a sponsoring research institution such as a Federal Reserve Bank or other public agency. Eligibility is open to senior graduate students and junior faculty. Sponsoring institutions pay for the fellowship and administrative costs are covered by a grant from the NSF.

In the second year of the program the number of participating institutions nearly tripled and the number of applicants and fellows doubled. For example, consider the applicants. The program

received 84 applicants; 74 self-identified as female (but not from an under-represented minority group), 6 self-identified as a member of an under-represented minority group (not female) and 4 self-identified as female from an under-represented minority group. Forty-seven of the applicants were graduate students and 27 were currently faculty; the rest were either post-docs or candidates in other situations.

Further, this past summer 13 institutions agreed to sponsor fellows, with 11 institutions actually finding candidates to whom they offered fellowships. There were 10 participating fellows: five were female and non-minority graduate students; two were female non-minority post-docs; two were female non-minority faculty; and one fellow was a male minority graduate student.

The participating institutions included the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, the Federal Reserve Banks of Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Kansas City, New York and San Francisco, the Brookings Institution, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., the Rand Corporation, Resources for the Future, the Urban Institute, and the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

The program is run by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the chairs of CSWEP and CSMGEP. The current committee is Patricia Mosser (Federal Reserve Bank of New York), Janice Shack-Marquez (Board of Governors), and Dick Startz (chair, University of Washington). Several more Reserve Banks and research institutions will be participating in 2009. Information about the program can be found at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AEA/CSMGEP/pipeline/>.

The Committee's Recent and On-going Activities

The CSMGEP continues to expand its efforts to increase the representation of minority groups in the economics profession.

At the 2008 AEA meetings, the CSMGEP hosted two sessions. The first session was entitled "Racial and Ethnic Gaps in Education: Theory, Policies, Practice." The papers included:

- "Leaving No Child Behind: Two Paths to School Accountability" by David Figlio (University of Florida), Cecilia Rouse (Princeton University), and Analia Schlosser (Princeton University);
- "The Impacts of Choice and Accountability on African American versus Latina Children in Chicago" by Brian Jacob (University of Michigan);
- "Within School Variation in the Quality of Instruction Across Course Levels and Racial Groups" by Ronald Ferguson (Harvard University); and
- "Racial Gaps in College Preparation: Exploring the Role of Postsecondary Remediation Using a Regression Discontinuity Approach" by Eric Bettinger (Case Western Reserve University) and Bridget Terry Long (Harvard University).

Ngina Chiteji (Skidmore College) chaired the session and Chiteji, Mark Lopez (University of Maryland), Kerwin Charles (University of Chicago), and William Darity, Jr. (Duke University) served as discussants.

The second was a Dissertation Session. The four papers were:

- “Prison Labor in a Model of Dynamic and Complete Information” by Robynn Cox (Georgia State University);
- “Poverty Reduction, Aid and Economic Freedom” by Maharouf Oyolola (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee);
- “An ‘A’ for Effort: Should College Dropouts Try Harder?” by Omari H. Swinton (Duke University);
- “The Dynamics of Jobholding Among Contingent Workers and the Effect on Family Income” by Leslie Wallace (University of California-San Diego).

Sue K. Stockly (Eastern New Mexico University) chaired the session and Ngina Chiteji (Skidmore College), Gary A. Dymski (University of California-Riverside), Susan Collins (University of Michigan), and Mark Hugo Lopez (University of Maryland) served as discussants.

In addition, the CSMGEP hosted a session at the 2008 Southern Economic Association annual meetings in Washington, D.C. The title of the session was “Topics in Savings, Growth, and Other Socioeconomic Outcomes.” The papers included:

- “Hate Crimes and State Labor Market Conditions in the Early 2000s” by Marie Mora (The University of Texas-Pan American) and Mark Hugo López (Pew Hispanic Center);
- “Savings Incentives and Prices: A Study of the 529 College Savings Plan Market” by Vicki Bogan (Cornell University);
- “An Instrumental Variable Analysis of the Impact of the HIV/AIDS Epidemic in Low- and Middle-Income Countries” by Juan Delacruz (Lehman College – CUNY).

Sue Stockly (Eastern New Mexico University) chaired the session and Luisa Rocio Blanco Raynal (Pepperdine University), Carlos Vargas-Silva, Sam Houston State University, and Isabel Ruiz, (Sam Houston State University) served as discussants.

We continue to update and improve the CSMGEP website. The site: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AEA/CSMGEP/index.htm> not only contains information about the Pipeline Program, but also has resources for students interested in pursuing careers in economics and for department chairs interested in increasing the representation of minorities among their graduate students.

Last year, together with the American Society of Hispanic Economists and the National Economic Association, the CSMGEP published the inaugural issue of *The Minority Report*, an annual newsletter to showcase the people, programs, research, and activities of the three groups. We distributed print copies of *The Minority Report* at the ASSA meetings last January, and it can still be accessed on the CSMGEP website. We plan to distribute the second issue in January.

In addition, this year we started a listserv to which we can “blast” relevant information to members. A key motivation for creating a listserv was to be able to alert interested departments and organizations about minority job market candidates which the CSMGEP would compile in October and November of each year. In this first year, we compiled a list of the names, fields, institutional affiliations, and websites (or CVs) of 15 minority job market candidates. For those interested in joining the listserv or seeing the list of minority job market candidates, visit the CSMGEP website.

We have also continued the (web) series profiling minority economists. The goal of the series is to highlight the many accomplishments of these economists and to give young people who might be considering a career in economics a glimpse into the lives of those who made that decision. This year we also added the profile of an economist who has mentored many promising minority economists. The series this year included profiles of Philip Jefferson (Professor of Economics at Swarthmore College), Sheldon Danziger (Henry J. Meyer Distinguished University Professor of Public Policy at the University of Michigan), and Larry Chavis (Assistant Professor of Strategy and Entrepreneurship at the University of North Carolina, Kenan-Flager Business School). You can read their profiles – as well as those of previous profilees – on our website.

This year the CSMGEP also added one new member: Marie Mora (Professor of Economics University of Texas – Pan American). Marie has been a very active member of the committee this year for which the chair is extremely grateful.

We are also extremely grateful to the generosity of the following contributors to the Pipeline Program: the economics departments at Brown University, Duke University, MIT, Princeton University, the University of California at Santa Barbara, the University of Maryland, the University of Southern California, and the University of Virginia, as well as to the American Economic Association, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Moody’s Foundation, the National Science Foundation, and the RAND Corporation. Without their support, the CSMGEP could not continue its many – and growing – efforts to increase the representation of minorities in the economics profession.

In addition, we would like to thank James Poterba and the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) for hosting three minority graduate students at the 2008 Summer Institute. The intention was to extend the reach of the Summer Program by inviting those alums that would be on the job market in the fall to the summer meetings. One attendee, Claudia Sitgraves, a graduate student at the University of California at Berkeley, wrote of the opportunity:

I am just writing to say thank you so much again for your invitation to the NBER 2008 Summer Institute and your financial support in attending. It was a pleasure to meet you as well. As a graduate student who will be on the job market in the fall, this conference was an invaluable opportunity to meet so many of the faculty whose influential work supports my own research. I had many conversations with senior faculty members about my projects, and their input will be very helpful to me as I continue to work on my research. I also had many opportunities to talk with junior faculty members, and their recollections of and advice for the job market was reassuring and supportive (and hearing about

behaviors to avoid was entertaining as well). All in all, attending this conference was really a great experience. Thanks so much again, Claudia Sitgraves (Berkeley).

The Chair extends sincere thanks to John Siegfried and his staff at the AEA – Barbara Fiser, Marlene Hight, Susan Houston, Regina Montgomery, and Violet Sikes – for their marvelous assistance and guidance. As always, their efforts have been invaluable. Finally, the term of CSMGEP member Gary Dymksi ends this December. Gary has been a committed and tireless advocate for our efforts and his membership on the committee will be sorely missed.