Happy New Year! 2022 marked a much-welcome return to in-person events, but the year also brought much turbulence. From the Dobb’s ruling overturning Roe-vs-Wade to sexual harassment in the economics profession, CSWEP and our constituents have had to contend with much. It is worth noting that women around the world had a tough year with the brutal repression in countries like Iran and the heartbreaking rollback of access to education for the young women of Afghanistan.

I am pleased to report that CSWEP adroitly navigated these choppy waters. Based on our core principles of equity and access and in the interests of the health and safety of our constituents, we worked with the AEA to livestream CSWEP sessions while also allowing for hybrid participation. To address the pressing issues brought to the fore by the Econ #MeToo movement, we organized an important panel discussion at the ASSA meetings in New Orleans. The panelists featured Ben Bernanke (former AEA president and chair of the ethics committee), Christy Romer (current president of the AEA), Leto Copley (AEA ombuds), Audrey Anderson (Bass, Berry & Sims PLC, and Title IX expert), and Billy Williams (Senior Vice President for Ethics, Diversity, and Inclusion at American Geophysical Union). Skillfully moderated by Judy Chevalier, our former CSWEP chair, the visible engagement of the AEA leadership brought cause for optimism that we may make some headway in addressing the deeply traumatic and intractable issue of sexual harassment in economics. A recording of the webcast is available.

I will briefly summarize the many in-person and online activities hosted by CSWEP in this letter. This issue of the News also includes the 2023 CSWEP Annual Report summarizing the wide-ranging activities we organized over the year and the results from our annual survey on the status of women in academic economics. We are also delighted to present interviews with our Carolyn Shaw Bell Award winner, Martha Bailey, and the Elaine Bennett prize winner Rebecca Diamond in this issue.

We thank Maggie Levenstein and her team for conducting CSWEP’s annual departmental survey and appreciate the 230 doctoral and non-doctoral departments who participated. After a few years of rising optimism about women in economics, the 2022 survey brings more sobering news. Given the pandemic’s disparate impact on women, some trends are not unexpected but warrant vigilance, nevertheless. The shares and the absolute numbers of women entering Ph.D. programs and serving in the faculty of Ph.D.-granting departments continues on page 2.
departments decreased in 2022. For undergraduate economics majors, the female share is still well below parity and nowhere close to the 55% share of women in the undergraduate population.

The overall share of female faculty also declined, driven in part by a decrease in women faculty in non-tenure track ranks. Some welcome news is that the share of female assistant professors and full professors reached all-time highs in both Ph.D.-granting and non-Ph.D. departments. However, the shares of associate professors fell. Possible explanations for the observed patterns could include pandemic-related clock extensions leading to postponements in decisions to go up for tenure and promotions from associate to full continued. But these are mere conjectures requiring further investigation. I encourage you to read the full report on the survey and a video presentation on our website.

I take this opportunity to extend sincere thanks to our outgoing board members, Terry-Ann Craigie, Jennifer Doleac, and Kate Silz-Carson. We are immensely grateful for their service in organizing AEA sessions at regional meetings, mentoring breakfasts, overseeing and spearheading issues of the newsletter, and active participation on our board. We welcome our new board members, Misty Heggeness, Orgul Ozturk, Gina Pieters, and Yana Rodgers.

CSWEP continued its strong presence at the ASSA 2023 annual in-person meetings. We held our eleventh annual junior mentoring breakfast in person and in a second virtual session. Mid-career women joined senior mentors and three speakers (Teresa Harrison, Yana Rodgers and Lisa Burrows) at the tenth annual mid-career breakfast. A sincere thanks to the senior mentors who volunteered their time and to Kasey Buckles, Ina Ganguli, and Marionette Holmes for organizing these much-awaited events.

CSWEP organized seven competitive-entry paper sessions at the 2023 annual meetings. Our sessions showcased research by junior economists on the economics of education and big data and its applications, along with three sessions on the economics of gender and gender in the economics profession. A big thank you to Laura Veldkemp, Jillian Grennan, Olga Shurchkov, Rebeca Thornton, Ina Ganguli, Kasey Buckles, and Franciscia Antman for organizing the sessions. This issue of the News carries the call for papers for CSWEP sessions at the 2024 annual meetings scheduled in San Antonio, TX.

After two years of virtual meetings, we held our annual business meeting and awards ceremony in person at the 2023 annual meetings. I encourage you to view the nomination videos, the inspiring speech by our 2022 Carolyn Shaw Bell award winner, Martha Bailey, and the fantastic talk by Rebecca Diamond, the 2022 Elaine Bennett prize winner, on our website. This issue features in-depth interviews with both of our award recipients.

We are excited that CSWEP’s flagship CeMENT workshops were held in person this year. Lori Beaman and Jessica Holmes directed the workshops for faculty from Ph.D. and non-Ph.D. granting institutions, respectively. Attendance was robust, and 63 mentees participated, and we are so grateful to the 22 mentors who contributed their valuable time to nurture a younger generation of women economists.

In 2022, we continued our webinar tradition and co-hosted five professional development webinars on Publishing in Finance Journals along with AFFECT, our sister committee in the American Finance Association. Along with CSQIEP and on behalf of CSWEP, Marionette Holmes organized a panel discussion on Solutions and Innovative Ideas for Addressing DEI Issues at the ASSA meetings. Please share the archived recordings with graduate students and younger members of our profession.

CSWEP had a strong showing at all four Regional Economic Association Meetings with well-attended paper sessions, career development panels, mentoring breakfasts, and networking events. Special thanks continue on page 3
to our Regional Representatives (Shahina Amin, Francisca Antman, Terry-Ann Craigie, and Jen Doleac) who worked hard to organize and host CSWEP’s events at the Regionals. Featuring research from women economists in the academic and policy communities, our DC CSWEP representative, Stephanie Aaronson, organized two panels each for the Spring and Fall research conferences held by the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM).

Over the last couple of years, several institutions and individuals have approached CSWEP to form partnerships or act as sponsors to support their endeavors on gender in economics. These interactions and initiatives are very exciting and add to the vitality of CSWEP. While we are delighted to co-sponsor and support these broader efforts, we concluded that adding a board member with the explicit role of outreach and partnerships would be tremendously helpful. Misty Heggeness has stepped into this role and will facilitate these efforts as our newly minted Associate Chair of Outreach and Partnerships.

CSWEP has some excellent news to report on the fundraising front. We received a nearly $50,000 grant from the Sloan Foundation to cover travel and hotel expenditures for 35 graduate students per year to attend the 3rd and 4th-year graduate student mentoring workshop at the SEA meetings in 2022 and 2023. In partnership with the Social Sciences Research Council and the leadership of Anna Harvey, CSWEP co-sponsored and received a $1 million grant from the Sloan Foundation to establish a Women in Economics Research Consortium. We invite proposals to evaluate cost-effective and scalable interventions designed to increase the presence and success of women in economics.

Anna Paulson and Shahina Amin represented CSWEP on the jointly administered AEA-CSMGEP-CSWEP committee to select candidates for an excellent year for the AEA’s Summer Fellows Program. Fourteen different sponsors hired 25 fellows, a substantial increase from the 17 hired in 2021. CSWEP also hosted two graduate student mentoring workshops. The first workshop was held virtually and organized by Amanda Agan, Vellore Arthi, Marianne Bitler, Rowena Gray, Erin Hengel, Elaine Hill, Bhagyashree Katare, Maya Rossin-Slater, Carolyn Sloane, Jenna Stearns, Lucy Xiaolu Wang, Sabrina Young. The workshop focused on “hidden curriculum” information—134 women and non-binary graduate student participants and 54 volunteer mentors participated.

At the Southern Economics Association meetings, Celeste Carruthers, Melanie Guldie, Catherine Maclean, and Orgul Ozturk organized and hosted an in-person workshop in Ft. Lauderdale attended by 35 mentees paired with 14 mentors. Kasey Buckles organized our second mid-year mentoring “Econopalooza” event. The online event featured seven field-specific sessions that allowed junior economists to meet people in their fields. Thirty men and women facilitators and 76 junior economists participated.

Thanks to the organizers and mentors who make our many events and initiatives possible. Please forward this issue of News to your students and colleagues. They can send a message to info@cswep.org to be part of our mailing list for announcements and other news. Drop us a line if you want to volunteer for CSWEP activities or share comments and suggestions. Also, follow us on Twitter @AEACSWEP to stay up to date with our events and initiatives. I wish you all the best for a productive year ahead.
Interview with Bell Award Winner
Martha J. Bailey

When I realized that I could use economics to think about contraception, childbearing, social policy, it was mind blowing for me.

Her care, rigor, transparency, and thoroughness have established the standard of what it looks like to combine economic history and economics of the family.

Beyond her research, Professor Bailey has performed an enormous amount of service for the profession, from editing the Journal of Labor Economics to serving on AEA’s Executive Committee to directing CSWEP’s CeMENT workshop. But perhaps most central to her award is her commitment to mentoring. In their nominating letters, her former students and colleagues highlight how her warmth and encouragement made them want to become economists or helped them through the rough patches that could have pushed them out of the profession. They describe how she invests deeply in giving constructive advice about research and the publication process, about the “hidden curriculum” of economics, and about the kinds of issues that can be hard to broach with male mentors such as fertility, child rearing, and harassment. And they emphasize how she goes out of her way to find doors to open for her many mentees.

The letter-writers describe Professor Bailey as a “fierce advocate,” a “force for women in economics,” and “undeniably a powerhouse.” She is a “force of nature” with “seemingly boundless energy focused on improving the lives of women, especially junior women, in the economics profession.” Our group of twelve nominators “cannot think of a candidate who better represents the values” or “better exemplifies all the criteria put forth by the Carolyn Shaw Bell award,” and we are thrilled to congratulate her for winning the 2023 award.

Martha J. Bailey

Sara Heller

Martha J. Bailey is the recipient of the 2023 Carolyn Shaw Bell award, given annually to an individual who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, through example, achievements, increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the economics profession, or mentoring others.

Professor Bailey spent much of her career at the University of Michigan before moving to the University of California-Los Angeles. Her scholarship artfully uses historical data to shed light on how technological advancement in contraception and changes to the social safety net affect women’s economic and social outcomes. In addition to her well-known work on the War on Poverty and the minimum wage, she has also studied how access to contraception and family planning affects women’s fertility and the gender earnings gap.
Bell Award Winner

Your research spans a wide range of topics—fertility, education, labor markets, and poverty—and your papers straddle a number of different disciplines—demography, history, computer science, and health. Given this breadth of interests, what is it about economics that made you choose it as your home discipline?

I always have loved the rigor and systematic thinking that economics brings to studying hard problems. Economics provides a framework and a toolkit to understand just about everything. When I realized that I could use economics to think about contraception, childbearing, social policy, it was mind blowing for me. I still get excited to teach it to my undergraduates and share it with my Ph.D. students—it really never gets boring.

In putting your nomination for this award together, I learned that basically every female economist with whom you’ve interacted finds you an incredibly inspiring force of nature. But when you first found out you had won, you seem genuinely shocked anyone would even have nominated you. Why were you so surprised, and is there any lesson for the rest of us in the disconnect between your perception and other people’s perceptions?

I was really surprised. There are so many amazing women who have done incredible research, served as mentors to so many of us, who have not yet won this award. So winning this award was a really unexpected and very big honor. Looking back to the time when I started as an assistant professor, there has been so much progress for women in economics. When I started, well-meaning people told us to put off having kids until we got tenure. Now, we throw baby showers for our colleagues. They told me not to work on “girly topics” like contraception, but now there are entire AEA sessions devoted to this. And there is increasingly a collective language to describe the sometimes subtle sexism that affects us. It is incredibly cool to have been part of that sea change, but also hard to point to any one thing and say “I did that.” It’s also so easy to think about all of the things I wish I had done but didn’t manage. If I learned anything from the incredibly moving comments all of you [nominators] made, it is that the small things we do for each matter a lot—paying attention, kindness, and sometimes a little bit of fearlessness.

The public conversation about working in economics is often focused on the challenges we really need to address. But let me start with the flipside, which I think we should talk about more: What is your favorite part of your job, and why?

I love almost every part of the job. I love the detective work of research—using data to uncover the stories of how the world works and how our choices have shaped the world. I love teaching—I know this is nerdy, but it is an absolute thrill to be in the classroom going through the basics. I’ll admit that I don’t mind some of the service—the things we do at universities really matter to our students lives and to policy discussions. This is an amazing job that really makes a difference.

And now thinking about the challenges, what feasible change or changes do you think would most improve the profession?

Economists are so good at so many things, but the profession could really use some humility and compassion. I think we’d benefit from opening our minds more to the things our models miss, to new ideas that challenge the orthodoxy, and to different voices, which also relates to encouraging more and different types of people to become economists.

Your success across research, teaching, and professional service makes it seem like you have infinite time. But time constraints must bind—how do you decide where you put your energy?

I never feel like there is enough time. I don’t always succeed, but I try to put my energy into things that give me joy—teaching, research, service that makes a difference. These things take energy but they give me a lot back. I think everyone gets energy from different things, so focusing on what charges you up is a great guide to feeding yourself and enjoying this job to the fullest.

The perception of non-stop pressure and workload is one of the things that can turn young people off of academia. Do you have leisure time? How do you spend it?

I spend a lot of time with my kids. I love to cook, which means I spend a lot of my leisure time reading about and sourcing food. I love to read and listen to music. Moving to LA means I get to see a lot more shows and theater. Injuries mean I have given up running, but I have recently gotten into yoga. I also enjoy spending time with my dog.

What’s the best piece of advice you’ve ever gotten?

I got this advice as a mentee at CeMent many years ago: If everyone in your life is happy, you are probably not yourself. The advice encouraged me to be OK with disappointing other people, especially when this is important to take care of myself.
Interview with Bennett Award Winner
Rebecca Diamond

I took an economics class my freshman year mostly due to my dad saying, “You’re taking a pretty hard math and science load. Maybe an econ class would balance it out, because it might not be too much work.” It turned out I loved that class. I ended up getting a summer job with Professor Joe Altonji at Yale. I got the job because my micro theory professor, Don Brown, was in the same lunch line as Joe, and I had done well in his theory class, so somehow I got a job as a labor economics RA. I hadn’t even taken econometrics. I had never worked with data, and that summer totally changed my perspective. My interest in economics went from solving problem sets and going to classes to intrinsically wanting to work on the weekends and think about data and how it relates to real world policy. That put me on a different track of just focusing on economics.

That sounds amazing, the accidental entry into this profession. So let’s continue, and one more personal question. One thing we all face, women and men, is how to organize our family life as we proceed into a pretty serious tenure track world. So in that note, would you talk about your children with your relationship with the tenure issue?

Yeah, so I had my first child my fourth year here. I was still an assistant professor. And honestly, I didn’t quite realize how much work kids were going to be. It can really change your priorities in using your time, and it definitely did mine. But at the same time, if you’re very thoughtful in how you spend all your minutes in the day, and how you spend your money, then it can be incredibly fulfilling to both be a parent of a young kid and still take your job really seriously. We just basically put all our resources into our kid.
My wife was also very supportive, and during the year and a half or so right before tenure, she was definitely doing more than her fair share of the childcare because I was just traveling a bunch. But the first year and a half of our kid’s life, it was pretty 50/50. We quickly learned to spend resources on outsourcing all parts of home production that are not about spending time with your kid. Time becomes very precious and allocating it to quality work and family time is very important. It can seem so expensive, we saved no money, but at the same time it pays off in the long run because little kids are only little for a short time and your costs go down in terms of all these extra support angles. My wife also has a very demanding job. She runs a cancer research lab, so it’s not like one of us was just a stay at home parent. You stop spending time on extra stuff. We felt very fulfilled in being able to take our jobs really seriously and have a kid.

All right. Turning, in fact, to your research, you’re well known for areas of the urban economics and housing. How did that work begin?

I think this is true for a lot of graduate students, that you’re not quite sure where you’re going to end up, and that is how I ended up in urban and housing. Honestly, a lot of it is due to my advisors. I had three amazing advisors at Harvard, Larry Katz, Ed Glaeser, and Ariel Pakes. All three of them had very different perspectives on what they thought made good research and which types of papers they would teach in their classes. It was a little bit of a mixed bag to try to learn from these three different people, because they would say things that would push you in opposite directions. But I ended up in urban I think because I was initially interested in labor economics, and I was sitting in Larry Katz’s course and he had a couple of lectures on local labor economics, which I just found intrinsically interesting.

And it seemed like you could answer a lot more equilibrium type phenomena in the labor market by looking across cities and across space, whereas when you look at the nationwide labor market, you don’t have as much data and variation, so I found that particularly interesting. I had also been taking IO from Ariel Pakes, and he was teaching a lot of structural estimation techniques. I had to write a labor term paper and I was trying to think about whether there a space where I could take some of these tools I was learning in IO and do something useful, or maybe not even useful, just something coherent on one of these labor topics, which had usually used a very different estimation approach. And the local labor economics and location choice area seemed a place where things like models developed to estimate product demand might be useful to say something about households choosing cities and city demand. And then it just spiraled from there.

Well, that’s quite a start. So to continue, to illuminate more in more detail, would you mind describing your two favorite papers and what makes them your favorites?

My job market paper, which was born out of the discussion we just had, is one of them. My job market paper, which was looking at the well-known fact, particularly studied by Enrico Moretti, that there was this spatial divergence of college graduate workers moving to increasingly high wage, high cost cities from the ‘80s and through the 2000s, while less educated workers were disproportionately clustering in more affordable, lower wage places. I was trying to think about what the implications of that spatial sorting were for inequality. So there’s a very large literature thinking about the causes of this nationwide increase in wage inequality between these two groups, and a lot of that has to do with technological change and its interaction with skill. But what was less clear was how to think about how these workers are actually in different places at different times, and they’re facing different local costs, and how changes our interpretation a nationwide increase in wage inequality. If everyone who earns a high wage lives in an expensive place, from a consumption perspective, maybe they’re not actually that much more unequal.

Or it could be that those high-skill cities, even though wages are higher and costs are higher, maybe the amenities are higher too. You get all this additional utility from living in a place with clean air or low crime, and maybe if you think about the full bundle of how a city changes your utility, it could be that wage inequality is understating broader inequality. So that question had been posed in the literature, but that got me thinking a lot about how could you quantitatively disentangle those effects.

One of the benefits of grad school is you have so much time to think about everything. You don’t have all these other demands in your time that you have as a professor. You can just sit and think about the same problem all day every day for years, basically. And I spent a lot of time doing that. This paper is one of my favorites because there are so many angles of it that I was able to think about. It’s not all in the published paper, but it taught me how to build a model to be able to quantitatively answer the research question and how to estimate the model and how to think about its implications for different types of counterfactuals. Just going through that process and building up that toolkit laid the groundwork for my ability to pick good topics, modeling choices, and data for my future work.

My second favorite paper is my paper on rent control with Tim McQuade and Franklin Qian. Rent control is one of the oldest econ 101 topics where you write down a supply curve and a demand curve, and you
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there’s a ceiling on prices, and you do your little consumer surplus, producer surplus, and deadweight loss calculation, and we all talk about how bad rent control is for distorting prices. I remember talking with Tim early on thinking that just doesn’t seem to get at what affordable housing advocates talk about when they advocate for rent control. They describe this need for rent control to prevent people getting displaced from communities that they’re invested in, and that outside of the standard econ 101 framework.

I remember I was prepping my Ph.D. course and I was reading some history of San Francisco housing policy, and I learned about this law change in the mid-90s where San Francisco expanded their rent control to small multi-family apartment buildings built prior to 1979, which seemed like a very nice natural experiment. We have this arbitrary threshold, the year 1979. And suddenly, in the mid-90s, those older apartments get covered by rent control, and very similar ones, slightly newer ones that were already renter occupied, didn’t. This seemed like great variation, but we had no data to track what happened. We needed to know where people lived in the mid-90s in San Francisco and track them over time, and study where they moved. So the idea sat in the back of our brains for a while, because we had no idea how to get data. We attempted to digitize phone books. We went to the San Francisco Public Library and scanned a bunch of phone books, but it didn’t really go anywhere. It was just too messy.

And then we cold emailed a bunch of companies on the internet, of those companies that tried to advertise that they know your information about you. We found this company which had a much more regular looking website called Infutor, and we cold emailed them asking if they have information about where people lived in the mid-90s. It turned out they did.

Well, those are two amazing papers. With these papers in mind, and certainly your future papers, where do your ideas come from? They sound like policy papers, but where do your ideas come from?

I always have more ideas than I can implement. The initial idea for the rent control paper was in the back of my head in different versions for a long time. Just reading the newspaper and talking to people and looking at what’s going on in the Bay Area motivates a lot of my research. But having a bunch of ideas in the back of your head, you don’t always know how to approach them with a research design. And then as you learn about new data sets or you talk to new potential collaborators, sometimes you add a little spark of how to make progress on a question that you’re interested in. But for the most part, I usually try to have the question first, and then try to find the modeling or data angle second. Not always, but that leads to more impactful papers. Sometimes it’s tempting, particularly as a grad student, to try to read the literature and think about what this specific paper hasn’t done and then try to do that.

Sometimes you could make incremental progress there, but it doesn’t necessarily make the same impact, because where we’ve made progress are those papers, and where we haven’t made progress are the things that are often debated in the press.
Yeah. You’re right. I mean, thinking about what’s out there, big ticket items get you further, I think many people have said, than looking for gaps in literature. We’ve already talked about how you combine a lot of data sets and how you seek these data sets, but this is increasingly the norm for top papers. So why do you feel a need for multiple data sets? And if you want, say a few more words about how you pull that off.

I have a high tolerance for willingness to scour the internet for a long time to try to find these unusual data sets, so I’ve spent a lot of time just combing the web. A lot of that time doesn’t pay off, but that was how I found the Infutor data set, and that was a backbone to a lot of other data sets that we created by linking it to other data sources. Linking Infutor to deeds and property tax records tells you a lot about what’s going on in the housing market. We’ve linked it to patents, so we knew a lot about inventors and we are also able to use that data to infer whether one is an immigrant, and study how immigrant versus US-born inventors differed in terms of their productivity and life cycle. Once you find something new, and then to the extent that you can combine it with existing data sets by linking it together on common information can be a powerful way to create new data sets. That’s what a lot of my stuff that’s in progress is doing is linking together a number of different private sector data sets.

Proceeding on, like most papers today you have a lot of co-authors on your papers. How do you initiate or begin papers with them, and how does the teamwork proceed going forward?

I think picking complimentary or good co-authors is super important, and you don’t always know who’s going to be the best co-author ahead of time. The co-author I’ve worked the most with is Tim McQuade, and he and I, we have very complimentary skillsets, which has been incredibly productive. He also was here at Stanford for many years, and I personally work a lot better face-to-face on getting the modeling figured out. Working on Zoom can work for very concrete progress, but having Tim here and across the hall made us both incredibly productive.

Thinking about data again, nowadays it’s very tempting to see a data set and think I’ll grab it and I’ll come up with an idea later. Have you done that, and what do you think of that approach?

So I have a couple papers that actually do fit that, but they were much harder papers to write, and I personally find it very hard to reverse engineer the big ticket impactful question from the data. My Uber paper on the gender wage gap in Uber drivers actually fits this. Paul Oyer and I had met with some Uber people and they were interested and watched us to pitch them an idea. And I remember Paul and I spent hours just brainstorming. It took a long time to convince ourselves that there was something that we wanted to do that was worthwhile and a big-ticket question. We settled on studying the gender wage gap in Uber drivers because it was a formulaic pay scheme, which ruled out a lot of theories of gender wage gaps. Since pay was based on a known formula, with all inputs observed, we could fully decompose the channels through which there was a gender wage gap.

Right. Exactly. All right, so let’s conclude by returning to your main research areas. Do you have any comments about the growth of the fields or where they’re going?

I’m super bullish on urban economics. It has been exploding in terms of papers and interest, which I think is great. It is a field that isn’t one of these standard fields that every department always makes sure they hire in. But despite that, so many fields have a spatial angle now, and there’s just so many more papers taking that seriously, maybe because data has gotten more granular, and you can see all this geographic heterogeneity much more easily. Trade, macro, labor, public finance, and IO all have non-trivial chunks of papers focused on their intersection with housing and urban economic questions, which is super exciting. I really like the multidisciplinary approach, because all of these different fields have different methods and toolkits to approach these questions.
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Introduction

Since its founding as a standing committee of the American Economic Association in 1971, the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) has served women economists by promoting their careers and monitoring their progress through the profession. CSWEP’s has a myriad of regular activities. In 1972, CSWEP conducted the first survey of economics departments regarding the gender composition of faculty and, since 1993, surveys approximately 250 departments annually with findings reported in the American Economic Association: Papers & Proceedings and reprinted in the CSWEP Annual Report. CSWEP organizes mentoring programs that serve several hundred economists annually. These include our flagship CeMENT Mentoring Workshops for junior women, shown in randomized control trial studies to improve performance metrics. CSWEP also offers a CeMENT workshop designed for faculty in Ph.D.-granting institutions or research-oriented non-academic positions and a second for faculty in non-Ph.D.-granting institutions. At the annual AEA/ASSA Meetings, we typically host three Mentoring Breakfasts and additional career development roundtables and panel discussions. These were held virtually in 2022. CSWEP also hosts career development panels and mentoring events at each of the four regional economics association meetings. In 2022, these were a mix of virtual and in-person events.

CSWEP provides professional opportunities to junior women through competitive entry paper sessions at the Annual AEA/ASSA Meetings and the regional economic association meetings. CSWEP also endeavors to raise awareness among men and women of the challenges unique to women’s careers in economics and best practices for increasing diversity in economics. To recognize and celebrate the accomplishments of women, CSWEP awards the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award annually for furthering the status of women in the economics profession and the Elaine Bennett Prize biennially for fundamental contributions to economics by a woman within seven years of the Ph.D., adjusted for leaves.

CSWEP disseminates information on women in economics, professional opportunities, and career development through the CSWEP website and the CSWEP News (which successfully moved from 3 annual issues to 4 in 2020). The CSWEP News articles offer valuable career development advice for men and women, and subscriptions have grown to over 3600 subscribers. Our website provides and tracks resources for women economists and economists seeking to create a more inclusive profession.

During 2022, we continued many initiatives launched in 2020 and 2021. First, we hosted several career development webinars, including our extremely popular “Fireside Chats: Publishing in Finance Journals” series, launched in 2020. Following last year’s mentoring event for graduate students, we hosted two graduate student mentoring workshops.

Amanda Agan, Vellore Arthi, Marianne Bitler, Rowena Gray, Erin Hengel, Elaine Hill, Bhagyashree Katare, Maya Rossin-Slater, Carolyn Sloane, Jenna Stearns,
Lucy Xiaolu Wang, Sabrina Young organized the first one. It was held virtually, 120 women and nonbinary graduate student participants attended, and 35 mentors volunteered. The workshop focused on graduate students pursuing economics and economic-adjacent Ph.D. programs. The second, organized by Celeste Carruthers, Melanie Guldi, Catherine Maclean, and Orgul Ozturk, was held in person in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in association with the Southern Economics Association meetings. Thirty-four graduate student mentees and 14 mentors attended the session. We are pleased to report that CSWEP obtained a two-year travel grant (~$50,000) from the Sloan Foundation to fund mentee travel to increase participation, especially amongst graduate students whose home departments may lack such funds.

In addition to continuing our innovative and important networking initiatives, we held the second annual Econopalooza Summer Networking event. In June of 2022, we hosted seven individual meetings of economists divided by field over three days. Roughly seventy-six junior economists and 30 senior economists participated in this event.

The centerpiece of this Annual Report of CSWEP’s activities is the summary of the 2022 Annual Survey in Section IV. The CSWEP data are available to individual researchers via ICPSR.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows. Section II reports on the administration of CSWEP. Section III describes CSWEP activities. Associate Chair Margaret Levenstein of the University of Michigan directed the 2022 CSWEP Annual Survey, analyzed the results, and wrote the report on the status of women in the economics profession in Section IV. Appendix A lists the 2022 Board members.

CSWEP Administration

CSWEP Office

I, Anusha Chari of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, entered my first year as CSWEP chair. In September 2018, CSWEP began a new model of administration. CSWEP coordinates with the AEA’s Nashville office to house CSWEP’s Committee Coordinator rather than at the home institution of the Chair as had been done previously. In the summer of 2019, the Committee Coordinator for CSWEP undertook a similar role assisting CSMGEP. The Committee Coordinator divides their time between CSWEP duties, CSMGEP duties, and occasional tasks as needed for the Association. Rebekah Loftis assumed this role in December 2019.

A central goal of the staffing reorganization was to facilitate smoother and more efficient chair transitions. This year, we experienced a smooth transition when I stepped in as Chair. Similarly, a central goal of establishing the submission portals for CeMENT was to facilitate smoother and more efficient transitions of the CeMENT program directors. Martha Bailey stepped down as CeMENT program director following the 2022 program, and Lori Beaman from Northwestern University took over the role.

CSWEP Communications

The success of CSWEP programs depends on the ability to communicate broadly and effectively to members of the profession inside and outside academia. Our main communications tools are our subscriber email list, Twitter account, website, webinars, and newsletters.

Our subscriber list remains our primary form of communication. To receive communications from CSWEP, members of the profession must send an email to info@cswep.org. We currently have 3,681 subscribers. A subset of our subscribers are CSWEP Liaisons. The CSWEP Liaison Network (created in 2014)
recruits an individual at each institution who is willing to ensure that their department completes our annual survey and is ready to distribute CSWEP newsletters, announcements, and professional development opportunities to potentially interested individuals. Our goal was to recruit a tenured faculty liaison in every economics department, including, where appropriate, economics groups in business, public policy, and environmental schools. In 2019, we began an effort to establish a CSWEP liaison in every branch of government that employs Ph.D. economists and to appoint a liaison within each of the major foundations that conduct economic research.

We worked with the AEA office to improve our website and make it easier to navigate. We have also made a substantial effort to enhance the professional development resources available on our website. For example, we keep a list of conferences, workshops, and events focused on mentoring or professional development. We list resources for job-seekers, chairs looking to hire diverse talent, etc. on our website at https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/committees/cswep/programs/resources. Our website also archives recordings of our webinar series.

Our Twitter account, @AEACSWEP, was launched in 2017, and we have been tweeting prize announcements, calls for papers, and information about our board members since that time. Our Twitter account has been instrumental in building awareness of our webinar series and advertising our mentoring opportunities. We also use our Twitter account to flag non-CSWEP professional development resources of interest to our followers and point our followers to the more extensive resources available on our webpage. As of this writing, our Twitter followers totaled 7,505, more than doubled over the last two years.

CSWEP Activities in 2022

CSWEP and AEA Initiatives on Equity, Diversity, and Professional Climate

The CSWEP Board continues to support AEA efforts on Equity, Diversity, and Professional Climate. Past board member, Petra Moser from New York University, serves on the committee to design and confer the departmental diversity awards. Former CSWEP Chair Chevalier also serves on the AEA’s outreach committee. Our board continues to stand ready to assist the Executive Committee and Officers in diversity and inclusion efforts that the AEA may launch, including hosting a joint panel at the ASSA meetings on exploring new frontiers in diversity and inclusion with CSQIEP.

Mentoring Programs

The effective mentoring of women economists is central to CSWEP’s mission. Our CeMENT Mentoring Workshops are a crucial part of this endeavor. The CSWEP Mentoring breakfasts at the AEA/ASSA meetings (virtual in 2022), mentoring events at five regional economic association meetings, our graduate student mentoring workshops, and our new Econopalooza initiative are all critical components of our mentoring work. CSWEP also coordinates the AEA Summer Fellows Program, which provides mentoring and research support for Ph.D. students and junior faculty.

CeMENT Mentoring Workshop for Faculty in Doctoral Programs and CeMENT Mentoring Workshop for Faculty in Non-Doctoral Programs.

Our CeMENT Mentoring workshops are the cornerstone of CSWEP’s mentoring efforts. Evidence from a randomized controlled trial shows that the workshop is effective in helping junior scholars earn tenure.1

Responding to the enormous demand for our mentoring workshops, CSWEP increased the number of

---

mentees accommodated in our workshops for Faculty in Doctoral Programs and for Faculty in Non-doctoral Programs. In early 2020, we also received permission from the Executive Committee to increase the frequency of our workshops devoted to faculty in non-doctoral programs from every other year to an annual cadence. In 2021, the Executive Committee approved funding for both workshops through January 2026. Both programs were held virtually in 2021 and 2022. The workshops will continue immediately following the AEA meetings in January 2023.

The 2022 CeMENT Mentoring Workshop for Faculty in Doctoral Programs was held virtually after the ASSA meetings on January 10–12, 2022. The workshop consisted of large panel discussions on career development topics, smaller breakout sessions, and small group mentoring sessions that paired junior mentees with senior mentors in their fields (see agenda appended). The smaller groups had four to five junior economists with similar research interests.

Based on informal and formal feedback we received, the workshop was a great success. The evaluations were comparable to last year (6.65 vs. 6.63) when the workshop was remote and slightly better than two years ago when the workshop was in person (6.65 vs. 6.53) (on a scale of 1-7 where 1 is “not at all helpful” and 7 is “extremely helpful”). The average mentor rating of the workshop was 6.82 (vs. 6.65 last year and 6.56 two years ago). Among all of the sessions, junior participants rated the “Getting Tenure” and “Getting Published” panels the most valuable, with the average rating of 6.54 and 6.33, respectively (vs. 6.56 and 6.47 last year and 5.98 and 5.96 two years ago)—“Getting Published” was co-hosted with the non-doctoral program.

In keeping with past practice, junior participants submitted applications starting June 2021 with a deadline of August 15, 2021. AEA built the centralized application portal for both doctoral and non-doctoral workshops. We received 90 applications in total, 62 of which were considered and reviewed as doctoral workshop applications—a smaller than usual number, likely because the workshop was virtual or because the COVID pandemic has made it difficult for many to create the time required to participate. Two mentees withdrew their applications. We created a pool of eligible applicants who have or will soon start a tenure-track job in a department offering a doctoral degree or research institution with comparable requirements for career success. These criteria created a pool of 43 individuals, three of whom had deferred their attendance from January 2021. Among 40 individuals, 13 in the control group and randomized out of participation in previous years received priority. The applicants were sorted into groups based on research areas (Development, Environmental, Health, Labor, Macro, and Public Finance) and randomly assigned within the area. Martha Bailey, CeMENT director randomized the applications. We initially offered spots to 38 applicants, and one deferred their attendance to next year (January 2023). We then offered the vacated spot to one applicant on the waitlist. One rejected attendance. We also deferred spots for two randomized applicants whose research area did not closely overlap with mentors in their fields. Thirty-seven junior participants were matched with 16 senior economists by field for the workshop. Below is some feedback from junior participants.

I would appreciate it if CSWEP organizes a follow-up in-person CeMENT gathering for us in the future when AEA resumes in-person meetings since I like an in-person format. Thank you so much for organizing! It was a wonderful experience. Getting written comments on our papers would be very helpful.

What a bunch of awesome, smart, generous, kind mentors and mentees!! We are SO HAPPY that CEMENT exists and it should 100% continue. It does so much to help women/minorities in the profession, and more than anything it was amazing to look at a sea of allies on the screen and suddenly not feel as isolated or alone.
Thank you so much for organizing this amazing event and thanks all the mentors who gave so much good advice! If I tenure successfully, I will definitely come back and be a mentor myself!!

Thank you to the organizers and funder for an awesome workshop! It means a lot to me.

THANK YOU so much for the hard work organizing, keeping us on schedule, and finding excellent mentors! It’s fantastic to connect with others, especially in these isolating times.

I can't thank you and all the mentors and volunteers enough! This workshop was a turning point in my career. Thank you! You are awesome!

I loved this workshop! It feels very isolating to go from grad school and having formal advisors to having to seem confident and independent. This was a wonderful way to get a bit of advice and feel like I could ask for support again. Thank you! Words are not enough—this was a life changing experience.

Thank you so much for organizing, and thank you to the mentors for volunteering their time!

I really enjoyed getting to know the mentors and mentees in my group session and everyone was so supportive and encouraging. While I think it makes sense to organize groups by topic, I felt like one of the mentors discounted me because I’m in a policy/multidisciplinary department (not econ department). Maybe it would be helpful to have a group of people from more policy/multidisciplinary departments, but the tradeoff would be less subject expertise and I did find the subject expertise to be helpful.

This was fantastic. Thank you so much! Only thank you so much to the organizers!

Thank you very much to everyone who contributed to organizing and running this workshop! I am extremely grateful to have had the opportunity to attend and am starting the year 2022 with a much clearer mindset and a big mental health boost!

This workshop was all I needed and more! It went above and beyond my expectations—which were already high. It gave me the push I needed to start the semester. I have high hopes that this workshop will be career (and life) changing for me. I am very thankful for this opportunity.

It was an amazing experience, thank you Martha, Gwyn and all the mentors for your time.

This was such an amazing workshop, thank you so much for doing this! After starting my job during a pandemic, this gave me such a confidence boost that I really need it.

Thanks so much for organizing the workshop! It was really helpful and I would recommend it to anyone!

It was a great workshop. I would recommend this to any junior faculty.

Great workshops! Would have loved the opportunity to know more about other mentees apart from those in my groups.

It is lovely! Amazing to be guided by other women.

Thank you so much for the hard work spent putting this together. It was a really nice workshop and the hard work was evident.

Thank you to CeMENT Mentors!

CSWEP says thank you to the following individuals who served as mentors during the 2023 CeMENT Mentoring Workshops, which followed the 2023 AEA/ASSA annual meetings. We thank you for your generous gift of time and expertise to all of our 2023 mentees.

**Mentors for the CeMENT Workshop for Doctoral Program Faculty**
- Ashley Swanson, University of Wisconsin
- Galina Vereshchagina, Arizona State University
- Gopi Shah Goda, Stanford University
- Jenny Aker, Tufts University
- Jessie Handbury, University of Pennsylvania
- Jillian Carr, Purdue University
- Kinda Hachem, University of Virginia
- Leila Agha, Harvard University
- Maria Fitzpatrick, Cornell University
- Mariana Carrera, Montana State University
- Meta Brown, Ohio State University
- Molly Lipscomb, University of Virginia
- Silke Forbes, Tufts University
- Tatiana Homonoff, New York University

**Mentors for the CeMENT Workshop for Non-Doctoral Program Faculty**
- Cynthia Bansak, St. Lawrence University
- Moriah Bostian, Lewis and Clark College
- Tanya Byker, Middlebury College
- Teresa Harrison, Drexel College
- Jessica Hoel, Colorado College
- Jen Mellor, William and Mary College
- Julie Smith, Lafayette College
- Marketa Wolfe, Skidmore College
The CeMENT workshop for faculty at institutions that do not offer a Ph.D. in Economics was also held online on January 10–12, 2022. The workshop is designed to support faculty who are at institutions that emphasize both research and undergraduate teaching. Participants at the 2022 workshop received advice about publishing, grant writing, teaching, networking, the tenure process, goal setting, and achieving a work/life balance. Small group sessions allowed each participant to receive detailed feedback on research papers. Overall, the workshop rating was “extremely helpful,” with a mean overall rating of 6.7/7 (1 being “not at all helpful” and 7 being “extremely helpful”). Many participants commented on the support they received and the usefulness of the network that they started at the workshop. Below are some quotes from the participants:

**Thank you for all the work put into this! I really feel so grateful to have been a part of it and I really, really enjoyed my experience and gained soooo much!!!!**

Despite the craziness that came from the workshop being online, I truly enjoyed every session and learned so much. I want to thank everyone who made this workshop possible —you’ve certainly made a significant change on my career and life!

This workshop was a great experience and I’m so glad I attended! Thank you to everyone involved in organizing CeMENT!

Thank you so much! I am really grateful to have been able to participate and got a lot out of the workshop! LOVED it. Thanks to everyone involved for organizing it!

For the 2023 workshop, Lori Beaman of Northwestern University will begin her directorship of the program for faculty in Ph.D.-granting institutions (and for researchers outside academia with similar research expectations). Jessica Holmes of Middlebury College will continue as director of the program for faculty from institutions that do not grant Ph.D.s. In 2021, we announced that the 2022 workshop would be virtual; we made this announcement before receiving applications. The 2021 applications for the 2022 workshop represent the first time in recent years that we have seen a substantial drop-off in applications. We received 62 applications from faculty in Ph.D.-granting institutions and 28 from faculty in non-Ph.D.-granting institutions. We informally received feedback that junior faculty were very reluctant to participate virtually (despite the high ratings from the 2021 session) due to general fatigue with virtual events. We also informally received feedback that the late timing of the program (following later-than-typical meetings) made the workshop impossible for economists who had to return to teaching obligations.

### Mentoring “Breakfasts” for Junior Economists

CSWEP held a virtual mentoring event for junior economists during the AEA meetings in place of our typical mentoring breakfasts. This event was organized by Kasey Buckles of Notre Dame and Anusha Chari of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, at the time serving as Associate Chair and Director of Mentoring. Approximately 148 junior economists participated in the breakfasts. Sixty-one senior mentors staffed topics tables on Research/Publishing, Teaching, Tenure/Promotion, Non-Academic Careers/Grant-Writing, Work/Life Balance, Job Market, Networking, and Getting Involved in Policy.

Junior participants rotated between the virtual tables at 20-minute intervals based on their interests and research fields. The median rating was 90 out of 100 in a post-event survey of participants.

### Peer Mentoring Breakfast for Mid-Career Economists

CSWEP held a virtual mentoring event for mid-career economists during the AEA meeting in place of our typical Mid-Career mentoring breakfasts. Petra Moser of New York University organized this event at the University of Chicago.
2022 ASSA meetings. Approximately 30 mid-career women attended the event with 12 senior mentors. The breakfast was devoted to informal discussions within 12 breakout rooms using Zoom. Each breakout room consisted of 2–4 mid-career participants and one senior mentor who moderated the discussions about promotion to full professor, whether to accept administrative roles, managing research time, work/life balance, career transitions, and negotiating with department and university administrators.

**AEA Summer Economics Fellows Program**

The AEA Summer Economics Fellows Program began in 2006 with National Science Foundation (NSF) funding. Designed and administered by a joint AEA-CSMGEPC-SWEP committee, the program aims to enhance the careers of underrepresented minorities and women during their years as senior graduate students or junior faculty members.

Fellowships vary from one institution to the next. In general, senior economists mentor the fellows for two months, and fellows, in turn, work on their research and have a valuable opportunity to present it. The sponsoring institutions are predominantly government agencies. Many fellows have reported this experience as a career-changing event.

Dan Newlon directs the summer fellows program. Our Committee Coordinator manages incoming applications. Two members of our board (Anna Paulson and Shahina Amin) were a part of the committee to assess applicants.\(^2\) 2022 was an outstanding year for the AEA Economics Summer Fellows Program, despite the pandemic-related freeze on hiring by some government agencies that have previously hired fellows.

Twenty-five fellows were hired this year, representing an almost 50% increase from the 17 fellows hired last year. The number of applications also increased from 105 applications last year to 159 applications this year. Unfortunately, none of the hires were from underrepresented minority groups, which is incredibly disappointing since last year, there were five minority hires. The number of minority applications slumped from 17 last year to 10 this year, which was probably a significant reason for no minority hires. The overall success rate was 16%, the success rate for female applicants was 20%, and the success rate for minority applicants was 0%.

**Workshops for Graduate Students**

The first workshop, organized by Amanda Agan, Vellore Arthi, Marianne Bitler, Rowena Gray, Erin Hengel, Elaine Hill, Bhagyashree Katare, Maya Rossin-Slater, Carolyn Sloane, Jenna Stearns, Lucy Xiaolu Wang, Sabrina Young, was held virtually on September 30, 2022. In most economics and economics-adjacent Ph.D. programs, students will have completed their coursework and chosen their fields by the end of their second year. Students then face the daunting and exciting task of conducting independent research, sometimes for the first time in their lives. Students can feel overwhelmed and lost at this juncture in their studies and may not always have access to support and resources to help them navigate graduate school successfully and make the most out of their Ph.D. experience. They may therefore miss out on valuable “hidden curriculum” information and feel unsupported. The goal of this workshop was to address this need. Given the workshop’s virtual nature and the volunteer mentors’ willingness, we could accept all 134 women and nonbinary graduate student participants who applied. There were 54 volunteer-mentors.

Celeste Carruthers, Melanie Guldi, Catherine Maclean, and Orgul Ozturk organized and hosted the second workshop in association with the Southern Economics Association meetings in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. This workshop was held in person on November 18, 2022. Organizers divided participants into small groups based on shared research interests and matched them with two mentors. Mentors were women/non-binary economists in the early stages of their careers.

\(^2\) Many thanks to the 2022 committee for screening and matching fellows to sponsors: Daniel Newlon the past AEA (chair), CSWEP Board member Anna Paulson of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, CSWEP Board member Shahina Amin of University of Northern Iowa, Lucia Foster of the Center for Economic Studies at the U.S. Bureau of the Census, CSMGEP board member Perry Singleton of Syracuse University, and finally, CSMGEP board member Neil Ericsson of the Federal Reserve Board. More information on the AEA Fellows Program is available at https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/committees/summer-fellows-program
careers—assistant and associate professors in economics and other departments, as well as those employed outside academia (e.g., research think tanks, government positions). The workshop focused on various issues, including generating research ideas, finding advisors, collaborating and co-authorship, finding opportunities to present research and get feedback, networking, and work-life balance. We accepted 35 mentees out of the overall 115 applicants who all attended and were paired with 14 mentors.

**Econopalooza**

Throughout 2020 and early 2021, CSWEP noticed a recurring concern from the participants in our mentoring events—a lack of opportunities to meet others in one’s field during the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, CSWEP organized a virtual networking event in the summer of 2021 called “Econopalooza.” The event, organized by board member Kasey Buckles, and held June 14–16, 2022 consisted of seven field-specific sessions featuring breakout rooms, each breakout group led by a senior facilitator. Each junior researcher prepared a one-minute “elevator pitch” to introduce themselves and their research.

The event’s goal was to provide a low-time-commitment opportunity for individuals to meet others in their field. As we wrote in the instructions, “the event will be a success if it facilitates any new connections, for example (1) one person in your group follows up with another about an idea or data after the event (2) one person adds another person to a seminar invitation list (3) one person thinks of another person when organizing a session to submit to a conference (4) one person in your group seeks out another at a subsequent in-person or virtual conference break to talk about work.” Overall, we had 30 senior facilitators participate and 76 junior participants. We solicited feedback from both the senior facilitators and the junior participants. When asked if this virtual event should continue even after in-person events resume, 75% of respondents replied that it should continue.

**Professional Development Webinar**

After the 2022 AEA meetings, on January 28, 2022, CSWEP co-hosted with CSMGEP, CEE, and CSQIEP a panel discussion entitled “Helping Graduate Students Get into Economics Graduate School.” Organized by Dick Startz, the panelists consisted of John List, University of Chicago; James Peoples, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Nancy Rose, MIT; Sandile Hlatshwayo, International Monetary Fund; and Dick Startz, University of California–Santa Barbara. After presentations, panelists split into individual breakout rooms to take questions from the audience. Overall, 140 people attended the webinar.

We also continued our successful “Fireside Chats: Publishing in Finance Journals” series, organized by CSWEP and co-sponsored by AFFECT, in the spring of 2022. We hosted five interviews with the JFQA (Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis) editor, the editors from the Review of Asset Pricing Studies, the Review of Corporate Finance Studies, the Review of Finance journals, and the editor of Management Science. All in all, 333 people attended our fireside chat webinar series from a diverse set of institutions.

**Awards**

**Carolyn Shaw Bell Award**

The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award is given annually to an individual who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession through example, achievements, increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the economics profession, or mentoring others. The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award was created in January 1998 as part of the 25th Anniversary celebration of the founding of CSWEP. Martha Bailey, Professor in the Department of Economics, and affiliate at the California Center for Population Research at the University
of California–Los Angeles, is the 2022 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award recipient.

Professor Bailey also serves as a Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, CEPR, CESifo, and IZA. Her research focuses on labor economics, demography, and health issues in the United States within the long-run perspective of economic history. Her work has examined the implications of the diffusion of modern contraception for women’s childbearing, career decisions, and the convergence in the gender gap. Recent projects focus on the 1960s, including evaluations of the shorter and longer-term consequences of War on Poverty programs and the labor-market effects of equal pay legislation in the United States. She directs the LIFE-M project, which links millions of vital records with census data for the early 20th-century United States.

Her work has appeared in the American Economic Review and Quarterly Journal of Economics. The National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, the Laura and John Arnold Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Russell Sage Foundation have funded her research. She has also won several awards for outstanding teaching, including the 2017 John Dewey Teaching Award at the University of Michigan and the 2022 Berck and Lisa Cheng Award at UCLA. She currently serves as an editor at the Journal of Labor Economics and on the American Economic Review editorial board.

Elaine Bennett Research Prize
CSWEP awards the Elaine Bennett Research Prize every other year to recognize, support, and encourage outstanding contributions by young women in economics. The first Elaine Bennett Research Prize was awarded in 1998. Rebecca Diamond, Professor of Economics at Stanford Graduate School of Business, is the recipient of the 2022 Elaine Bennett Research Prize. Established in 1998, the Elaine Bennett Research Prize recognizes and honors outstanding research in any field of economics by a woman not more than seven years beyond her Ph.D. (adjusted for personal leaves). Her research focuses on the causes and consequences of housing regulations, geographic segregation of households, and local labor market inequality. Her housing policy work has quantified the effects of rent control on renters, the impact of foreclosure on homeowners, renters, and landlords, and how affordable housing developments act as place-based policies. Her work on labor inequality has studied the importance of on-the-job experience in explaining the gender wage gap and how skill-biased local labor demand changes can induce local amenity changes and widen inequality over and above wage inequality. Her methods combine causal inference with structural models to quantify the distribution of welfare effects.

Professor Diamond is the founder and director of the Cities, Housing, and Society Lab and received a Sloan Fellowship and an NSF CAREER grant in 2019. She is currently a Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research. She received her Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University in 2013 and her B.S. in Physics, Economics, and Mathematics from Yale University in 2007.

CSWEP’s Presence at the Annual Association Meetings and Regional Economic Association Meetings

The 2022 American Economic Association Meeting
In addition to mentoring activities, the presentation of the Annual Report, and the presentation of awards, CSWEP sponsored seven competitive-entry paper sessions at the virtual AEA/ASSA Meetings. For the 2022 meetings, Jonathon Guryan of Northwestern University, Petra Moser of New York University, and Marta Murray of the Census Bureau organized four sessions on the economics of gender, including one on gender in the economics profession. Terry-Ann Craigie of Smith
College, Jesse Rothstein of the University of California, Berkeley, and Delia Furtado of the University of Connecticut organized one session on labor economics. Kate Silz-Carson of the U.S. Air Force Academy, Austan Goolsbee of the University of Chicago, and Eva de Francisco from the Bureau of Economic Analysis organized two sessions on public economics. These committees selected six papers for publication in two pseudo-sessions in the AEA: P&P. For consideration in these sessions, papers must have at least one junior author, and in the non-gender-related sessions, at least one author must be a junior woman.

The submissions process for these sessions is highly competitive—there were 126 abstract submissions for the 2022 sessions. Women consistently report that these sessions, which put their research before a broad audience, are professionally valuable.

Five 2022 Regional Economic Association Meetings
CSWEP maintains a strong presence at all four Regional Economic Association Meetings and, through our D.C. rep, intends to have a presence at the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management annual conference. Our pre-pandemic practice was to host a networking breakfast or lunch, paper sessions, and career development panels at the regional meetings. These events are typically well-attended by people of all genders and provide an informal opportunity for CSWEP representatives and senior women to network and mentor one-on-one. We are grateful to the Regional Representatives who organize and host CSWEP’s presence at the Regionals.

The 48th Annual Eastern Economic Association (EEA) Conference was held in person this year from May 5–7, 2022, at the Hilton Rose Hall Hotel, Montego Bay, Jamaica. Although our EEA Representative, Terry-Ann Craigie, could not attend in person, Judy Chevalier deputized in her stead. On all accounts, the conference and CSWEP-sponsored sessions were a success. In addition to the CSWEP networking breakfast, we had four sessions on various applied topics, including Covid-19 and vaccine compliance, migration & remittances, health, and labor. Attendance at the breakfast and the sessions was high.

The Midwest Economic Association (MEA) Conference was held in person in March 2022. The CSWEP Sessions were on Friday, March 25, 2022. The first session was on Advice for Job Seekers. The panelists covered job market dos and don’ts from a regional comprehensive university, liberal arts college, R1 university, and non-academia. Panelists also shared their own experiences. There were about 35 people in the room, and there were many questions from the attendees. The second session was on Academic Career Challenges and Opportunities. The four panelists covered research, teaching, and service from regional universities to liberal arts colleges to R1 universities. This session was also well attended. A very informal, lively discussion continued until the end of the session.

Between the two sessions, a Networking Luncheon was a sold-out event. There were lively, informal chats at every table. People seemed pleased to return to an in-person conference and exchange ideas.

For the Western Economic Association International (WEAI) Meetings (June 29–July 3, 2022), Francisca Antman (CSWEP Board Western Representative) organized and chaired one in-person paper session featuring four papers on “Innovation, Immigration, Productivity, and Intergenerational Transfers” and organized two virtual paper sessions on “Labor Market Disparities” and “Health Inputs and Outcomes,” each featuring three papers. These sessions offered researchers an opportunity to present their work, meet other academics and researchers, and get valuable feedback on their research. Antman also organized a panel with Dick Startz (UCSB) on “Helping Faculty Help Students get into Ph.D. programs in Economics,” which was co-sponsored by the AEA Committee on the Status of Minority
Groups in the Economics Profession (CSMGE) and the AEA Mentoring Program (AEAMP). This panel was organized as a hybrid session in which panelists attended in person, but audience members could participate in person or online. The panel included six panelists from a diverse set of institutions, including AEA and WEAI President Christina Romer, AEAMP Co-Director Trevon Logan, and AEAMP Co-Director Francisca Antman. In addition, Antman organized the CSMGE/CSWEP Networking Breakfast, which AEAMP Co-Directors Antman and Logan hosted. About 70 people attended this networking event to learn more about CSMGE, CSWEP, and AEAMP and form connections.

CSWEP DC Representative, Stephanie Aaronson, organized two sessions for the 2021 Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) Meeting. The 2021 APPAM meeting was scheduled for Fall 2021 but postponed to March 2022. CSWEP hosted two panels: one Employment and Training panel titled “Economic Recovery from the Coronavirus Pandemic” and one Social Equity and Race panel titled “Equitable Data/Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities.” Each panel featured research from women in the academic and policy communities, including junior and minority scholars as presenters and discussants.

The 2022 APPAM meeting was held in Washington DC on November 17–19. Stephanie Aaronson, DCSWEP Rep, organized two panels for the APPAM Fall Research Conference, which was held in Washington, DC November 17-19. The first panel, organized by Julie Carlson, was on “Interdisciplinary Approaches to Understanding Innovation Incentives.” There were three presenters, all graduate students, and they had the opportunity to receive feedback from 3 expert discussants. About eight people attended the session. The second session, organized by Misty Heggeness was “Interdisciplinary Research and Approaches Towards Creating More Gender-Aware, Gender-Equal Economic Policies.” There were five papers presented and 20 attendees.

One of the discussants, Kathryn Edwards, made sure to praise CSWEP in her discussant presentation, which was well received.

DCSWEP also held a networking holiday happy hour on December 8, 2022. About 35 people attended—a mix of women from various federal agencies and nonprofits in DC, as well as some graduate students. It was a success. DCSWEP would like to thank Stephanie Holzbauer for her help in coordinating the panels for the APPAM conference and for organizing the happy hour.

The Southern Economics Association (SEA) Meeting was held in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in November. As already discussed, CSWEP co-sponsored a mentoring session for graduate students the day before the meeting, organized by Catherine Maclean along with several others. Jen Doleac, the Southern Representative organized three research sessions research sessions and a cocktail reception. Attendance at all of the events was very high.

The research sessions were standing-room-only, with 30–40 attendees each. The reception drew about 200 attendees.

CSWEP News: 2022 Focus and Features

Under the able direction of CSWEP News Oversight Editor Kate Silz-Carson of the U.S. Air Force Academy and with the graphic design expertise of Leda Black, CSWEP published four newsletter issues in 2022.5 Kate has served as Oversight Editor for two 3-year terms. She has worked tirelessly to help deliver superb content on topical issues to help advance the careers of women in economics, demystify the hidden curriculum in economics, and allowed the newsletter to go from strength to strength. A very heartfelt thank you to Kate for her service, and we are sad to see her term end. CSWEP is delighted to introduce Gina Pieters from the University of Chicago, who is taking over from Kate and has been working closely to ensure a seamless transition into the new year.

continues on page 21
The year’s first issue contains the CSWEP annual report and an interview with the CSWEP prize winners. The other three issues of the year each feature a Focus section of articles with a theme chosen and introduced by a guest editor who solicits the featured articles. The quality of these Focus articles is consistently high, with many proving to be enduring career resources for junior economists. The CSWEP Board extends our thanks to the authors and other contributors.

**Issue 2: A Guide for Non-Tenure Track Faculty**
While non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty numbers rise across universities accounting for one-third of entry-level academic postings, career paths within these ranks have received relatively little systematic attention. This issue’s Focus section addresses this gap. Shreyasree Das and Seth Gitter organized a stellar panel discussion at the 2021 SEA meetings on NTT academic careers. Based upon this session, they curated a collection of five essays for this issue of the News on different aspects of professional development for NTT faculty.

**Issue 3: Navigating the Ph.D. Admissions Process**
Enter into U.S. economics Ph.D. programs is highly selective, with candidates from all over the world competing for prized spots, especially at top doctoral programs. This issue presents a guide for helping students gain admission into economics Ph.D. programs. Kasey Buckles, Associate Chair and Director of Mentoring, collected resources, articles, and tips for our website as a resource for students trying to gain admission to graduate programs.

**Issue 4: Economics Seminar Dynamics**
Our Oversight Editor of the CSWEP News, Kate Silz-Carson, put together a collection of articles that originated from a CSWEP online webinar on seminar culture that also showcased the work of the Seminar Dynamics Collective.3

CSWEP wishes to extend our thanks to all who took the time to write contributions to newsletters during 2022. Professional development features of these and past issues of CSWEP News are now more easily accessible at CSWEP.org, where one can find them archived by year as well as by target audience and topic.

**Status of Women in the Economics Profession4**

**Summary**
This report presents the results of the 2022 CSWEP survey of U.S. economics departments. It compares the top ranked economics departments—which produce the vast majority of faculty in Ph.D. granting departments—to all Ph.D. and non-Ph.D. granting departments. It examines gender differences in outcomes in the Ph.D. job market and the progress (and attrition) of women through the academic ranks. After three years of small, but positive, progress in the representation of women in economics, this year’s survey has much more mixed news. Both the share and the absolute numbers of women entering Ph.D. programs and serving in the faculty of Ph.D.-granting departments decreased last year (Table 1). The number of top-twenty departments that have first year classes that are at least 35% female also fell (Table 7), so the experience of those women entering the profession is more often one of relative isolation. On the brighter side, for the first time, there are no top-twenty departments with fewer than 20% women, and the share of the female share of assistant professors reached new highs of 33.2% (Ph.D.-granting departments) and 42.6% (non-Ph.D. departments). The share of women among undergraduate economics majors at Ph.D.-granting departments increased (from 34.4% last year to 36.0% in 2022), but fell in non-Ph.D. departments from 37.8% to 37.0% (Tables 1 and 3). In both types of departments, the female share is still well below parity and does not approach the 55% share of women in the undergraduate population.5

---

3 https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/committees/cswep/programs/resources/webinars/disparities-2021

4 This survey report is written by Margaret Levenstein, CSWEP Associate Chair and Survey Director. We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Michael Shove, Aneesa Buageila, and Erin Meyer in the administration and analysis of the survey.

In 1971 the AEA established CSWEP as a standing committee to monitor the status and promote the advancement of women in the economics profession. In 1972 CSWEP undertook a broad survey of economics departments and found that women represented 7.6% of new Ph.D.s, and 8.8% of assistant, 3.7% of associate, and 2.4% of full professors. In the two decades after CSWEP’s first survey, there was significant improvement in women’s representation in economics. By 1994, women made up almost a third of new Ph.D. students and almost a quarter of assistant professors in economics departments with doctoral programs. The share of associate and full professors who were women had almost tripled.

Progress at increasing the representation of women continued through the early 2000s and then essentially stopped for nearly two decades. The declines in representation seen in this year’s report, after three years of progress, suggest that individual departments and schools, as well as the discipline as a whole, need to strengthen and innovate their efforts to attract and advance women. Commitment at the department and discipline level to make the field inclusive and equitable are critical to continuing this progress so that the field is more representative of the people it studies.

The CSWEP Annual Surveys, 1972–2022

In fall 2022 CSWEP surveyed 128 doctoral departments and 126 non-doctoral departments. We have received responses from 123 doctoral and 107 non-doctoral departments. The non-doctoral sample is based on the listing of “Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts” from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Learning (2000 Edition). Starting in 2006 the survey was augmented to include departments in research universities that offer a Master’s degree but not a Ph.D. degree program in economics. We have harmonized and documented the departmental-level data from the 1990s to the current period to improve our analysis of long-run trends in the profession. Department-level longitudinal reports are provided to all responding departments; these reports are shared with department chairs and CSWEP liaisons on an annual basis. Previous years of survey data are accessible as ICPSR study 37118.

2022 Survey Results

In 2022 the share of faculty in Ph.D.-granting economics departments who are women was constant at 26.2% (Table 1). The number of women in non-tenure track positions fell by over 10% (Table 1). The shares of women at the assistant and full professor levels reached all-time highs (Figure 1), but the number of associate professors fell. After increasing for the past four years, the share of women in the entering Ph.D. class fell last year. Women make up barely over a quarter of all faculty in Ph.D.-granting departments, and over a quarter of all female faculty in Ph.D.-granting departments are in non-tenure track positions (Table 1).

Turning to the 21 economics departments that make up the “top twenty” and produce the vast majority of faculty who teach in Ph.D.-granting departments, we see a very thin pipeline (Tables 2a and 2b). There are a total of eight female associate professors in the top ten departments, and a total of 21 in the top twenty. There are 22 female assistant professors in top ten departments, a slight increase from last year, but still below the average for the early 2000s. The share of women in the entering Ph.D. classes in top ten departments fell last year, though there was an increase in the number and share of women in the first year classes of the top twenty.

Turning to an examination of non-doctoral departments, we see a similarly mixed pattern (Figure 2 and Table 3). The share of faculty who are women is higher than in Ph.D.-granting departments, at every level of the professoriate, but it fell in 2022 (to 36.2%). The female share of both assistant professor and associate professors is a little higher (42.6 and 37.9%, respectively).

6 We have not received responses from the following Ph.D.-granting departments: Temple, Nebraska, USC, Utah State, and Wayne State.

7 https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/ICPSR/studies/37118

8 We report data on non-Ph.D. departments beginning in 2006. The sample changed considerably in that year, expanding to include departments in universities that give masters. Figure 2 and Table 3 use a consistent panel of departments over time.
Table 1. The Pipeline for Departments with Doctoral Programs: Percent and Number of Students and Faculty Who Are Women*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>122.7</td>
<td>160.8</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>194.2</td>
<td>204.0</td>
<td>193.0</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>283.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>139.8</td>
<td>150.9</td>
<td>155.9</td>
<td>173.5</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>174.0</td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>190.5</td>
<td>195.0</td>
<td>189.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>146.6</td>
<td>199.7</td>
<td>232.8</td>
<td>212.2</td>
<td>228.5</td>
<td>233.7</td>
<td>233.0</td>
<td>246.5</td>
<td>237.0</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>255.0</td>
<td>274.5</td>
<td>260.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subtotal)</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>305.4</td>
<td>326.9</td>
<td>436.0</td>
<td>520.7</td>
<td>521.3</td>
<td>564.8</td>
<td>583.9</td>
<td>610.5</td>
<td>596.5</td>
<td>632.0</td>
<td>661.0</td>
<td>679.5</td>
<td>717.5</td>
<td>732.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>150.7</td>
<td>209.0</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>222.0</td>
<td>295.5</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>325.0</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>285.3</td>
<td>263.0</td>
<td>298.0</td>
<td>258.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Faculty</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>344.7</td>
<td>418.0</td>
<td>586.7</td>
<td>729.6</td>
<td>701.3</td>
<td>786.8</td>
<td>879.4</td>
<td>921.5</td>
<td>921.5</td>
<td>866.0</td>
<td>946.3</td>
<td>942.5</td>
<td>1015.5</td>
<td>990.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Granted</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>265.9</td>
<td>326.1</td>
<td>367.1</td>
<td>390.7</td>
<td>358.0</td>
<td>404.0</td>
<td>372.0</td>
<td>359.0</td>
<td>368.0</td>
<td>349.0</td>
<td>378.0</td>
<td>352.0</td>
<td>399.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>647.2</td>
<td>850.4</td>
<td>1219.8</td>
<td>1317.7</td>
<td>1227.5</td>
<td>1346.0</td>
<td>1324.5</td>
<td>1430.0</td>
<td>1469.0</td>
<td>1454.3</td>
<td>1464.5</td>
<td>1581.0</td>
<td>1450.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>445.4</td>
<td>518.2</td>
<td>568.4</td>
<td>553.6</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>508.0</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>517.0</td>
<td>498.0</td>
<td>474.0</td>
<td>542.0</td>
<td>452.0</td>
<td>476.0</td>
<td>458.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Majors Graduated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>2498.0</td>
<td>3281.0</td>
<td>5114.0</td>
<td>5785.0</td>
<td>5733.0</td>
<td>6998.0</td>
<td>7756.0</td>
<td>7577.0</td>
<td>7894.0</td>
<td>8225.0</td>
<td>8336.0</td>
<td>9202.0</td>
<td>8311.0</td>
<td>8129.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Majors*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>7603.0</td>
<td>5767.0</td>
<td>6687.0</td>
<td>7247.0</td>
<td>7534.0</td>
<td>7774.0</td>
<td>8417.0</td>
<td>8356.0</td>
<td>8084.0</td>
<td>7985.0</td>
<td>7973.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Entry and exit change the population universe. Any known Ph.D. programs are considered members of the population. Any non-respondents were imputed first with UAQ survey responses and, if those are unavailable, with linear interpolation. All programs responded to the 2022 survey. For five year intervals, simple averages are reported.
Both doctoral and non-doctoral programs rely on women to teach, with women making up 37.0% of all non-tenure track faculty in the former and 37.7% in the latter (Tables 1 and 3).

At every level of the academic hierarchy, from entering Ph.D. student to full professor, women have been and remain a minority. Moreover, within the tenure track, from new Ph.D. to full professor, the higher the rank, the lower the representation of women (Figure 1). In 2022 new doctorates were 34.3% female, falling to 33.2% for assistant professors, to 26.5% for tenured associate professors, and 17.8% for full professors. This pattern has been characterized as a “leaky pipeline.” Our reliance on this leaky pipeline for any progress in women’s representation in the profession requires growth in entry, which has not occurred in this century.

To provide a visual representation and estimates of this leaky pipeline, this report presents a simple lock-step model of typical academic career advancement (Figures 3 and 4). We track the gender composition of younger cohorts from when they enter graduate school and older cohorts from receipt of their degree. We compare the share female as the cohort progresses through academic ranks. CSWEP’s model has long shown that women complete their Ph.D.s and enter into assistant professor positions at proportions roughly equal to their share as new graduate students for each cohort. While women continue to complete their Ph.D.s at the same rate as men (compare the blue and red lines in Figure 3), they disproportionately exited (or perhaps
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Table 2a. The Pipeline for Top Departments: Percent and Numbers of Faculty and Students who are Women at All Top 10 Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Tenure Track (Subtotal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Granted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>240.2</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>255.0</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>247.0</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>264.0</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>233.0</td>
<td>265.0</td>
<td>281.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Majors Graduated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: For each category, the table gives women as a percentage of total. For the five-year intervals, simple averages of annual percentages are reported.
Table 2b. The Pipeline for Top Departments: Percent and Numbers of Faculty and Students who are Women at All Top 20 Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Tenure Track (Subtotal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>112.1</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>127.0</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>152.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>127.4</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>147.0</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>196.0</td>
<td>194.0</td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>207.5</td>
<td>209.0</td>
<td>216.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Granted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>218.9</td>
<td>297.4</td>
<td>407.1</td>
<td>401.5</td>
<td>444.0</td>
<td>422.0</td>
<td>390.0</td>
<td>451.0</td>
<td>444.0</td>
<td>447.0</td>
<td>396.0</td>
<td>439.0</td>
<td>521.0</td>
<td>447.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td>142.5</td>
<td>135.4</td>
<td>129.2</td>
<td>121.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>126.0</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>129.0</td>
<td>137.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Majors Graduated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td>2502</td>
<td>2512</td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>2385</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>2715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>2676</td>
<td>2643</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>2602</td>
<td>2699</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2522</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td>2679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: For each category, the table gives women as a percentage of total. For the five-year intervals, simple averages of annual percentages are reported.*
never entered) the assistant professor ranks prior to coming up for tenure (compare the red and green lines in Figures 3 and 4). The convergence of the red and green lines in the last few years (in both Figures 3 and 4) suggests that women are now entering the ranks of tenure track professors at about the expected given their representation among new Ph.D.s. The estimated leakage of associate professors was also decreasing (note the convergence of the green and purple lines for the graduating classes of 2005 and 2006 in Figure 4), but appears to have reemerged for the graduating classes of 2007 and 2008. One step forward, two steps back.

Figure 5 shows the trend for women undergraduate senior majors over time. The female share of undergraduate majors seems have been flat, at around 35%, since 2015. The share female increased slightly in 2022, driven by increases in undergrads in Ph.D.-granting departments, despite decreases in women undergrads in non-Ph.D. departments.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 provide snapshots of the job market experiences of women from different types of Ph.D. programs. Women made up 30.5% of job candidates from the top 20 schools last year (Table 4) and almost 35.6% of all Ph.D. students on the market (Table 5). Table 6 presents placement data slightly differently, showing where last year’s job market candidates placed, by the rank of the originating department. The most striking change in placement patterns is the growing number of students from top ranked departments who are taking jobs in the private sector. This seems to be equally true of new female and male economists.
### Table 3. Percent Women Faculty and Students: Economics Departments without Doctoral Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>107.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>All Tenure Track (Subtotal)</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>249.0</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>267.5</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>276.9</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>294.8</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>312.5</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>314.3</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>317.0</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>328.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>All Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>111.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>All Faculty</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>321.5</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>349.3</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>372.0</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>397.1</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>394.5</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>389.2</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>344.3</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>369.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Undergraduate Economics</td>
<td>Majors Graduated</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>1345.0</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>1388.8</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>1495.4</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>1555.3</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>1572.9</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>1559.6</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>1397.4</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>1391.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Undergraduate Senior Majors</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>1460.0</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>1709.1</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>1699.6</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>1792.8</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>1830.6</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>1801.2</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>1600.9</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>1480.7</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>1717.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>M.A. Students Graduated</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>M.A. Students Expected to Graduate</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>251.0</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>271.0</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>293.0</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>315.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>N Respondents</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: For each category, the table gives women as a percentage of women plus men.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-based, All Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Ph.D. Granting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Non-Ph.D. Granting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Faculty, Any Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-based, All Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total on the Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: For five year intervals, simple averages are reported.
Conclusions

This report is disappointing. After three years of at least some progress in women’s representation in economics, we have returned to the pattern of the first twenty years of the century: stagnation and even backsliding. The share of women in first year Ph.D. programs fell last year. The share of women in undergraduate economics majors remains well below parity and does not show any increasing trend. Women are over-represented in non-tenure-track teaching jobs. The number of women in such positions declined last year, much more than any increase in women’s representation in tenure-track positions, leading to overall declines in women’s representation.

Efforts to address these continued disparities are critical, both for fairness and for the quality and relevance of the economics research that is undertaken in this country. With support from the Sloan Foundation, CSWEP and the Social Science Research Council are launching the Women in Economics Research Consortium9 to support research on interventions and policy changes designed to increase women’s representation and success in economics, particularly those that are scalable and can therefore have a broad impact on the profession. This kind of research is critical to improving our understanding of effective changes. Ongoing, explicit support of the American Economic Association for diversity and respect within the profession, which was coincident with increases in representation seen in previous years, is critical for sustained progress.

CSWEP’s many years of data on the evolution of faculty composition at the department level are unique in the social sciences and beyond. CSWEP now makes department-level longitudinal data available to individual departments so that they have this information to determine appropriate steps to achieve gender equity. Annual aggregate data and departmental-level data are available for research purposes in a manner that protects the confidentiality of the responding departments through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research and will be updated annually.

Figure 4. Lock-Step Model: Percentage of women, by receiving-Ph.D. cohort—Graduation, last year-in-rank assistant professorship, and last year-in-rank associate professors

Figure 5. Undergraduate Senior Economics Majors

Note: CSWEP Ph.D. survey began collecting major counts in 2009
Table 5. Percent Women in Job Placements of New Ph.D.s from All Other Economics Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-based, All Types</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>169.5</td>
<td>210.8</td>
<td>171.1</td>
<td>174.0</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td>201.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Ph.D. Granting Department</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Non-Ph.D. Granting Department</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Faculty, Any Academic Department</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-based, All Types</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Placement</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Placement</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total On the Market</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>164.5</td>
<td>232.2</td>
<td>315.5</td>
<td>244.5</td>
<td>291.0</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>238.0</td>
<td>261.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: For five year intervals, simple averages are reported.
Table 6. New Ph.D. Job Placement by Gender and Department Rank, Current Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021–2022</th>
<th>Top 10</th>
<th>Top 11–20</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-based, All Types (Share of all individuals by gender)</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Ph.D. Granting Department</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Non-Ph.D. Granting Department</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty, Any Academic Department</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-based, All Types (Share of all individuals by gender)</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Job</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic Job</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Placement (Share of all individuals by gender)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Placement (Share of all individuals by gender)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total on the Market</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Distribution of Top 20 Departments by Female Share of First Year Ph.D. Class, 2018–2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of women in first year Ph.D. class</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40% or above</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note to Table 7: This table classifies departments by the unweighted average share of women in their entering class over the period 2018-2021. This differs from the average share of women entering Ph.D. programs, each year, because of differences in the size of different programs.

Appendix A: Figures and Tables on Data Quality and Reporting

Table 8. Number of Economics Departments in the CSWEP Survey, by Year and Type of Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Doctoral Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number responded CSWEP</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programs Surveyed</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Doctoral Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number responded CSWEP</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programs (UAQ or CSWEP)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: To minimize entry and exit changes to the population universe, all Ph.D. programs surveyed are considered members of that population. Non-Ph.D. programs with two or more responses since 2006 and at least one in the last two years are included. Any non-respondents in a given year are imputed first with UAQ and then with linear interpolation.
Figure 6. Comparison of self-reported and imputed data from Figure 1

- First Year Students
- First Year Students, Self-reported
- Senior Majors
- Senior Majors, Self-reported
- New Ph.D.s
- New Ph.D.s, Self-reported
- Assistant Professors (U)
- Assistant Professors (U), Self-reported
- Associate Professors (T)
- Associate Professors (T), Self-reported
- Full Professors (T)
- Full Professors (T), Self-reported

Note: T and U indicate tenured and untenured, respectively.

Figure 6a. Comparison of self-reported and imputed data from Figure 2
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- Full Professors (T)
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Note: T and U indicate tenured and untenured, respectively.
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wealth, geography, race and gender and populations along lines of income, disparate impacts on heterogenous monetary and fiscal policy can have macroeconomic stabilization through papers that examine the extent to which macroeconomic shocks such as infla-
comes or the distributive effects of heterogeneity among consumers or firms, that explore the implications of hetero-
geneity among consumers or firms, the gender-related sessions could be referred to as "women" or "female" who is untenured, or who has received a Ph.D. less than seven years ago; but could also refer to a woman–the gender-related sessions is not permitted; therefore, authors will be expected to notify CSWEP immediately and withdraw their abstract if their paper is accepted for a non-CSWEP session at the 2024 AEA Meeting. Similarly, authors whose paper is accepted to a 2024 CSWEP session will be expected to withdraw it from consideration by any other organization at the same meetings.

The deadline for submission is: March 3, 2023.
To have research considered for the CSWEP-sponsored sessions at the 2024 AEA/ASSA Meeting, the Correspondence Author must (1) complete the online submission form and (2) send the abstract to 2024_CS.cholo7d9wvugvd2h@u.box.com.

The call for abstracts has specific instructions for the content of the abstract, which should be a PDF document not exceeding two pages in length, double-spaced, with a maximum of 650 words (not including references). It is crucial you save your PDF with the following format: "Corresponding Author Last Name-First Name Abstract Title."

The abstract should contain details on motivation, contribution, methodology and data (if applicable); and be clearly identified with the author(s) name(s). Completed papers may be sent but may not substitute for an abstract of the appropriate length.
Call for Proposals CSWEP-SSRC Women in Economics Research Consortium

FALL AY 23/24 DEADLINE: March 1 2023
DEADLINE: AUGUST 31 2023

The CSWEP-SSRC Women in Economics Research Consortium invites proposals to rigorously evaluate potentially scalable interventions designed to increase the numbers and success of women in the economics profession. We particularly encourage proposals that involve collaborations with implementing partners on college and university campuses. We also encourage replications of previously evaluated interventions, especially replications that evaluate the scalability and external validity of previously evaluated interventions. Projects may begin as early as September 2023 and have timelines of up to 18 months. (No-cost extensions will be available to enable longer periods of observation). Budgets should not exceed $200,000 in total costs.

Applicant teams will be asked to include the following in their proposals:

1. Project description (maximum 6 single-spaced pages)
   • Clearly stated causal identification strategy (quasi-experimental or experimental), description of intervention design, specification of outcomes of interest, discussion of potential causal mechanisms, project timeline;
   • Proposed sample sizes and power analyses;
   • Evidence suggesting that the intervention could scale to multiple campuses, e.g., low unit costs, decreasing marginal costs, a simple intervention design easily replicable in different contexts, and/or an intervention design developed in partnership with university, disciplinary, and/or departmental leaders;
   • Commitment to posting a pre-analysis plan and to sharing of de-identified data and cleaning/analysis code;
   • Consideration of the ethical dimensions of the proposed project
2. Letters of collaboration from implementing partners
3. Budget and budget narrative

Proposals will be reviewed by external reviewers chosen in consultation with CSWEP leadership. Proposals will be reviewed and award decisions will be made on a rolling basis; applicants are encouraged to submit proposals earlier rather than later. Projects with the potential to deploy interventions during the fall semester of the 2023/2024 academic year should seek to have proposals submitted by March 1, 2023. All proposals must be submitted by August 31, 2023.

Funded investigators and research teams will become members of the CSWEP-SSRC Women in Economics Research Consortium. CSWEP and SSRC will work with consortium members to ensure the widespread dissemination of findings to university, disciplinary, and departmental leaders. Consortium members will be expected to present preliminary findings at an in-person convening of university leaders from the SSRC’s College and University Fund for the Social Sciences, tentatively scheduled to be held in the fall of 2024. Consortium members will also be invited to participate in CSWEP panels organized at AEA conferences, and to contribute to other communication and dissemination initiatives.

Call for Papers, CSWEP Sessions @ 93rd Southern Economic Association Annual Meeting

18–23 November 2023
New Orleans, LA

DEADLINE: 1 April 2023

CSWEP (Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession) will sponsor several sessions at the Southern Economics Association Meetings to be held November 18–20, at the New Orleans Marriott, in New Orleans, LA.

Orgul Ozturk (CSWEP Southern representative) will organize one or more session on economics of education and another set on Food Insecurity and Food Policy. Papers in these areas are particularly solicited, although submissions in other areas will also be considered for potential separate sessions. (Extended abstracts will be considered if a full paper draft is not available.) Proposals for complete sessions (organizer, chair, presenters and discussants) are encouraged. Session submissions should include: (1) paper abstracts; (2) name, email address, and affiliation of all authors and session participants; and (3) which author will present each paper if accepted.

The deadline to submit a paper or session is April 1, 2023. All submissions should be sent to Orgul Ozturk, CSWEP Southern Representative, odozturk@moore.sc.edu.
CSWEP Sessions @ Eastern Economic Association 49th Annual Meeting

23 February–26 February 2023
Sheraton Times Square, New York City, NY

CSWEP Events

CSWEP Reception at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York
Thursday February 23, 2023, 5:00pm–6:30pm
CSWEP Breakfast at the Sheraton Times Square
Saturday 8am–9:20am

CSWEP Sessions

Fertility and the Labor Market
Friday February 24, 2023
Session Chair: Conor Lennon, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Organizer: Terry-Ann Craigie, Smith College

The Heterogeneous Effects of the First Childbirth on Women’s Income
Afrouz Azadikhah Jahromi, Widener University; Brantly Callaway, University of Georgia; Weige Huang, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law

Female Educational Attainment, Marriage, and Fertility: Evidence from the 1944 G.I. Bill
Conor Lennon, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Is Health Insurance a Barrier to Women’s Entrepreneurship? Evidence from State

Infertility Insurance Mandates in the United States
Meiqing Ren, University of Illinois–Chicago

Paid Family Leave and Innovation: Evidence from Inventor-level Productivity
Kyoungah Noh, University at Albany, SUNY; Chun-Yu Ho, University at Albany, SUNY; Gerald Marschke, University at Albany, SUNY; Won Sung, Bank of Korea
Discussants: Kyoungah Noh, University at Albany, SUNY; Meiqing Ren, University of Illinois–Chicago; Conor Lennon, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Afrouz Azadikhah Jahromi, Widener University

Gender and Labor Market Outcomes
Friday February 24, 2023
Session Chair: Francesca Truffa, Stanford University
Organizer: Terry-Ann Craigie, Smith College

Modeling the Quiet Revolution
Kristina Sargent, Middlebury College; Amy Guisinger, Lafayette College

Protection for Whom? Trade, Labor Enforcement, and Gender Disparities in the Labor Market
Jennifer Poole, American University; Lourenco Paz, Baylor University

Family Immigration Policy and Women’s Employment
Janice Compton, University of Manitoba; Jennifer Frimppong, University of Manitoba

Peer Effects and the Gender Gap in Corporate Leadership Evidence from MBA Students
Francesca Truffa, Stanford University; Ashley Wong, Stanford University; Menaka Hampole, Northwestern University
Discussants: Francesca Truffa, Stanford University; Janice Compton, University of Manitoba; Jennifer Poole, American University; Kristina Sargent, Middlebury College

Gender Diversity in Education and the Workplace
Friday February 24, 2023
Session Chair: Nitzan Tzur Ilan, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas
Organizer: Terry-Ann Craigie, Smith College

Undergraduate Gender Diversity and the Direction of Scientific Research
Ashley Wong, Stanford University; Menaka Hampole, Northwestern University

Leaky Pipeline, Slippery Ladder: Socioeconomic Background in Academic Careers
Anna Stansbury, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Kyra Rodriguez, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Anna Gifty Opong-Agyeman, Harvard University

Gender and Collaboration in the Federal Reserve System
Nitzan Tzur Ilan, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas; Deepa Datta, Federal Reserve Board of Governors

Mind the Data Gaps: An Examination of Women-Owned Enterprise Representation
Nusrat Abedin Jimi, Vassar College; Nitzan Tzur Ilan, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas; Anna Stansbury, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Ashley Wong, Stanford University
Discussants: Nusrat Abedin Jimi, Vassar College; Nitzan Tzur Ilan, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas; Anna Stansbury, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Ashley Wong, Stanford University

Topics in Economic Development
Friday February 24, 2023
Session Chair: Laura Meinzen-Dick, Villanova University
Organizer: Terry-Ann Craigie, Smith College

Devouring as HIV Prevention for Young Women: Evidence from Zimbabwe
Jon Denton-Schneider, Clark University

Gender Differential in the Effect of Rainfall Shocks on Rural Labor Informality
Kritika Sen Chakraborty, University of New Mexico

Tenure Insecurity and the Continuum of Documentation in a Matrilineal Customary System
Laura Meinzen-Dick, Villanova University; Helder Zavale, Eduardo Mondlane University; Hosaena Ghebru, International Food Policy Research Institute

The Effects of Internal Migration on the Labor Market Outcomes of Chinese Urban Natives
Yinan Yang, Rutgers University
Discussants: Yinan Yang, Rutgers University; Laura Meinzen-Dick, Villanova University; Kritika Sen Chakraborty, University of New Mexico; Jon Denton-Schneider, Clark University

continues on page 39
Immigration
Friday February 24, 2023
Session Chair and Organizer: Eva Dziadula, University of Notre Dame

Skilled Immigrant Earnings, Visa Type and H-1B Program
Kusum Mundra, Rutgers University–Newark; Ormid Bagheri, Kent State University

Migration and Household Informal Activity
Ira Gang, Rutgers University; Melanie Khamis, Wesleyan University; John Landon-Lane, Rutgers University

Recent Trends in Sweden's New Business Formation: How do Immigrant and Native Startups Compare?
Hieu Nguyen, Illinois Wesleyan University; Quang Evansluong, Umeå School of Business; Aliaksei Kazlou, Linkoping University

The Impact of In-State Tuition Rates on Undocumented Immigrant’s College Enrollment, Graduation Rates and Employment Outcomes
Susan Averett, Lafayette College; Cynthia Bansak, St. Lawrence University; Grace Condon, Boston Consulting Group; Eva Dziadula, University of Notre Dame

Child and Adolescent Wellbeing
Saturday February 25, 2023
Session Chair: Nitzan Tzur Ilan, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas
Organizer: Terry-Ann Craigie, Smith College

The Effects of a Natural Disaster on Child’s Nutritional Status
Afrin Islam, Temple University; Thomas Marsh, Washington State University

Parental Information and Investments in Children’s Human Capital
Jalnidh Kaur, Columbia University

Conversion Therapy, Suicidality, and Running Away: An Analysis of Transgender Youth in the U.S.
Yana Rodgers, Rutgers University; Travis Campbell, Southern Oregon University

Pornography Usage During Adolescence: Does it Lead to Risky Sexual Behavior?
Hamida Mubasshera, Temple University

Discussants: Hamida Mubasshera, Temple University; Yana Rodgers, Rutgers University; Jalnidh Kaur, Columbia University; Afrin Islam, Temple University

Gender and Time Allocation
Saturday February 25, 2023
Session Chair: Dhaval Dave, Bentley University
Organizer: Terry-Ann Craigie, Smith College

Remote Work, Collective Labor Supply, and the Child Penalty
Dana Scott, Yale University

Time Use and Activity over the Pandemic
Dhaval Dave, Bentley University; Gregory Colman Pace, Pace University

The Effects of Health Shocks on Time Spent in Home Production
Suchika Chopra, University of Georgia

The Impact of Austerity on Gender Inequality in Time Allocation in the United States
Anamika Sen, University of Massachusetts–Amherst; Ricardo Salas Diaz, University of Massachusetts–Amherst

Discussants: Anamika Sen, University of Massachusetts–Amherst; Suchika Chopra, University of Georgia; Gregory Colman Pace, Pace University; Dana Scott, Yale University

Public Benefits, Health, and Economic Outcomes
Saturday February 25, 2023
Session Chair: Tara Watson, Williams College
Organizer: Terry-Ann Craigie, Smith College

Impacts of Health Center Ownership Change on Medical Expenditure and Health Outcome: Empirical Evidence from a Random Shock in China
Shi Ting, Lanzhou University of Finance and Economics; Shin-Yi Chou, Lehigh University; Dapeng Chen, Lehigh University; Chen Chen, Shaxi University of Finance and Economics; Shaoyang Zhao, Sichuan University

Does Old Age Social Security Help Children? The Impact of Social Security on Childhood Well-Being
Lara Shore-Sheppard, Williams College; Lucie Schmidt, Smith College; Tara Watson, Williams College

The Impact of Medicaid Enrollment Expansion on the Health Well-being of Social Security Beneficiaries
Bahareh Eftekhari, Howard University

Discussants: Bahareh Eftekhari, Howard University; Dapeng Chen, Lehigh University; Lara Shore-Sheppard, Williams College

Topics in Household Decisions and Wellbeing
Saturday February 25, 2023
Session Chair and Organizer: Maroula Khraiche, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
Calls, Announcements, Sessions

The Role of Overconfidence in Household Investment Decisions
Maroula Khraiche, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley; Xi Mao, University of Texas Rio Grande; Jing Xu, Zhejiang Gongshang University

Boll Weevil Infestation and Land Inequality: Evidence from the Postbellum South
Xi Mao, University of Texas Rio Grande; Juan Moreno-Cruz, University of Waterloo; Zixing Shen, University of Waterloo

Multidimensional Impacts of Trade Liberalization on Young Adults | Tongyang Yang, Widener University; Tibor Besedes, Georgia Institute of Technology; Seung Hoon Lee, Yonsei University

Change in Legal Marriageable Age and Female Well-being Indicators | Chunting Lyu, Georgia Institute of Technology

Discussants: Tongyang Yang, Widener University; Chunting Lyu, Georgia Institute of Technology; Maroula Khraiche, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley; Xi Mao, University of Texas Rio Grande

Taxes, Wealth, and Redistribution

Saturday February 25, 2023
Session Chair: Jayne Jungsun Yoo, U.S. Census Bureau
Organizer: Terry-Ann Craigie, Smith College

Does More Democracy Encourage Individualism?: Evidence from Women’s Suffrage in the US
Yeona Jung, Sungkyunkwan University

Housing Costs in Central Cities, Residential Location and Female Labor Supply
Jayne Jungsun Yoo, U.S. Census Bureau

Enrollment of Women in Higher Education in India: Does Hostel Accommodation Play a Role?
Annessha Mukherjee, Centre for Development Studies; Satyaki Dasgupta, Colorado State University

Discussants: Jayne Jungsun Yoo, U.S. Census Bureau; Satyaki Dasgupta, Colorado State University; Yeona Jung, Sungkyunkwan University

Old Money vs. New Money: Effects of Age on Realization Response to Capital Gains Tax
Sobia H. Jafry, University of Toronto

Empathy, Motivated Reasoning, and Redistribution
Tingyan Jia, Stanford University

Discussants: Erin Cottle Hunt, Lafayette College; Sobia H. Jafry, University of Toronto; Tingyan Jia, Stanford University; Tarik Umar, Rice University

Topics in Gender Economics

Saturday February 25, 2023
Session Chair: Jayne Jungsun Yoo, U.S. Census Bureau
Organizer: Terry-Ann Craigie, Smith College

How to Keep an Active Research Agenda While Also Having High Teaching Expectations
Elizabeth Moorhouse, Lycoming College, Williamsport, Pennsylvania

Interdisciplinary Work and Why It Is Valuable
Francisca Richter, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

Thoughts on the Publication Process
Daniela Puzzello, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

So You Have Tenure, Now What?
Andrea Ziegert, Denison University, Granville, Ohio

Advice for Job Seekers: Finding the Right “Fit”
Friday, March 31, 2023, 3:15–5:00pm
Chair and Organizer: Shahina Amin, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa
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