

**REPORT ON THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF MINORITY GROUPS IN THE ECONOMICS
PROFESSION (CSMGEP)
December 2007**

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

Data on Minority Economists and those in the Pipeline

In this report we summarize data collected by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation’s *Survey of Earned Doctorates* (made available through the Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology) on the numbers of bachelor’s and doctoral degrees awarded in economics to U.S. citizens and permanent residents by race and ethnicity. In addition, we report on the annual survey data from the *Universal Academic Questionnaire* (UAQ) of the American Economic Association on the numbers of economics faculty, again by race and ethnicity in 2006.

As shown in Table 1, between 1995 and 2005 there were between 16,000 and 23,000 bachelor’s degrees in economics awarded to U.S. citizens and permanent residents annually (temporary residents comprise fewer than 2,000 bachelor’s degrees each year). Throughout this 10 year period, the percentage of these degrees awarded to African Americans decreased slightly. While African Americans comprised 6.6 percent of degrees in 1995, they comprised 6.0 percent of degrees in 2005. The percentage of bachelor’s degrees awarded to Native Americans has remained fairly constant at about 0.4 percent (there were about 69 bachelor’s degrees awarded to Native Americans in 1995 and about 92 awarded in 2005). In contrast, the percentage of degrees awarded to Hispanics has slightly increased from 4.9 percent to 5.9 percent.

Table 1. Percentage of Bachelor's Degrees in Economics Awarded to Minority Students, 1995-2005

Year	Total	African Americans (%)	Hispanics (%)	Native Americans (%)
1995	17,393	6.6	4.9	0.4
1996	16,109	6.3	5.2	0.4
1997	15,877	5.8	5.2	0.4
1998	16,461	5.9	5.2	0.4
1999	NA	NA	NA	NA
2000	17,709	5.9	5.5	0.4
2001	18,553	5.9	5.6	0.4
2002	19,923	6.1	5.4	0.3
2003	21,823	6.1	5.4	0.4
2004	22,763	6.2	5.7	0.5
2005	22,964	6.0	5.9	0.4

Sources: Tabulated from National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS). Data derived from Department of Education/National Center for Education Statistics: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Completions Survey and NSF/SRS, 2005 (WebCASPAR Database System); only U.S. citizens and permanent residents are included.

The percentage of degrees awarded in economics to minorities, as a group, remained roughly constant at 12 percent between 1995 and 2004 (see Table 2). In contrast, the percentage of degrees awarded to minorities during the same time period increased from 14 percent to 17.4 percent when all fields are combined. Further, the percentage of degrees awarded to minorities in science and engineering increased from 13.8 percent in 1994 to 17.1 percent in 2004; the percentage of degrees awarded to minorities increased from 16.6 percent to 19.3 percent in all social sciences (which includes economics).

Table 2. Percentage of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in All Fields to Minority Students, 1995-2004

Year	Econ. (%)	All Fields (%)	Total Science & Eng. (%)	Math (%)	Psychology (%)	All Social Sciences (%)
1995	11.9	14.0	13.8	11.5	14.9	16.6
1996	12.0	14.6	14.5	12.3	15.8	17.5
1997	11.5	15.1	15.1	13.4	16.9	18.4
1998	11.5	15.7	15.6	14.1	17.5	18.7
1999	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2000	11.8	16.6	16.6	13.9	19.3	19.4
2001	11.8	16.9	16.8	13.5	19.7	19.4
2002	11.8	17.0	16.9	13.3	19.7	19.6
2003	12.0	17.2	17.0	12.4	19.8	19.3
2004	12.3	17.4	17.1	11.7	20.1	19.3

Sources: The Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology (CPST). The data on the percentage of bachelor's degrees in economics awarded to minorities is derived from the National Science Foundation, WebCASPAR Database System, based on data from the National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS Completions Surveys; only U.S. citizens and permanent residents are included. Data for all other columns is derived from national Science Foundation, *Science and Engineering Degrees by Race/Ethnicity of Recipients: 1995-2004*; only U.S. citizens and permanent residents are included.

Moving along the pipeline, the total number of doctoral degrees awarded in economics declined slightly from 447 in 1993 to 352 in 2004 (see Table 3); the number of minorities who were awarded these degrees has decreased at about the same rate – from 34 in 1993 to 29 in 2004. As a result, the percentage of doctoral degrees awarded to minorities in economics remained relatively constant at about 8 percent (reaching a record 9 percent in 1999). While the percentage of doctorates in economics awarded to minorities has remained constant, this conceals different trends by race and ethnicity. The percentage of doctoral degrees in economics awarded to African Americans declined from 4.5 percent in 1993 to 2.3 percent in 2003, however there was a sudden increase to 5.4 percent in 2004. At the same time, the percentage of degrees awarded to Hispanics increased from about 3.1 percent in 1993 to 3.7 percent in 2003, but decreased to 2.8 percent in 2004. The percentage of degrees awarded to Native Americans ranges from 0 to 0.5 percent (or between 0 and 2 students).

Table 3. Percentage of Doctoral Degrees in Economics Awarded, 1993-2004

Year	Total	Total Minority	Minority (%)	African American (%)	Hispanics (%)	Native Americans (%)
1993	447	34	7.6	4.5	3.1	0
1994	483	32	6.6	3.9	2.7	0
1995	523	35	6.7	4.2	2.3	0.2
1996	518	37	7.2	3.7	3.5	0
1997	488	41	8.4	3.7	4.5	0.2
1998	480	40	8.4	3.8	4.6	0
1999	459	42	9.1	5.0	3.9	0.2
2000	440	35	8.0	4.1	3.9	0
2001	395	27	6.9	2.3	4.1	0.5
2002	381	27	7.0	3.1	3.9	0
2003	355	22	6.3	2.3	3.7	0.3
2004	352	29	8.2	5.4	2.8	0

Source: Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology. Data derived from the National Science Foundation: 1993-1994: *Survey of Earned Doctorates* from 2002 and previous years, 1995-2004: *Survey of Earned Doctorates*, 2004 and previous years; includes only U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

Table 4 shows how the percentage of doctoral degrees awarded to minorities (i.e., African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans combined) changed between 1993 and 2004 in selected other fields. Whereas the percentage of doctorates awarded to minority students in economics had been falling between 1993 and 2003, there was an increase to 8.2 percent in 2004. In contrast, the percentage in all fields steadily increased from 8.3 percent in 1993 to 12.1 percent in 2004. This steady increase is evident in all science and engineering fields, psychology, mathematics, and all social sciences combined (which include economics).

It must be emphasized that the absolute numbers of minorities remain very small. In 2004 there were only 29 doctoral degrees in economics awarded to minorities: 19 to African Americans, 10 to Hispanics, and none to Native Americans.

Table 4. Percentage of Doctoral Degrees in Other Fields Awarded to Minority Students, 1993-2004

Year	Econ. (%)	All Fields (%)	Total Science & Eng. (%)	Math (%)	Psychology (%)	All Social Sciences (%)
1993	7.6	8.3	6.4	4.2	8.4	10.0
1994	6.6	7.9	6.1	4.0	8.6	9.0
1995	6.7	8.4	6.3	2.8	9.7	9.6
1996	7.2	8.7	7.0	3.1	10.6	9.4
1997	8.4	9.1	7.3	4.5	11.0	9.5
1998	8.4	10.0	8.1	6.8	12.1	11.1
1999	9.1	10.9	8.8	4.7	12.8	12.0
2000	8.0	10.8	8.9	5.3	13.0	11.6
2001	6.9	10.9	8.8	6.9	12.1	12.1
2002	7.0	11.7	9.6	6.6	13.2	12.7
2003	6.3	12.0	9.4	6.6	12.7	13.2
2004	8.2	12.1	9.6	7.1	13.9	12.3

Source: Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology. Data derived from the National Science Foundation, 1993-1994: *Survey of Earned Doctorates* from 2002 and previous years, 1995-2004: *Science and Engineering Degrees by Race/Ethnicity of Recipients*; includes only U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

Finally, we report the number of minority faculty in academic institutions (Table 5). Overall, among the 274 departments that responded to the UAQ Survey in 2006, minorities represented 4.6 percent of the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, down from 5.1 percent last year. Minorities comprised a greater share of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the economics departments of PhD-granting institutions (4.9 percent) than in either the Master's degree-granting institutions (3.7 percent) or the bachelor's degree-granting institutions (4.5 percent).¹ Note, however, that the distributions for Blacks and Hispanic differ. For example, there were 75 full-time tenured or tenure-track Hispanics in PhD-granting institutions compared to only 25 African Americans. In contrast, there were more Blacks than Hispanics at the master's degree- and bachelor's degree-granting institutions.

Overall, approximately 55 percent of full-time tenured or tenure-track economists are at PhD-granting institutions and 31 percent at bachelor's degree-granting institutions. Blacks with such positions are underrepresented at PhD-granting institutions (only 36 percent of full-time tenured or tenure-track Blacks are at such institutions) and over-represented at bachelor's-degree-granting institutions. In contrast, 74 percent of full-time tenured or tenure-track Hispanic economists are at PhD-granting institutions compared to 21 percent at bachelor's-degree-granting institutions.

The distribution across the ranks also differs by race and ethnicity. Overall, 50 percent of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty are full professors, 23 percent are associate professors, and 25 percent are assistant professors. This compares to 39 percent, 33 percent, and 27 percent respectively for Blacks; and 35 percent, 8 percent, and 56 percent for Hispanics. While both

¹ PhD-granting institutions are those that award the PhD as the highest degree; master's degree-granting institutions award the master's as the highest degree; and bachelor's degree-granting institutions award the bachelor's as the highest degree.

Blacks and Hispanics are underrepresented among full professors, there are signs of progress in the pipeline, particularly among Hispanics.

There is a ratio of 12 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members to 1 full-time non-tenure-track faculty member among all reporting departments. This ratio is only 8 to 1 for Blacks but 16 to 1 for Hispanics. Similarly, while, overall, there are 5.6 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members for each part-time (either tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure-track) faculty member, the ratio is 2.5 to 1 among Blacks and 6.3 to 1 among Hispanics. Thus, there is evidence that Black economists are disproportionately relegated to these less prestigious positions although not so for Hispanic economists.

We note that these figures, while suggestive, must be interpreted with caution. First, the response rate to the survey is quite low, at approximately 25 percent. As such, the data may not be representative, particularly if departments with greater (or fewer) numbers of minority faculty are more likely to respond. Second, one cannot distinguish non-response from legitimate zeros. The missing values are assumed to be true zeros which would lead us to understate the extent of racial and ethnic diversity in economics departments.

Table 5: Numbers and Distribution of Faculty by Type of Institution and Race/Ethnicity (2006-2007)

	Number of Institutions in Sample	Full-time Tenured or tenure track					Full-time Non-tenure track	Part time	
		Full	Associate	Assistant	Other	Total		Tenured/ Tenure track	Non-tenure track
Ph.D. institution	88								
<i>Total</i>		1,136	371	513	21	2,041	173	36	256
<i>Black</i>		10	6	9	0	25	1	0	3
<i>Hispanic</i>		25	8	42	0	75	4	0	5
M.A. institution	36								
<i>Total</i>		224	137	114	8	483	38	65	91
<i>Black</i>		6	7	0	0	13	0	8	3
<i>Hispanic</i>		4	0	1	0	5	0	4	2
B.A. institution	150								
<i>Total</i>		500	348	285	27	1,160	97	70	135
<i>Black</i>		11	10	10	0	31	7	10	4
<i>Hispanic</i>		6	0	14	1	21	2	3	2
All Institutions	274								
<i>Total</i>		1,860	856	912	56	3,684	308	171	482
<i>Black</i>		27	23	19	0	69	8	18	10
<i>Hispanic</i>		35	8	57	1	101	6	7	9

Notes: Racial and ethnic representation includes U.S. citizens and permanent residents only. Includes faculty on leave during 2006-07, but excludes visiting appointments. A person who is full-time at the institution but only part-time in the economics department is considered full time. Non-responses to racial and ethnic diversity could not be distinguished from blanks representing zeros; thus all blanks were treated as zeros. Therefore, racial and ethnic representation may be under-represented. Source: Universal Academic Questionnaire, 2006.

Pipeline Program

Concerns about the underrepresentation of members of historically disadvantaged ethnic and racial groups led the AEA to establish a program 30 years ago to improve the “pipeline” of minority economists: the Summer Program. Since then, the AEA has also recognized that it is not only important to enroll students in graduate programs, but that they must also complete them. Consequently, the CSMGEP created a mentorship program, (the Mentoring Program which was formerly known as the “Pipeline Project”) for students accepted or enrolled in a PhD program in economics; eligibility for the program has recently been extended to new PhDs as well. In addition, last year the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) and CSMGEP joined together to create a Summer Fellows Program that allows senior graduate students and junior faculty to spend a summer in residence at a sponsoring research institution. The Committee refers to the three programs (and any others that might be developed) as the AEA’s Pipeline Program.

The Summer Program

Duke University hosted its last of four consecutive Summer Programs this past summer. While the program is open to all U.S. citizens and permanent residents, individuals from racial or ethnic groups whose U.S. citizens have been historically disadvantaged are given preference for a scholarship. Further, there is a slight preference for students from non-research colleges and universities.

Last summer, the program hosted 47 students with 43 minorities receiving scholarships (two non-minorities also received scholarships). Among the 47 students, 24 were African American, 18 Hispanic, 1 Filipino-American, and 4 were non-minority.

Table 6, below, shows the demographic characteristics of the scholarship recipients from 1993 (when the program was at Stanford University) through 2007. Several trends over the past 14 years are apparent. First, the proportion of female scholarship recipients has remained relatively constant at about 40 percent as have the relative proportions of African American and Hispanic scholars. Most strikingly, however, the program has grown significantly from approximately 25 students (on average) at Stanford to an average of nearly 40 students at Duke. This growth can be explained by the growing applicant pool as well as increased capacity at Duke University.

Table 6**BREAKDOWN OF RECENT AEA MINORITY SCHOLARS BY RACE AND GENDER***(annual average number of Program participants)*

	Stanford University 1993-1995	University of Texas 1996-2000	University Colorado at 2001-2003	of Denver 2004-2007	Duke University 2007 only
African American	14.3	9.2	18.0	22.2	24
Hispanic	10.3	8.8	9.3	12.2	18
Native American	0.3	0.6	1.7	0.5	0
Other Disadvantaged Minorities	0.0	0.0	0.7	2.8	1
Program total	24.9	18.6	29.7	37.7	43
Female (percent)	37	41	47	42	35

While the numbers and characteristics of participants have been impressive, to date there has been only one formal attempt to assess the success of the Summer Program at achieving its objective of increasing minority representation in doctoral programs in economics and related fields. As noted in last year's report, in "The Causal Effects of Participation in the American Economic Association Summer Minority Program" (*Southern Economic Journal*, July 2005), Gregory Price finds that Summer Program alumni were more productive in academic terms than comparable non-alumni economists. A much larger effort to assess the program is now underway, involving CSMGEP Chair Cecilia Rouse (Princeton), NEA President Gregory Price (Morehouse), former AEASP project coordinator Sue Stockly (now on the faculty at Eastern New Mexico), and the Summer Program director Charles Becker (Duke).

In the meantime, we turn to student responses regarding their interest in economics before entering and after completing the program, as well as graduate school attendance rates to judge its effectiveness. As in previous years, student responses from 2007 indicate that the program increases interest in attaining a doctoral degree in economics. As shown in Table 7, before entering the program 55 percent of students thought they were "very likely" or "certain" to enter a PhD program in economics; after the summer that percentage had increased to 80 percent.

Table 7

How would you describe the probability that you will enter a Ph.D. program in Economics? – 2007

Of those in the category below BEFOREHAND:	Number in this category AFTERWARD:				
	Total	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Certain
		4	4	13	19
Unlikely	8	2	3	3	0
Somewhat likely	10	1	1	5	3
Very likely	13	0	0	4	9
Certain	9	1	0	1	7

As the previous table only reflects intent, we next look at actual progression to graduate programs among the 195 minority scholars during the period 2001-07 (based on some but incomplete information about applications for the coming academic year). We have:

Table 8

PROGRESSION TO DOCTORAL PROGRAMS, AEA MINORITY SCHOLARS, 2001-2007
As of November 2007

Total number of scholars, AEASP 2001-2007	195
<i>Of whom:</i> Entered PhD programs in Economics/related fields	73
Still enrolled	56
No longer enrolled	17
Entered MA programs in Economics/related fields	52
Eventual progression to PhD expected	25
Progression to PhD unlikely	27
No graduate experience (undergraduate or BA complete)	70
Eventual progression to PhD expected	35
Progression to PhD unlikely	35
Eventual total progression to PhD (excluding those no longer enrolled and not planning to return)	
(a) enrolled (56 + 11 applying + 3 expected to return)	70 (36%)
(b) possible but not certain (56+25+35+3 expected to return)	119 (61%)

Approximately 37 percent (or 73) of the minority scholars have enrolled in a PhD program in economics or a related field; well over one-half have either enrolled or expect to enroll. While these figures do not include a counterfactual, it is important to keep in mind that there were only 29 doctoral degrees awarded to minorities in 2004 and two-thirds of the Summer Program students have come from non-research institutions that typically do not send students to graduate

school. Previous reports to the AEA that compare these figures to total minority enrollments in Economics suggest that the Summer Program's overall impact is to increase the long run supply of minority economists by about 25 percent, and possibly more, especially if attrition rates prove lower.

In the summer of 2008, UC Santa Barbara will become the 10th host of the AEA Summer Training Program; Professor Douglas Steigerwald will serve as its director. Continuing the tradition begun at the University of Colorado at Denver, the program will offer training on two levels. The Foundations Level will be targeted at students from disadvantaged academic backgrounds who are early in their undergraduate careers. The goal of the Foundations Level is to prepare these students for the Advanced Level. The Advanced Level will be targeted at students who are on the verge of applying to (or in some cases, enrolling in) graduate school. The goal of the Advanced Level is to reinforce (or create) the desire to apply to a PhD program and to prepare the students for first-year coursework.

At Santa Barbara, several new features will characterize the Foundations and Advanced Level programs. The Advanced Level instruction for Summer 2008 will be conducted exclusively by tenured or tenure-track faculty at UC Santa Barbara. This heightened level of university commitment will allow the program to build on the successful mentorship model of previous hosts while strengthening the signal (to students) of the importance of the program. Also, aspects of the coursework are being fine tuned to further emphasize *why* economic research is of interest. Finally, evaluation of the students will be conducted by the faculty as a whole. Thus, for a student completing the Advanced Level, the entire Advanced Level faculty will contribute to the evaluation of the student and a single letter of evaluation will be produced.

In its final year at Duke, the cost of the Summer Program was approximately \$660,000; the two major expenses were faculty and staff salaries and student scholarships (although in this year, Professor Thomas Nechyba taught for free). The major funding came from Duke University (\$300,000), the National Science Foundation (NSF) (\$120,000), the AEA (\$110,000), Moodys Foundation (\$25,000), RAND (\$10,000), and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (\$15,000 plus in-kind support through provision of a full-time instructor for the statistics/econometrics sequence). For the summer of 2008, UCSB expects major contributions from UCSB, the AEA, and the NSF but will also seek funding from other contributors; the CSMGEP plans to assist Prof. Steigerwald with these efforts.

The Mentoring Program

The Mentoring Program, which is aimed at those starting or completing doctorate degrees in economics and new doctorates, matches African-American, Latino, and Native American economics PhD students with mentors in the field, and also facilitates networking between minority economists and students at all stages of the educational and professional pipeline. Participants must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents.

There are currently 28 graduate student mentees in the program. They are enrolled in PhD programs at Columbia University, Duke University, Georgia State University, Howard University, Jackson State University, Northeastern University, Ohio State University, Rice

University, University of California at Berkeley, University of California at San Diego, University of California at Santa Barbara, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Kentucky, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

During 2007, Omari Swinton (Duke University) was appointed as an assistant professor at Howard University and Rodney Andrews (University of Michigan) received a two-year Robert Wood Johnson post-doc at Harvard University. Most other mentees are completing course work and writing their dissertations. For example, UC Berkeley's Arthur-Damon Jones spent his summer working at Mathematica Policy Research in Princeton. Each credits the Mentoring Program for directly helping them find these opportunities.

In addition, recognizing that new PhDs often need just as much mentoring as graduate students, there are also 10 assistant professors and 2 professional economists who are mentees. The assistant professors hold positions at Claremont Graduate University, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Central Connecticut University, Syracuse University, The New School, Ohio State University, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Weber State University, and Yale University. The professional economists hold positions at Mathematica Policy Research and the National Urban League Institute for Opportunity and Equality.

The mentors also represent a wide variety of institutions, including Cornell University, Duke University, the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Howard University, Michigan State University, Princeton University, Rutgers the State University of New Jersey, Eastern New Mexico University, North Carolina A&T State University, University of California Santa Barbara, University of Maryland, University of Pennsylvania, University of Vermont, University of Texas at Pan American, and Western Washington University.

The Pipeline Conference is the primary activity of the Mentoring Program. The Conference is held each summer during the Pipeline Program's Summer Program. This year, 8 newly-minted PhDs attended, as did 22 graduate students, and 18 mentors and friends of the program (in addition to all of the Summer Program students) bringing attendance to an all-time high. Participants presented papers and heard general sessions targeted towards professional development at all levels. Once again, participants rated the conference quite highly.

The Mentoring Program also provides funding for collaborative research projects between mentors and mentees. The awards range from \$750 to \$1,000 and the funds can serve a variety of purposes. For example, they can be used to cover the transportation and lodging costs that allow graduate students to travel to their mentor's location and spend several days working on the project, or cover the costs of data and supplies.

An important achievement of the Mentoring Program this year was the creation of the sakai.rutgers.edu website. This password-protected site connects all mentoring program participants and serves as a tool for disseminating information. This site has allowed us to make available over twenty opportunities for research, grants, job openings, and other initiatives.

Although the program has not been formally evaluated, we continue to believe that it serves an important function for the participants. The feedback on the Pipeline Conference is extremely positive (indeed, many of those that attend are returning attendees!) and the mentees typically believe the program was critical to their success in navigating graduate school and the early years as an academic. For example,

Rodney Andrews notes, “I’m a fan of the mentoring program, and believe it was instrumental in my development. The mentoring program put me in contact with Sheldon Danziger, my mentor and co-chair of my dissertation committee.”

Leslie Wallace, a doctoral candidate at the University of California at San Diego writes, “The AEA Summer Pipeline Conference has been an invaluable experience for my growth as a professional economist. As minorities in the economics profession, we often toil alone in our respective places of work without the on-going benefits this conference provides. This conference was a crucial link for me as it brought me together with an amazing and talented group of minority professionals through whom I gained an enriching level of support. I felt this particularly when I presented my research paper; the conference participants rallied around me offering their comments/suggestions in a warm, friendly and collaborative spirit. When I left the AEA Summer Pipeline conference, I left edified and richer from having established relationships with my fellow colleagues.”

Finally, according to Larry Chavis, an assistant professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, “The Mentoring Program provided a significant professional boost to my career as an economist. During the four conferences I attended as a graduate student I was able to present my research and make connections that directly led to job interviews and job offers. Yet it was the social side of the Pipeline Conference that provided an oasis for me during my time in graduate school and kept me on track towards a PhD. I found it refreshing to be with students who were facing the same challenges that I was facing. The conference was also an environment where students could meet and socialize with professors and professional economists as friends and mentors. I have many fond memories of conversations that lasted until the wee hours of the morning. These relationships kept me in graduate school when times were tough because I wanted to keep coming back. I was ecstatic when I graduated because I had cemented my relationship to this group forever.”

The cost of the Mentoring Program is about \$40,000 per year, the majority of which is used to fund the annual Pipeline Conference. This program is in its last year of a two-year NSF grant; thus Bill Rodgers, the director, submitted a new proposal to the NSF this fall for an additional two years of funding.

Summer Fellows Program

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

Sponsoring institutions pay for the fellowship, and administrative costs are covered by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

The first year of the Summer Economic Fellows Program surpassed all expectations. Six fellows, chosen from over 70 well-qualified applicants, spent part of summer 2007 in Federal Reserve research departments (the Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve Banks of Boston, New York and San Francisco). Comments from this summer's participants include:

“Unreservedly say it was a great experience working at Fed.”

“[The program was] really an invaluable experience to me. While most fellowship program just giving out some money, this program really helps us to gain more experience.”

“... my best regards to everyone in the program committee for providing such an excellent opportunity for junior faculty.”

“The program was great. I could work the whole summer on my dissertation, I had the opportunity to present my paper twice and I got many comments from the economists working at the Bank.”

“The program was a terrific success.”

The program is run by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the chairs of CSWEP and CSMGEP. The current committee is Patricia Mosser (Federal Reserve Bank of New York), Janice Shack-Marquez (Board of Governors), and Dick Startz (chair, University of Washington). Several more Reserve Banks and research institutions will be participating in 2008. Information about the program can be found at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AEA/CSMGEP/pipeline/>.

The Committee's Recent and On-going Activities

Fundraising for the Pipeline Program continues to be a top priority. This fall the Summer and Mentoring Programs submitted proposals to the NSF for funding. As noted above, the NSF also funds the joint CSMGEP/CSWEP Summer Fellowship program.

In an effort to demonstrate to potential funders that support for the AEA's Pipeline Program is strong from within economics, we also solicited contributions from economics departments. While we certainly hope to raise funds for the programs through this effort, we primarily aim to highlight the AEA's efforts in this area which may generate interest in more institutions hosting the Summer Program and create a valuable network of supporters for recruitment of mentors and for students for the Summer, Mentoring and Summer Fellows Programs. We also believe that by demonstrating widespread support for the programs, it will make it easier to raise additional revenues. We are extremely grateful to the economics departments at Brown University, Georgetown University, LeHigh University, MIT, Princeton University, the University of Southern California, and the University of Virginia, as well as the Gerald R. Ford School at the University of Michigan for their pledges of support for our endeavors.

Last year the CSMGEP began a (web) series profiling young minority economists. The goal of the series is to highlight the many accomplishments of these economists and to give young people who might be considering a career in economics a glimpse into the lives of those who made that decision. Seth Carpenter (Assistant Director of the Division of Monetary Affairs at the Federal Reserve Board), Lisa Cook (Assistant Professor of Economics at Michigan State University), and Marie Mora (Professor of Economics at the University of Texas – Pan American) were featured in our inaugural year. You can read their profiles on our website: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AEA/CSMGEP>.

At the 2007 AEA meetings, the CSMGEP hosted a Dissertation Session. The four participants were: Carmen Carrión-Flores (University of Arizona) – “What Makes You Go Back Home? Determinants of the Duration of Migration of Mexican Immigrants in the U.S.”; Omar Galarraga (Johns Hopkins University) – “The Employment Effect of Antidepressants for Women Living with HIV in the U.S.: Evidence from the Women's Interagency HIV Study (WIHS), 1994-2004”; Nicholas J. Hill (Jackson State University) – “Is It Really Safe Sex? Analyzing the Causal Link between Contraceptive Use and Crime Rates”; and Adrian Price (Jackson State University) – “The Macroeconomy and Health Insurance Coverage of Minorities.” Susan Collins (Georgetown University and Brookings Institution) chaired the session and Peter Henry (Stanford University) and Sue Stockly (Eastern New Mexico University) served as discussants.

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

We also added two new members: Mark Lopez (a research assistant professor at the University Maryland's School of Public Policy) and Kerwin Charles (a professor in the Harris School at the University of Chicago). The chair thanks them both for their willingness to devote their time and energy to this committee.

It is with considerable sadness that the Committee bids farewell to Charles Becker as director of the Summer Program. Charlie has led the program with such dedication, insight, and enthusiasm for the past 7 years that it has been an inspiration to us all. The program has grown and matured under his stewardship; indeed, during his tenure over 200 students participated in it. We also thank Daniel Graham, Gail McKinnis, Thomas Nechyba, Pietro Peretto, Rhonda Sharpe, Frank Sloan, Curtis Taylor and all of the other faculty and staff who devoted their time, energy, good humor, and wisdom and made the program at Duke University such as phenomenal success.

Finally, the Chair is indebted to John Siegfried and his staff at the AEA – Edda Leitner, Barbara Fiser, Susan Houston, and Violet Sikes – for their patience and insights. Their efforts have been invaluable.