American Economic Association
CSWEP
c/o Robin Bartlett
Department of Economics
Denison University
Granville, OH 43023

NONPROFIT ORG.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 22
GRANVILLE, OH 43023

Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION

www.cswep.org

Newsletter

A publication of the American Economic Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

Published three times annually *Fall, 1999*

In this issue:

- Teaching in Research Schools
- Effective Teams
- Pedagogue in Research
- Administration as a Career Path for Economists
- CSWEP Activities at 2000 Meetings

Have you paid your CSWEP dues? If your mailing label does not say "1999" in the upper right hand corner, then you have not paid dues for this academic year. Beginning with the Spring, 2000 issue, our Newsletter will only be sent to dues-paying associates, so please check your membership and send your dues, if necessary, to:

Joan Haworth, Membership Secretary
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303

We appreciate your support!

CSWEP Newsletter

Fall, 1999

Directory of CSWEP Board Members

Table of Contents

Features

Departments, Notes

Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession
AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION
www.cswep.org

CSWEP Newsletter
Robin L. Bartlett, *Editor*
KimMarie McGoldrick, *Co-Editor*
Sally Scheiderer, *Assistant Editor*
Jack Hire, *Graphic Design and Composition*

My Experience with Tenure Through Teaching at The University of Kentucky

Gail Mitchell Hoyt

I EARNED MY UNDERGRADUATE degree in economics at Centre College, a small, liberal arts college in Danville, Kentucky. I loved economics and I thrived on the liberal arts approach to learning the discipline. In the fall of 1988, I began graduate school at the University of Kentucky. I went to graduate school because I wanted to be an economist. But, I had no plans whatsoever to be a teacher. When I was informed that teaching was a part of what I had to do to be funded with an assistantship, I stepped into the position as if taking on a chore. However, after about two weeks of teaching, I realized that the "rush" that I got from teaching was like nothing else I had experienced up to that point in my academic career. I knew that I enjoyed being a student of economics, but I found teaching economics to other people to be absolutely thrilling. I had discovered a truly rewarding experience. While I enjoyed my research looking at the labor market impacts of substance use, I now knew that the teaching of economics would be an integral part of my career.

My first job after completing graduate school was at the University of Richmond in Virginia. At Richmond, tenure is based on teaching and research. Given that I enjoyed teaching and had experienced success teaching as a graduate student at The University of Kentucky, I was excited to accept this position and I found my two years at Richmond to be a valuable stage in my growth as an economist and a teacher. The caliber of the student body is outstanding, the classes are typically capped at twenty-five students, and faculty members are well supported, altogether making for a great teaching experience. I was also pursuing my research agenda at a pace that I believe would have led to tenure.

In 1993 the Chancellor of the University of Kentucky announced the creation of approximately twenty new special title series teaching positions for departments across the Lexington campus. Faculty in these positions would be eligible for tenure and have no research requirements. The teaching positions were created to ensure that at least fifty percent of students in lower level courses would be taught by full-time faculty. As a significant number of students from across the university are required to take microeconomic and/or macroeconomic principles, the economics department was offered two of these positions. The economics faculty felt that the positions would benefit the department anticipating better coordination in the introductory courses, higher student success rates, improved course evaluations, and more economics majors. One offer was made to Robert Gillette from Texas A&M and one was made to me.

My thoughts were mixed when I received the offer. Currently, in a regular tenure track position, I had reservations about how I would be treated and received in a teaching position in the economics department at Kentucky. This was compounded by the fact I had been a graduate student at Kentucky. I wondered if I would feel like a second-class citizen.

On the other hand, while I enjoyed Richmond, I believed that by coming back to Kentucky I could have a more powerful impact through my teaching. The student body at the University of Kentucky is more diverse in economic background and ethnicity. First-generation college students, international students, and nontraditional students who work and have children are a part of the student body. Through exposure to this mix of students and to a large number of students, I felt I could make a more significant contribution to economic literacy. I have always felt that if one could apply a small class, liberal arts approach in a large class setting at a public university, one could substantially improve the quality of the student experience. The University of Kentucky would provide the opportunity for a full-scale test of this belief.

Not for one moment have I found myself regretting the decision I made six years ago. I do find myself working hard and putting in long hours, but I enjoy what I am doing. I have an enormous amount of latitude in determining how I go about doing the specific tasks for which I was hired.

My primary responsibility is to teach and coordinate the sections of contemporary economic issues, microeconomic principles, and business and economics statistics. My colleague, Bob Gillette, who took the other teaching position, focuses on macroeconomics and shares responsibility with me for the statistics course. I teach approximately 600 students and work with six to ten teaching assistants (TAs) each semester who have teach their own sections.

My service responsibilities relate primarily to undergraduate education. I serve as an advisor for economics majors and now as the Director of Undergraduate Studies for economics. I am the faculty advisor to the Economic Society and helped to establish and coordinate the College of Business and Economics Lab for Economic and Accounting Proficiency, which provides free tutoring to students taking introductory courses in accounting and economics.

As teaching assistant coordinators, Bob and I develop and convey to TAs both course content and teaching techniques. We meet with the TAs weekly to check progress and to discuss issues related to teaching the material and classroom demeanor. We have compiled comprehensive lecture note packets with active learning ideas and teaching tips for the TAs. Every semester I go into each TA's classroom for observation and TAs observe one another. For the College of Business and Economics, Bob and I teach a graduate course on teaching methods that is required of all new TAs in the College. Working with teaching assistants and seeing them grow and develop as both economists and teachers of economics has been by far one of the most rewarding aspects of my job.

During my tenure at Kentucky, three different people have served as chair for the economics department. The chair at the time Bob and I were hired wanted to ensure that except for the differences in our research require-

continued on page 4

My Experience with Tenure

continued from page 3

ments, we would be like other members of the department. He felt that this was crucial for the successful reception of these teaching positions and for our own personal well being. The subsequent two chairs have taken the same view and made every effort to effectively incorporate us into departmental, college, and university activity. One way they have done this is by having us maintain a full service role in the department and college just as colleagues in regular research positions. I have been fully supported to attend conferences for the purposes of both teaching and research and I enjoy attending the department's applied microeconomic workshop series. I also have full voting privileges within the department and I have served as the Business College's representative to the University's Undergraduate Council.

Earlier I mentioned the leeway I have felt in defining my role in the department. An example is the teaching workshop we have developed. In my first year at Kentucky, I thought it would be a good idea for our department to host a statewide teaching workshop for economists. Bill Becker from Indiana University conducted the first workshop and we followed in subsequent years with specialists from a variety of areas in pedagogy. Bob and I have conducted this workshop for five years with financial assistance from our department and the Calvin K. Kazanjian Foundation for Economic Education Inc. Our department has encouraged Bob and I to try to be leaders in economic education within Kentucky and in the profession.

I have been encouraged, although not required, to continue to engage in various forms of scholarly work. While I continue with my established research program, I have chosen to shift the primary emphasis of my research to economic education and pedagogy. Developing a research program in economic education has allowed me to engage in research that enhances both my teaching efforts and hopefully those of others. I have studied the influence that economic instruction in the classroom has on the opinions that students hold regarding various economic issues. I have designed active learning strategies, worked at assessing the use and effectiveness of classroom peer observation, and tried to measure the outcomes of using service learning in statistics courses.

Has the position been a success from the department's point of view? My chair and colleagues say so, and they did grant me tenure. In the spring of 1994 the economics department had approximately 144 majors. We currently have approximately 291 majors and I feel our teaching positions have contributed to this increase. The evaluations of our teaching assistants have improved and are good. With each teaching assistant, we have observed their teaching skills and evaluations improve in the time they are in our graduate program. Have my attempts at applying a liberal arts approach in large lectures at a public university been a success? It has worked for me and I have fun and learn new things every time I teach my courses.

All in all, I have been very happy in this teaching position. I have been treated as a first-class citizen. Having someone else in a parallel position to mine has improved my experience. I have had the opportunity to develop new classroom activities and try a variety of techniques such as service learning, which have dramatically increased the depth and quality of the teaching experience for me and I hope for the students. By teaching primarily at the principles level and working with our teaching assistants who teach at that level, I feel that mine is a daily battle against economic illiteracy. At the end of the day after teaching economics to more than 600 students I feel a tangible sense of accomplishment. I certainly acknowledge the importance of the research mission in our profession and in my life as an economist, but without a doubt, my comparative advantage is at teaching, and doing the administrative activities that relate to advising students and training teaching assistants. I feel very fortunate to have the opportunity to be in a position where my primary focus is on the part of economics that I truly love – teaching it.

The Benefits and Costs of Team Teaching: Experience from an Interdisciplinary Collaboration

Maureen J. Lage - Department of Economics, Miami University of Ohio
B. Kay Snavely - Department of Management, Miami University of Ohio

ALONG WITH SOME COLleagues at Miami University, we developed and team-taught a new course, Women, Gender and Business. This course was designed as an interdisciplinary course for women's studies and business school students. The goal of the course is to teach topics that may not be covered (or not covered in much detail) in the typical business curriculum, but students (especially female students) will face as they enter the workforce. Given the interdisciplinary nature of the course, the course was developed from the beginning to be team-taught. We will describe the process used in developing the course, as well as the costs and benefits of team teaching in general.

Course Content Development

Work began on developing the course content and pedagogy approximately one year prior to the time it would first be offered. Faculty members from each department in the business school, as well as affiliates of the women's studies program met several times to discuss course objectives and content. During this developmental phase, two members of this faculty group wrote a successful research grant to fund speakers and other expenses (books, slides, etc.) of the course. Collectively, the design team identified a set of necessary, but not sufficient, content areas. Among those core content areas were topics from several business and social science disciplines: wage gap and comparable worth from the economics field, employment law and sexual harassment law from the business law field, representations of women in advertising from the marketing field, and work related role bias and leadership behaviors of men and women from the organizational behavior field.

Course Delivery

The course development team recognized that the delivery of the content called for a more creative pedagogical model beyond the typical lecture format common in many business courses. Based on the goals of engaging student learners from several disciplines, integrating the expertise of professors in business and non-business fields, and creating a learning environment where diverse viewpoints would be exchanged and considered in a respectful manner, the developmental team proposed a team teaching model. With the support of the original course development team, the business school dean, and the chairs of economics and management, the authors' request to team teach was approved.

Of particular value in endorsing the team teaching model was an agreement by the two department chairs that both faculty receive full course load credit, despite the team teaching model. The authors consider this "full pay" for team teaching a breakthrough in how many universities fund team teaching. Historically, one of the disadvantages of team teaching is the generally accepted practice of each part of the team only receiving part of the course credit. The authors argued successfully that effective team teaching of the type we designed required far more preparation and grading time than teaching a class individually.

To enhance the team teaching model, faculty members from the original course development team who were not officially designated course instructors, committed to attending the portion of the course where they had specific expertise. As a result, during most class periods, there would typically be three faculty members present – the two instructors as well as a guest who had done research in the specific topic being addressed. The instructional team (composed of the authors) facilitated the final syllabus design, the additional topics beyond the core topics, the readings assignments, the invitation of guests beyond the core team, and the "nuts and bolts" of the class – exam format, grading policy, paper assignments, etc.

During each class, both instructors participated in the facilitation, often with the additional involvement of a guest speaker. Rather than take turns in leading class, the instructors believed that modeling teamwork in front of students by speaking and listening respectfully with each other generated a classroom climate for open exchange and contributed to students' willingness to hear and present diverse opinions. When guest speakers were the focus of a class, the instructors positioned themselves as students, sitting among the class and engaging in learning in the same manner as students. Many students indicated that the learning process was better because the professors were clearly learning too.

Student Reaction

Student evaluations were sought both at mid-semester and the conclusion of the course to learn students' perceptions of the quality of learning in the course. Student comments indicated overall positive learning experiences. Summary statements listed the following as specific course factors which contributed to effective learning:

- Guest speakers
- Open discussion
- Challenging questions
- Interesting and relevant material
- Team teaching
- Interdisciplinary
- Diversity of class members
- Liked the class would recommend to others

A sample of the open-ended responses of students further demonstrates support for both the course content and the pedagogy:

> "The sampling of different majors/perspectives ... this allows for an energetic display of varied opinions."

> "I like the fact that each day we have had a 'specialist' well prepared to present the material we had read. Their use of examples and materials from outside the class has been very interesting also. I find that having persons who are from a wide range of majors gives the class some real insight into different perspectives on women and work."

Students also offered suggestions for improving the course, most of which involved the burden of some lengthy reading assignments, types and number of papers written, and the possibility of offering the course more often during the week. The general reaction from students was that such a course should be a regular part of the business curriculum and that both men and women students would benefit by such

continued on page 6

Team Teaching ...

continued from page 5

education. Though the majority of students were women both sexes endorsed the quality of the course.

Team Teaching – Benefits and Costs

As is clear from the above discussion, there were, in fact, two distinct team components of the course. The first team consisted of the faculty from women's studies and the business school who worked on developing the course and writing the research grant, while the second team consisted of the authors actually teaching the course. In discussing the costs and benefits of team teaching, we will focus on the case of two individuals team teaching, since that is a more common experience. In general, however, the costs and benefits of these two teams are similar.

One of the biggest advantages of working in teams is the value gained from another perspective. For an interdisciplinary course, like the one we were developing, these perspectives, as well as the knowledge gained about our colleagues' teaching and research expertise, are invaluable. We would argue, however, that the benefits can accrue even when colleagues in the same discipline teach relatively established content. An example practiced by the first author uses a model of team teaching introductory economics classes. In this case, the first author and a colleague in her economics department routinely "team teach" their individual sections of Principles of Microeconomics. Students are assigned to one of the instructors and are in class with solely that instructor. However, the expertise of both instructors is regularly available to students in both classes. The students are informed that the two instructors work as a team and that they will be receiving common assignments, problem sets, quizzes and exams.

A second advantage to teaching in teams is that, by its very nature, the instructors are forced to discuss teaching styles, habits, and students' methods of learning, factors which individual instructors often don't address because of time constraints, personal habits, and lack of feedback. For example, early in the course and on more than one occasion, one of us assumed we would be doing things in a certain way while the other assumed it would be done differently. In these cases, our assumptions were based on our individual teaching habits or styles. Teaching in teams forced us to think about the underlying philosophies behind our teaching methods, as well as expose us to alternative methodologies. As a result of working together inside and outside class the perspectives and tools for implementing class learning expanded for both instructors. We picked up tips from each other and from guests, and these tips have improved our teaching in all courses.

A third gain from team teaching directly affects how students look at teamwork. Increasingly, students are being asked to work in teams – both in their courses at college as well as at their jobs when they leave college. Having courses taught by faculty teams allows professors to model the work environment businesses often rely upon to increase productivity and understanding across functional areas. In addition, it allows students to directly observe effective (hopefully) teamwork up-close, particularly to observe respect for the diversity of other disciplines by thinking outside of functional boxes or silos. Furthermore, working in teams reminds professors of some of the issues students face when managing multiple team projects in different courses.

In the classroom, a faculty member may typically be the only "expert" on a subject in the course. However, with team teaching, there are two opinions that can be brought to the material. Not only did students like getting more than one perspective, it was informative for students to see that there is more than one "truth." Finally, if done well, team-teaching can be a much more enjoyable way to teach a course. While not always agreeing with each other, the authors both learned additional methods of teaching and enjoyed the experience of working together.

Having outlined the benefits of team teaching, fairness requires that we also discuss the costs of such a set-up. One major cost is that team teaching requires more time than teaching a traditional class. For example, not only did the authors meet prior to the course in developing the outline, but we also met at least twice a week outside of class, a considerable time commitment for a class that met once weekly. In addition, both of us graded every paper assignment individually and then met to get a consensus on student grading (While both faculty need not grade every paper, we found that in a new course, this practice was a good reliability check). A second cost is that team teachers must be willing to compromise. A team, by definition, does not represent any one person's methods, but rather an integration of different viewpoints and understandings. In some cases, you will inevitably both be convinced that your way is the best way – in these cases, something must give. With the large degree of autonomy most academics are used to, this flexibility may be one of the hardest aspects of team teaching. Learning to overcome occasional roadblocks, however, is also one of the advantages.

One final cost is (perhaps) the misperception of students and colleagues. We found that students would try to find the "weak link" in the chain or try to play one of us against the other. Students once tried to convince one of us to change the assignment, arguing that maybe the other one could be worked on. In fact, they had gotten it completely backward – coming to the one who was not sympathetic to their request, instead of the one who might have been much more sympathetic. In general, it is important to anticipate such potential problems and talk them through before they happen. Having a few mutually established, strict ground rules can help avoid these situations. Faculty may also have false perceptions about team teaching. Seeing two faculty members in a class where there is typically only one instructor, may generate an ill-conceived assumption that someone is "getting away" with something. In addition, faculty members may not truly understand the concept of team teaching – for example, more than one faculty member assumed that we were splitting the grading of student assignments.

Conclusions

So, is team teaching something you should try? Certainly it is not for everyone. Without tenure, you should be cautious about taking on an assignment which requires more work than a typical course and which may be perceived as requiring less work. In addition, given the large amount of time required for successful team teaching, professors should be cautious whenever offered half the course credit for team teaching. However, if you have tenure, enjoy discussing teaching, are open to new experiences, and are willing to compromise, team teaching is definitely worth a try – two heads are better than one.

The Life of a Pedagogue in a Research Institute

Beth Bogan - Senior Lecturer, Economics Department, Princeton University

I FELL IN LOVE WITH ECONOMICS reading Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* in a great books course in high school, but I thought of economics more as entertainment than an academic endeavor. Mathematics was my college major until the end of my junior year, when I was invited to write an honors thesis in economics. I jumped at the opportunity and officially declared economics my major.

Wellesley was a wonderful place for women in the '60s. Although graduate school was the furthest thing from my thoughts when I arrived, by senior year Carolyn Bell had convinced me that I would love studying for a Ph.D. Continuing my studies was appealing, especially in light of reactions to my engagement the summer after my sophomore year. Everyone in my hometown expected me to quit school immediately. After all, the reason for going to college was to find a man and I had done that well: I was marrying an MIT man. Offended that anyone thought I would quit school, I wanted to show them that marriage did not mean the end of education.

While my husband was building nuclear submarines for the Navy in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, I earned a master's degree in quantitative economics at the University of New Hampshire. After his experience in the Navy, my husband looked at jobs in New York and Chicago, so I applied to Columbia and Chicago. I was actually rooting for Chicago, but Tom got the better job offer in New York and, at that time, I would never have considered living in different places.

Columbia in the late '60s was intellectually fun. I took classes with Becker, Mincer, Burns, Chow, Lancaster, Kenen and Hart. Of the 90 students in our class about a half dozen were female. I never felt discrimination. However, the faculty did not understand what an excellent education women received at Wellesley. When I aced Mathematical Economics and had the second highest average in the entire graduate economics program, the Department Chair was flabbergasted. He said no one had expected me to do that well, although, once I had proven myself, the Department was very supportive. The Chair suggested that I apply for, and helped me to win, a presidential fellowship, an NSF and an Earhart.

While studying at Columbia, I didn't have a career goal. I just wanted to understand the way the world worked. Then, as I thought about my life, an internal struggle ensued: knowledge was the goal, but children would be the center of my life. I began to realize I would go crazy without academic stimulation and decided I would eventually become a college professor. Tom wanted children but otherwise was happy for me to work. Ironically, I had kidded throughout grad school that we would have a child by his 30th birthday and I delivered our first son on the eve of his 30th birthday and a month after receiving my Ph.D.

In the spring of 1971, as I looked forward to completing the Ph.D. and the birth of our child, I thought I would wait several years before seeking a position. But my wonderful, gray-haired advisor said, "This is the '70s; a woman can work and have children." Once he said that, I thought deeply about seeking a position at a top ranked institution, but I understood my competitive zeal and knew I would go all out for tenure. That, I believed, was totally incompatible with raising children, and decided to seek a job at a teaching institution near home. I received several job offers that met that constraint, and I chose Fairleigh Dickinson University.

The '70s were great years to be at Fairleigh Dickinson. Many women, who had married and dropped out of college, wanted to complete degrees and FDU had three campuses conveniently located in the suburbs of northern New Jersey. Many of my economics students were women who had begun their studies at MIT, Vassar and other schools. They were excited to be back at school and were preparing seriously to enter the labor market for the first time. I was a tenured full professor by 1979.

Once our younger son was in school all day in the early '80s, I accepted the position as Chair of the Economics and Finance Department for the Madison NJ campus. Later I became Chairman of the Tri-campus Department of Economics and Finance, which had over 700 graduate students seeking MBAs. It was a wonderful challenge to run a Department of 40 men. Faculty and administrators kept telling me how pleased they were with the way I was running the Department, and for many years I enjoyed it. However, I was finding it impossible to make time for the level of reading and learning that I loved.

When our first son was accepted at Princeton, he teased me that I wanted to go to Princeton more than he did. He was right. (He went to MIT.) In 1989 I wrote to Alan Blinder, then Chairman of the Economics Department at Princeton. I recognized that I had not published enough to be considered for a full time position at Princeton, but was it possible to come as a visitor? Alan invited me to teach Introductory Microeconomics as a visitor. Teaching at Princeton was my dream job. The students liked my teaching and I enjoyed them. I also had the opportunity to attend cutting edge graduate seminars and to spend more time studying new ideas to incorporate into my classes.

After returning to FDU, I received an offer from Princeton for a newly created position: Senior Lecturer in Economics. I resigned my position as a tenured full professor and declined an offer to be Associate Dean of the FDU business school, all for a three-year appointment as a Senior Lecturer (with the possibility of renewal). In taking the position, my only concern was in letting women down. I worry that women don't seek and take management "line" positions. I felt guilty doing what I wanted, rather than becoming a Dean and seeking higher positions in university management. Nevertheless, the Senior Lectureship was the perfect position for me – an opportunity to focus on teaching and to pursue whatever enhances my ability to captivate students and help them to learn economics.

For example, when I wanted my macroeconomics students to understand Japan's recession, I made appointments to talk with academics, businessmen and government officials in Japan. In addition to bringing back a deeper

continued on page 10

Administration as a Career Path for Economists

Elizabeth Hoffman - Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Illinois at Chicago

IT WAS THE SPRING OF 1989. I was living the life to which every new assistant professor aspires. I was a tenured full professor at the University of Arizona, in one of the best economics departments in the country for the kind of research I do, experimental economics. I was a member of the proposal review panel for the NSF economics program and a member of the Board of CSWEP. I was teaching four courses per year: just enough to enjoy the stimulation of sharing my favorite subject with fresh young minds, but not enough to interfere with an active, funded research program. And, I had recently been heavily recruited to the University of Arizona from a comfortable life at the University of Wyoming.

Then (I believe it was in May), the Dean of the College of Business and Public Administration invited me to breakfast. My first thought was panic. I did not have anything to wear to breakfast with the dean. I had one black suit for funerals and formal presentations; one white dress for weddings and going to fancy restaurants; and some fraying and slightly too small wool skirts and sweaters left over from college. At that moment in my life, "dressing for success," meant, do I have a clean pair of jeans and a clean tee shirt to put on in the morning?!

Wearing a skirt and sweater set that almost fit, I went to breakfast, wondering what he could possibly want from me. Perhaps he wanted me to chair a task force on the future of business school education or something like that. I was utterly stunned when he said that he wanted me to take over as Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Director of the MBA Program. The only response I could think of was, "why me?" And he said, "because I hear that you get things done." Well, a week or so of negotiation later, including a guaranteed escape clause if I hated doing it, I agreed. Now, 10 years later, I am provost of a major research university. My life is no longer comfortable. It is hectic and sleep deprived. But, it is also unbelievably exciting and satisfying. And, now when I dress in the morning, I ask myself, "which black suit and silk blouse should I wear today?" But, most importantly for an audience of economists, I find being an administrator intellectually exciting, because I use the intellectual paradigm of economics and the lessons I have learned from a life-long research interest in cooperation. Basically, my job is to facilitate cooperation among scholars, departments, colleges, other universities, and non-university partners, as well as to optimize the allocation of scarce resources to enhance our teaching, research, and outreach efforts.

I tell my story this way because it illustrates a very important point about an academic administrative career. The best way to become a top academic administrator is to become a top quality faculty member first. If you veer off into administration too early in your career, you will get stuck in a low-level administrative position. You may become an assistant department head or an assistant dean, but you will not be likely to rise higher. You will not be competitive for the real administrative career ladder of department head, dean, vice president/vice chancellor, and president/chancellor. Achieve the status of full professor the old fashioned way, but also develop a reputation for getting things done, on time, on budget, and with style and vision. Take your service assignments seriously and demonstrate leadership. But, never lose sight of the fact that, until you are a full time administrator, you will only get rewarded for your research and teaching excellence. The rest is just preparation for a future, other career. If you do those things, and you have the right personal qualities for academic leadership, the administrative positions will find you. There is such a lack of leadership talent in higher education today, that headhunters are desperate for talented academic women who combine academic excellence and demonstrated administrative leadership skills.

So, you may ask, what are the personal qualities that make for great academic administrators, given that academic excellence has already been achieved? First, and foremost, you must be able to formulate a clear vision for the future of your program or institution and communicate that vision to every possible audience: students, faculty, other administrators, and a variety of public audiences. But, if you articulate a vision in a vacuum, no one will hear it. Thus, you must also be a great listener. I spend most of every day in meetings, from one-on-one to large groups, listening to what people have to say, what they want from me and from the university, and what concerns they have about university policies or decisions. But, you must also be able to sort through the cacophony of listening to many points of view, bring your own experience and intellect to the problem, and formulate a clear vision or take a decisive action. No one wants an administrator who cannot make a decision, formulate an action plan, carry it out, and only look back if the decision turns out to have been clearly and unequivocally wrong. But, they do want administrators who listen to them first. Everyone understands that you cannot satisfy everyone and no one even wants you to try. But, they do want to feel that they had a voice in the decision making process, even if they do not like the outcome in the end. Another way of looking at it is that you need to be a very good diplomat and negotiator, not just of money and goods, but also of ideas. The best administrators listen to a range of ideas that seem incompatible and reformulate the problem so that each individual can find some of his or her ideas remaining in the reformulation.

Don't even think of going into administration unless you are tolerably good at time management, at juggling multiple projects, and at sleeping at night regardless of what is going on around you. Do you generally finish papers on time or early for a conference or are you still analyzing data the day before and writing the paper on the plane? Do you always work on several papers simultaneously or do you work on one paper at a time until you finish it? Do you sleep well even in the worst of times or do you stay awake worrying about every detail? The answers to these questions will help you assess whether you might be suited for administration. As an administrator, you will always be juggling multiple projects, many of which have very short deadlines for completion. And, lateness is almost never acceptable. Moreover, there will always be issues that could keep you awake at night, but your performance over the long haul depends on your ability to take advantage of every opportunity you have to rest.

Let me close by emphasizing how much I have enjoyed my 10 years as an academic administrator, despite my early reservations. I approach every major decision as a scholarly exercise and pride myself on both the lasting quality of those decisions and on the support of all those with whom I work. Many of my colleagues have encouraged me to start publishing articles about administrative issues, but I still try to maintain a small research agenda and use all the writing time for that purpose. Perhaps this article is the first in such a new series.

CSWEP Activities at the 2000 AEA Meetings

January 7-9, 2000 • Boston, Mass.

Business Meeting and Reception

Date: Friday, January 7
Time: 4:45 p.m.-5:45 p.m.
Location: Hilton/Clinton Suite
CCOFFE reunion during the business meeting
A reception will follow the business meeting until 7:30 p.m.
Announcement of the First Carolyn Shaw Bell Award
Time: 5:45-6 p.m.

Hospitality Room

Days: Friday, Saturday and Sunday
Times: January 7 and 8 – 7:30 a.m.- 4 p.m.
January 9 – 7:30 a.m.-12 noon
A complimentary continental breakfast will be available while supply lasts. Beverages will be available in the afternoon from 1:30-3:30 p.m.

CSWEP Roundtable Discussion Session

• CSWEP into the Future: Men and Women in Economics
Date: Saturday, January 8
Time: 3:30 p.m.
Panel Includes: Robin L. Bartlett, Chair (Denison University), Susan Collins (Georgetown University), Henry Farber (Princeton University), Dierdre McCloskey (University of Iowa)

CSWEP Gender-Related Sessions

• History of Women in Economics
Date: Friday, January 7
Time: 8 a.m.
Chair: Charlotte A. Price (Sarah Lawrence College)
Papers: Zohreh Emami (Alverno College) "What Does Joan Robinson Have in Common with Feminist Economists?"; Michele Pujol (Grinell College) and Janet Seiz (Grinell College) "Harriet Taylor Mill"; Ulla Grapard (Colgate University) "Charlotte Perkins Gilman"; Robert Dimand (Brock University) "Emily Green Balch, Political Economist"
Discussants: Bette Polkinghorn (California State University at Sacramento), Ann Robson (University of Toronto), Mary Hirschfield (Occidental College), Gillian Hewitson (La Trobe University)

• Gender in Economic Thought
Date: Friday, January 7
Time: 10:15 a.m.
Chair: Kirsten Madden (Millersville University)
Papers: Robert Dimand (Brock University) "Nineteenth Century American Feminist Economics"; Nancy R. Folbre (University of Massachusetts at Amherst) "Social Motherhood: Early Feminist Theories of the Welfare State"; Evelyn L. Forget (University of Manitoba) "Gender and Classical Political Economy"; Yoshie Imai (Brown University) "John Stuart Mill and Women"
Discussants: Drucilla Barker (Hollins College), Margaret Coleman (New York State OSCD Office), Christopher Nyland (Monash University), Maria Sophia Aguirre (The Catholic University of America)

• Women, College and Economics
Date: Friday, January 7
Time: 2:30 p.m.
Chair: Carolyn Shaw Bell (Wellesley College)
Papers: Elizabeth J. Jensen (Hamilton College) and Ann L. Owen (Hamilton College) "Reluctant Economists: Women Undergraduates at Liberal Arts Colleges"; Jill M. Constantine (Williams College) "Why Do So Many More Black Women than Black Men Enroll in College?"; Lynne Evans (University of Durham, UK) and John Ashworth (University of Durham, UK) "The Decline and Persistent Underrepresentation of Women in Economics"; Lois Joy (Smith College) "Do Colleges Shortchange Women? Comparing Gender Differences in the Transition from College to Work"
Discussants: Kyle Kauffman (Wellesley College), Cecilia Conrad (Pomona College), Marianne Ferber (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), Caroline Fohlin (California Institute of Technology)

CSWEP Non-Gender-Related Sessions

• The Economics of Waste
Date: Saturday, January 8
Time: 8 a.m.
Chair: Molly Macauley (Resources for the Future)
Papers: Karen Palmer (Resources for the Future) and Margaret Walls (Victoria University) "Can Pricing Downstream Waste Disposal Encourage Upstream Design for Environment?"; Sarah Stafford (College of William and Mary) "Green Crime: The Effect of Punishment on Firm Compliance with Hazardous Waste Regulations"; Don Fullerton (University of Texas at Austin) and Ann Wolverton (University of Texas at Austin) "The Two-Part Instrument in a Second Best World"; Eduardo Ley (IMF), Molly Macauley (Resources for the Future) and Stephen Salant (University of Michigan) "New Variations in Modeling the Interstate Shipment of Municipal Solid Waste"
Discussants: Erik Levinson (University of Wisconsin), Hilary Sigman (Rutgers University), Terry Dinan (Congressional Budget Office)

continued on page 10

... Activities at the 2000 AEA Meeting

continued from page 9

- Social Security Reform and Gender
  Date: *Saturday, January 8*
  Time: *10:15 a.m.*

Chair: Olivia Mitchell (University of Pennsylvania)

Papers: Marianne Baxter (University of Virginia) "Social Security as a Financial Asset: Gender-Specific Risks and Returns"; Phillip Levine (Wellesley College), Olivia Mitchell (University of Pennsylvania) and John Phillips (Social Security Administration) "Comparing Men's and Women's Wellbeing in Retirement"; Theresa Devine (Congressional Budget Office) "Women and Social Security Reform"; Sharmila Choudhury (Social Security Administration), Michael Leonesio (Social Security Administration), and Kelvin Utendorf (Social Security Administration) "Analysis of Social Security Reforms that Affect Women"

Discussants: Jonathon Gruber (MIT), Jeffrey Liebman (Harvard University), Jennifer Ward-Batts (University of Michigan), Edith Rasell (Economic Policy Institute)

- Topics in Health Economics
  Date: *Sunday, January 9*
  Time: *10:15 a.m.*

Chair: Lisa Lynch (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy)

Papers: Jennifer Mellor (College of William and Mary) and Jeff Milyo (Tufts University) "Income Inequality and Health Status in the United States: Evidence from the Current Population"; Susan Ettner (Harvard Medical School) and Richard Hermann (Harvard Medical School) "The Role of Profit Status Under Imperfect Information"; Diane Dewar (SUNY at Albany) "Has Health Insurance Coverage Changed for Women?"; Donna Gilleskie (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Rosalie Pacula (RAND Corporation), and Koleman Strumpf (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) "Youth Smoking: Dynamic Behavior with Endogenous Taxes"

Discussants: David Cutler (Harvard University), Dahlia Remler (Columbia University), Carol Rapaport (New York Federal Reserve Bank), Jeanne Ringel (Louisiana State University)

The Life of a Pedagogue ...

continued from page 7

understanding of the issues and some pictures to highlight my lecture, I also found it easier to convey a high level of enthusiasm, which is electric in a classroom. More recently, I have spent time developing Powerpoint slides for computer projection in class. The Senior Lecturer position allows time for developing new approaches to teaching that the research faculty generally cannot afford.

My position at Princeton has been a win-win situation, as I complement the research faculty. No matter how research-oriented a university or how gifted the student body there are many services that students need from faculty. These include answers to individual questions, help with course selection and sequencing, and discussion of graduate programs and careers. With 280 majors in our Department there is a lot of necessary contact time. Our Department also requires that every junior write a independent research paper and every senior write a thesis. Many students come to me for guidance in selecting a senior thesis topic and an advisor. I know what most of my colleagues are working on and can greatly increase the efficiency of the matching process by getting the right people together. It is also important that our Department be represented on committees that approve course or curricula changes so I serve on the University Committee on the Course of Study.

The belief in academia that publishing research is the only way to demonstrate ability and to enrich our teaching is not consistent with our economic theory of multi- product production. Universities produce both new knowledge and the teaching of existing knowledge. It is unlikely that the same people will always be the best at both, especially at the undergraduate level. Perhaps even research universities need a few more teachers hired for their ability to inspire students – teachers who devote their time to understanding and communicating the newest ideas across a discipline.

Without having to focus narrowly on making a new contribution in one sub-field, I attend graduate research seminars in a number of areas and read widely. It is my ideal of the intellectual life. I have forged my own career path as the economic generalist and teacher trying to excite college students with economics as a tool for understanding the world in which they live. I have worked very hard, and the result has been that I have had the career and lived the life I wanted. Could I have asked for more?

CSWEP Board Member Biographies

Jean Kimmel

I GREW UP IN TAMPA, FLORIDA with two academic psychologists as parents and participated in several sports in high school. Attending college at George Washington University on a full tuition volleyball scholarship, I majored in philosophy for a year before becoming bored with it and tired of its inherent abstractions. I switched my major to economics because I still wanted to exploit strong verbal and analytical skills and adequate math skills, and I appreciated the real world relevance of economics. I completed my B.A. in economics in 1982 but I did not feel sufficiently prepared to head straight for an economics doctorate program because I had treated academics somewhat casually my first two years at GWU. I started my graduate studies at the University of Delaware in their agricultural economics program, but switched to economics after the first year and earned my M.A. degree in economics in 1984.

After interning at the Department of Transportation in Washington D.C. for 8 months, I completed my education at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1990, basing my dissertation on the SIPP, a rich micro panel data set. As a result of the large human capital investment made to complete the dissertation, I was experienced with a data set that held much promise for interesting and publishable research.

I conducted a broad national job search and chose a research position as an economist at the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research in Kalamazoo, Michigan where I remain employed today as a senior economist. The bulk of my research in labor economics to date has been about child care, multiple-job holding, and female labor supply. More recently, I have begun to expand a bit more into the field of health as it relates to employment behavior.

When I left UNC, I had imagined that near full time research would lead quickly to a handful of strong publications that would give me lots of choices for a possible return to academics. Who knew it would be so difficult and take so long to publish? And most surprising, who knew that I would make a life in Kalamazoo?

Here I sit, ten years out of UNC and from what I have discerned, building a career and living a life is all one big hairy time allocation problem. What to research and how much time to spend working? What to pursue and when to pursue it in one's personal life? I haven't always gotten it right (like, the marriage market clears better when one is younger and in school...oops), but thinking about goals, keeping my options open and asking myself frequently where I want to be in five or ten years has been helpful. Academics aren't encouraged often to write annual plans or plot out long term goals, but we are required to do this at my Institute, and while I don't like it, I find it beneficial.

Taking the long view is useful particularly when work effort ebbs and flows due to personal time commitments. I have been fortunate to work less than fulltime to devote more time to my two year old son David and my three month old daughter Elizabeth (a.k.a. Wild Man Dave and Lizzie Doodle, respectively). Working fewer hours reduces my work productivity but I can plot out my time carefully to assure that I have a fairly steady stream of output. Sharing part of the research agenda with coauthors helps to smooth this output stream and makes the process more interesting as well.

Bronwyn H. Hall

AS IS TRUE OF MANY ECONOMISTS, my choice of the subject was made via a somewhat roundabout path that started with a physics degree from Wellesley College back in 1966. However, my route to economics took considerably longer than most and I did not receive my economics Ph.D. from Stanford University until 1988. How did I get to that point and why did it take so long? When I left college, I married another economist who was just finishing graduate school at MIT (Robert Hall) and this had two consequences: I began my conversion into an economist via contagion effects and I pursued a career in computer programming/research assistance that would adapt to cross-country moves and the birth of two children. My first two jobs were as programmer in the Lyman Laboratory of Physics (Harvard University) and then programmer at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory (UC Berkeley). I actually co-authored a series of papers published in physics journals, which I do not usually put on my CV! My work in physics generally involved the statistical analysis of large datasets, which is excellent experience for anyone planning to do applied econometric research.

In 1970, we moved back to Cambridge, Massachusetts from Berkeley at an extremely bad time for jobs in high energy physics. My economics connections enabled me to obtain two free-lance programming jobs, with Daniel McFadden (who was visiting MIT) and Dale Jorgenson (who had recently moved to Harvard). The first thing I noticed was that my rate of pay doubled when I switched fields, which somewhat reduced my longing to return to physics. After a year or so, I also began decoding the first edition of the National Longitudinal Survey (NLS) of Young Men for Zvi Griliches, also at Harvard University, and became the programmer for the Harvard Institute of Economic Research. In the early 1970s, economists were just beginning to use large datasets on the computer and people like me with experience from outside economics were very useful. In the course of working for Harvard, I gradually became interested in the subject matter, audited a couple of econometrics courses, and co-authored a couple of papers, one on nonlinear systems estimation that proposed what is now known as the "BHHH" method, and one on maximum likelihood estimation of self-selection models with endogeneity for the estimation of returns to schooling using the NLS.

I cannot go any further in this story without talking about TSP (Time Series Processor, an econometric software package). The first very simple version of this program was written by Robert Hall together with a number of other graduate students at MIT in 1965-66, for the IBM 1401. Bob continued making enhance-

continued on page 12

From the Chair ...

CSWEP Chair, Robin L. Bartlett - Denison University

AS MANY OF YOU KNOW, WE recently sent out a survey comparable to the one we send to Ph.D.-granting institutions to 160 liberal arts colleges and universities across the country.

We received 103 of them back and the information is summarized below. Even though liberal arts institutions hire more women economists than their Ph.D.-granting counterparts, the rule of halves still holds.

CSWEP ANNUAL DEPARTMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE – Liberal Arts Colleges
(Total List – 103 out of 160 reported)

Faculty Composition 1998-99 Academic Year *(excluding visiting faculty)*

	Untenured			Tenured		
	Women	Men	% Women	Women	Men	% Women
Assistant Professors (tenure track)	58	59	49.6	5	17	22.7
Associate Professors (tenure track)	7	14	33.3	57	131	30.3
Full Professors (tenure track)	2	11	15.4	37	249	12.9
Other (non-tenure track)	17	33	34.0	1	0	100.0

Student Information: 1998-99 Academic Year

	Women	Men	% Women
No. of Senior Majors	1203	2082	36.6

Hall Biography

continued from page 11

ments until about 1970, when he transferred it to the newly-founded Data Resources Incorporated to use as the basis for their econometric software offerings and joined them as a consultant. At around the same time, I took over the maintenance and development of TSP, and soon began distributing it for a nominal charge from Harvard University. When we moved to Stanford University in 1977, I established TSP International as an independent software business, and was its chief and only programmer until around 1982; in 1984, Clint Cummins joined me and has been doing all the programming ever since. As many know, we are still in business and have made the transition from mainframes to Dos and then to Windows and the internet. There is no question that operating a small high technology company gives one an interesting perspective as an economist; for one thing, I have certainly met a payroll many times, unlike many of my colleagues.

Although I moved to Stanford in 1977, I did not give up my Cambridge connections. The move happened to coincide with the arrival of Martin Feldstein as the President of the National Bureau of Economic Research, and the restructuring of the NBER to the form it has today. Although I resigned my job at Harvard, I immediately became a Research Economist at the NBER, on the newly created Productivity Program under Zvi Griliches. We began research on a large R&D, Patents, and Productivity project, creating a company level dataset that had patents matched to the companies for the first time, and used these data for the analysis of the contribution of innovative activity to productivity. Along with the newly formed technology (TIP) seminar at Stanford University, it was this project that really got me interested in the idea of pursuing an advanced degree in economics, and I determined that my field of interest would be the economics of technical change. In the same year as my divorce from Bob (1983), I entered the Ph.D. program at Stanford University in economics; my children were now 12 and 15, which made it somewhat easier to run a business and go to graduate school fulltime than it would have been earlier.

In 1987, at the age of 42, I began my first teaching job as Assistant Professor of Economics at UC Berkeley, where I had begun a stint as the wife of an Assistant Professor of Economics exactly twenty years earlier. I have been there ever since, and was promoted to tenure in 1993. Beginning with a visit to INSEE, Paris, in 1987, I have also spent a considerable amount of time working and researching in Europe, including a term at the New Economics School in Moscow and the past three years as a parttime Temporary Professor of Economics at Oxford University. Although I still teach and do econometrics, my interests have broadened over the years to include innovation policy and comparative perspectives on the financing of innovation. At Berkeley, I have enjoyed creating a new undergraduate course in the economics of technical change and a graduate seminar on innovation that draws students from business and agricultural and resource economics as well as my own department.

Regional Meetings

WESTERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

At the WEA meetings this year, CSWEP sponsored three sessions and a CCOFFE workshop. The three sessions included one on Health Insurance Policy, one on the Research Climate in Economic Institutes, and one on Labor and Gender Economics.

The Health Insurance Policy session was organized by Sharon Tennyson (Cornell University) and chaired by Katherine Harris (RAND). Arleen Leibowitz (UCLA) presented "The Effect of State Medicaid Policies on Medical Care for Persons with HIV," a paper co-authored with Dana Goldman (RAND) and Ronald Andersen (UCLA). Patricia H. Born (University of Connecticut) presented "HMO Contracting: Who Bears the Risk?;" and, Allison Percy (University of Pennsylvania) presented "Community Rating and Small Group Reform in Health Insurance Markets." Govind Hariharan, Jay Bhattacharya, and Robert Town generously provided discussion.

Panelists in the session on the Research Climate in Economic Institutes discussed the scope for research, the focus of research support and the rewards offered by their respective institutions. In addition, each panelist spoke about recent developments in her own institution. Anna Meyendorff described how the focus of the William Davidson Institute has broadened in its first decade from the study of transition economies to that of emerging economies. Julia Lowell discussed the RAND Corporation's changing mix of research on defense and other policy concerns, such as health and education. Catherine Mann discussed the policy relevance of the IIE, and compared it to other Washington institutions in terms of its independence and openness. Mary Beth Deily described recent changes at the National Science Foundation. She also described some of the qualities shared by successful grant applications, and she provided some preliminary statistics on the gender breakdown of grant recipients. The session was organized and chaired by Helen Popper.

The first two papers in the Labor and Gender Economics session both dealt with an important new topic area in labor economics, issues related to the apparent growth in the contingent labor force. Both papers use data from the supplement to the February 1995 Current Population Survey. In "Gender Gaps in the Incidence of Contingent Work: A Binomial Logit Analysis," Suman Kharbanda (Division of the Budget, State of New York) finds that there are not large differences by gender in the effects of worker characteristics on the probability of being a contingent worker. Young workers, female workers with school-age children, immigrants, and non-white workers are the most likely to be in contingent jobs. High skilled professional specialty workers are also relatively likely to be in contingent jobs, demonstrating that contingent work is not only a clerical job or casual labor market (e.g., construction, agriculture) phenomenon. In "Gender and Workers' Preferences for Contingent Employment," Douglas Kinnear and Alexandra Bernasek (both at Colorado State University) report that there are not statistically significant gender differences in explaining workers' preference for contingent employment, and that women in contingent jobs do not have stronger preferences than men for noncontingent employment. However, there are characterstics correlated with preferences for non-contingent work that are disproportionately experienced by women, such as the citing of personal reasons for working in a contingent job. These exploratory studies provide counterpoint to a simplistic view of contingent work as a feminized phenomenon.

The third paper was "Noncustodial Fathers and Welfare Transfers: What Is the Causal Effect?" by Emily Lin (University of Connecticut). Lin uses PSID data from 1980 through 1992 to explore the causality patterns between welfare participation and noncustodial fathers' post-divorce transfers. She finds that the womens' probability of welfare participation falls significantly as fathers' transfer payments rise. However, the fathers have such low marginal propensities to pay transfers out of their income that increasing their income has no substantial impact on the womens' welfare participation. The crowding-out effect of welfare receipt on fathers' transfers is not statistically significant.

The final paper, "Economics and the Breastfeeding Decision," by Nancy Burnett and Denise Robson (both at University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh), described the first stage of their unique study of how mothers' decision to breastfeed and the planned duration of breastfeeding are functions of various beliefs about its benefits and costs. Using self-collected data from a hospital maternity ward, they show that such economic factors as expected cost of formula have effects on the mothers' decisions. They plan a follow-up phase to the study to see whether women actually carried through with their plans.

Discussants Deborah Reed (Public Policy Institute of California) and Jill Constantine (Williams College) contributed valuable perspectives and helpful suggestions on the papers. Joyce Jacobsen (Wesleyan University) served as chair for this session.

SOUTHERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

CSWEP will sponsor a roundtable on Mentoring and a poster session on Teaching Innovations to be held in conjunction with a cocktail party/reception at the Southern Economic Association annual meetings. The meetings are November 21-23 at the Fairmont Hotel in New Orleans. The Roundtable and Poster Session will be Monday, November 22, 1999. The Poster Session is as follows:

Chair and Organizer:
KimMarie McGoldrick
Department of Economics
Robins School of Business
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173
Kmcgoldr@richmond.edu

continued on page 14

Regional Meetings

continued from page 13

Participants:

Kelly M. Brown
Department of Economics
School of Policy Studies
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3083
"Economics in Action: Using Experiments in the Classroom"

Suzanne D. Thornsbury
Food and Resource Economics Department
University of Florida
2199 South Rock Road
Fort Pierce, FL 34945-3138

Ferdinand F. Wirth
Food and Resource Economics Department
University of Florida
2199 South Rock Road
Fort Pierce, FL 34945-3138
"Teaching Economics to Non-Traditional Students in a Non-Traditional Setting"

Gail Mitchell Hoyt
Department of Economics
Gatton College of Business and Economics
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506-0034
"LEAP into Economics: Experiences with the Lab for Economic and Accounting Proficiency at the University of Kentucky"

Peter Schuhmann
Department of Economics
Robins School of Business
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173

KimMarie McGoldrick
Department of Economics
Robins School of Business
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173
"A Conjoint Analysis of Student Registration Decision Making."

Maureen J. Lage
Dept. of Economics
Miami University
Oxford, OH 45056

Glenn Platt
Dept. of Economics
Miami University
Oxford, OH 45056
"Gender Implications of The Inverted Classroom"

Suzanne Wallace
Department of Econ, Acct, and Business Management
Central College
Pella, Iowa 50219

Richard Glending
Department of Econ, Acct, and Business Management
Central College
Pella, Iowa 50219

Brian Peterson
Department of Economics
Manchester College
Manchester, Indiana 46962
"Simulations of Economic Problems with Interdisciplinary Analysis"

Lisa Ford
Department of Economics
Robins School of Business
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173
"Is Economic Theory Relevant? Getting Students to Say Yes"

MIDWEST ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

CSWEP is sponsoring two sessions at the Midwest Economic Association meeting to be held in Chicago from March 31 to April 2, 2000. Please note the new dates for the conference. The gender-related session is on Women's Health Issues and the other session is on the Economics of Aging. Also, check your conference schedules for the CSWEP business meeting and cocktail party. All are welcome to attend both.

EASTERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

The Eastern Economic Association Meetings will be held March 24-26th at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City in Crystal City, VA (just outside Washington, D.C.). There will be two or more CSWEP sponsored sessions. For gender-related topics, we are particularly interested in receiving one page abstracts for research investigating labor market and welfare issues, but all gender-related research topics are welcome. For other topics, we are particularly interested in receiving one-page abstracts for research having to do with health and environmental issues and globalization, but other topics are welcome. Please include with the abstract your name, affiliation, snail-mail and e-mail address, phone and fax numbers, and known limitations on which days and times you are available to make a presentation. Abstracts should be submitted by November 15, 1999 to:

Barbara M. Fraumeni
100 Langdon Street
Newton, MA 02458
(617)965-2783 weekends
(202)966-1927 weekday evenings
Fraumeni@msn.com

Submissions of full papers to the Eastern Economics Journal directly through the Eastern Economics Association are also encouraged, but not expected or required of individuals wanting to participate in a CSWEP session at the meetings. For further information on the Eastern Economic Association Meetings or the Eastern Economics Journal, please see:
http://www.iona.edu/academic/arts_sci/orgs/eea/eea.htm

Call for Papers

CSWEP at the Eastern Economic Association Meeting – At the Eastern Economic Association Meetings March 24-26th at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City in Crystal City, VA (just outside Washington, D.C.), there will be two or more CSWEP sponsored sessions. For gender-related topics, we are particularly interested in receiving one-page abstracts for research investigating labor market and welfare issues, but all gender-related research topics are welcome. For other topics, we are particularly interested in receiving one-page abstracts for research having to do with health and environmental issues and globalization, but other topics are welcome. Please include with the abstract your name, affiliation, snail-mail and e-mail address, phone and fax numbers, and known limitations on which days and times you are available to make a presentation. Abstracts should be submitted by November 15, 1999 to:

Barbara M. Fraumeni
100 Langdon Street
Newton, MA 02458
(617)965-2783 weekends
(202)966-1927 weekday evenings
Fraumeni@msn.com

Submissions of full papers to the Eastern Economics Journal directly through the Eastern Economics Association are also encouraged, but not expected or required of individuals wanting to participate in a CSWEP session at the meetings. For further information on the Eastern Economic Association Meetings or the Eastern Economics Journal, please see:
http://www.iona.edu/academic/arts_sci/orgs/eea/eea.htm

IAFFE Sessions at the Eastern Economic Association Meeting – It is high time to think about submitting papers, sessions, roundtables, or panels for the 25th Annual Meetings of the Eastern Economic Association to be held at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City, Virginia, March 24-26, 2000.

As in past years, IAFFE hopes to organize several sessions focused on gender issues in some of the following areas: Pedagogy, Labor Markets, Policy Issues, International, Development, History of Thought, and Methodology. We need four papers or panel participants for each session, a chair, and some discussants. Graduate students, junior faculty, and non-economists are encouraged to participate.

If you are willing to serve as chair or discussant, please indicate you area of interest, and/or if you would like to give a paper, please send the title and a 200-word abstract by November 22, 1999 to:

Ulla Grapard
Department of Economics
Colgate University
Hamilton, NY 13346
Newton, MA 02458
Phone: (315) 228-7538
Fax: (315) 228-7033
E-mail: ugrapard@mail.colgate.edu

E-mail is preferred. Find more details about hotels, deadlines, participation fees, etc. at the EEA's web site:
http://www.iona.edu/academic/arts_sci/orgs/eea/conf2000/home.htm

CSWEP at the Southwestern Economic Association Meeting – The year 2000 annual conference of the Southwestern Economics Association (SWEA) will be held in Galveston, TX, March 15-18, 2000. The SWEA is an affiliate of the Southwestern Social Science Association (SSSA) which is the oldest regional social science association in the U.S. Papers in all fields of economics are considered. Papers presented at the conference may be published in refereed journals of the associations, namely, the Southwestern Journal of Economics and the Social Science Quarterly. Submit papers or abstracts by November 1, 1999 to:

M. Moosa Khan
SWEA Program Chair
P.O. Box 638
College of Business
Prairie View A&M University
Prairie View, TX 77446
Phone: (409) 857-2122
Fax: (409) 857-2797
E-mail: mkhan@pramu.edu

CSWEP at the International Atlantic Economic Society – The International Atlantic Economic Society will be hosting its 49th conference in Munich, March 14-21, 2000, at Ludwig Maximilians Universität. The deadline for submission of organized sessions is November 1, 1999. Additional information on the conference can be found on the IAES web page at:
http://www.iaes.org/conferences/future/muncih_49/index.htm

Specific instructions on submitting a session can be found under the Paper Submission section.

Service-Learning in Economics – The American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) publishes a series entitled: Service-Learning in the Disciplines, however economics is not among the disciplines represented. AAHE has expressed interest in a volume on economics. As practitioners of service-learning, we believe the collection of papers described above will serve this unmet need. If you use service-learning in your economics classes and would like to be involved in this project, please send a two-page summary of your proposed paper to either of the addresses below by December 15, 1999. Papers may deal either with a detailed application of service-learning or may address the theoretical issues of service-learning in economics. All submissions will be peer reviewed. If you have questions or would like further information regarding this project, please contact:

KimMarie McGoldrick
Department of Economics
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173
Phone: (804) 289-8575
E-mail: kmcgoldr@richmond.edu

or

Andrea L. Ziegert
Department of Economics
Denison University
Granville, OH 43023
Phone: (740) 587-6575
E-mail: ziegert@denison.edu

Getting on the Program at the January 2001 AEA Meeting

Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession Sessions

NOW IS THE TIME TO THINK about submitting an abstract, or a proposal for an entire session, in order to participate in the AEA's annual meetings on January 5-7, 2001 in New Orleans. CSWEP generally organizes several sessions each year. A subset of the papers presented in these sessions is selected for publication in the May 2001 issue of the American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings.

For 2001, we expect to organize sessions in two areas:

There will be three sessions on gender-related topics. We are particularly interested in receiving abstracts for gender issues in economics, including economics of the family and household, child support and welfare reform. However, all gender-related research topics are welcome.

There will also be three sessions in the area of macroeconomics and international economics.

Abstracts on the following are particularly encouraged: macroeconomic aspects of international trade and finance, monetary policy, exchange rates, and international capital markets. However, all macroeconomic and international research topics are welcome.

If you are interested in presenting a paper, please submit an abstract which includes (1) objectives; (2) background; (3) methodology; and (4) results/expected results. Attach a separate cover sheet listing (1) name; (2) affiliation; (3) mailing address, e-mail address, phone and fax numbers; and (4) the appropriate JEL biographical code.

Abstracts should be submitted by January 15, 2000 to:

Professor Beth Allen, CSWEP
Department of Economics
University of Minnesota
1035 Management and Economics
271 19th Avenue, South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 624-0204
Fax: (612) 624-0209

Abstracts in other areas, or proposals for entire sessions, should be sent as soon as possible, but no later than February 1, 1999, to:

Professor Sherwin Rosen
Department of Economics
University of Chicago
1126 E 59th Street
Chicago, IL 60637-1580
Please mark envelope
"AEA Meetings 2001"

In compliance with the AEA, one author of each paper must be an AEA member. The Association discourages multiple proposals from the same person (under no circumstances should more than two be submitted by the same proposer).

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

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

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

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

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

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

News and Notes

The *Bureau of Economic Analysis* (BEA) is announcing a new research program which will be administered by the American Statistical Association. This ASA/BEA research program is designed to bridge the gap between government and academic research. This program allows senior statisticians and economists to come to BEA where they may use agency data and interact with agency staff. Applications are due December 10th. Further information on the program is contained on the BEA web site www.bea.doc.gov/jobs/rsch.htm.

The ***Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Scholars in Health Policy Research Program*** was established in 1992 to foster the development of creative thinkers and problem solvers in health policy. Recent graduates of doctoral programs in economics, political science, and sociology, including junior faculty, are invited to apply for this unique and challenging fellowship. Up to 12 Scholars are selected annually to participate in the Program at one of three nationally prominent academic institutions – the University of California at Berkeley (in collaboration with the University of California at San Francisco); The University of Michigan; and Yale University. There they have the opportunity to work collaboratively in multidisciplinary environments with faculty from the social sciences, medicine, public health, public policy, management, and law. Scholars also have access to the full range of university resources and receive annual stipend support of $60,000 for the first year and $62,500 for the second year of the program. There are no teaching or administrative responsibilities.

To be eligible, applicants must have a doctoral degree in economics, political science, or sociology received after January 1, 1995 but not later than July 15, 2000. Preference will be given to applicants who have not previously worked in the area of health policy research. Applicants must be U.S. citizens. The deadline for receipt of applications is October 29, 1999.

For application materials, e-mail or call the national program office:

Scholars in Health Policy Research Program
Boston University School of Management
595 Commonwealth Avenue, Room 546-B
Boston, MA 02215-1704

Telephone: 617-353-9220
Fax: 617-353-9227
E-mail: rwjf@bu.edu

OBITUARY

Elizabeth Myers Clayton, a professor emeritus at the University of Missouri at St. Louis, died June 4, 1999, at her home in Edmonds, Washington. Professor Clayton was professor of economics at UMSL from 1968 until she retired in 1992. She also had been an associate vice chancellor for research at the university. Her specialty was Soviet agricultural economics.

In her career, she was research fellow at Harvard Law School and the Kenan Institute of the Smithsonian Institution. In 1982, she was a visiting professor of law and economics at Moscow State University. From 1983 to 1985, she was managing director of the University of Illinois Soviet Interview Project.

The CSWEP 'Brag Box'

"We need every day to herald some woman's achievements ... go ahead and boast!"
Carolyn Shaw Bell

Rebecca M. Blank has accepted a position as Dean of the School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan. She recently served on the Council of Economic Advisors.

Kate Pulling has been promoted to rank of Professor. She teaches at the Community College of Southern Nevada in Las Vegas and was recognized in 1998 by the Regents of the University and Community College System of Nevada as an Outstanding Faculty.

Esther-Mirjam Sent, assistant professor in economics at the University of Notre Dame was recently awarded the 1999 Gunnar Myrdal Prize of the European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy for her book, The Evolving Rationality of Rational Expectations: An Assessment of Thomas Sargent's Achievements (Cambridge University Press, 1998). This prize is awarded annually for the best monograph on a theme broadly in accord with the EAEPE Theoretical Perspectives.

Professor *Rosario Green*, Senator of the Republic on leave and Mexico's Secretary for Foreign Affairs, has accepted her nomination as an Economics Institute Distinguished Alumna. Professor Green studied at the EI in 1966 before going on to graduate from Columbia University, New York, with a degree in International Economics and a Certificate in Latin American Studies. She subsequently specialized in Latin American Integration Issues at the Institute for Latin American Integration (INTAL), Buenos Aires. Since 1968 she has been a professor and researcher at the Colegio de Mexico, receiving a Honoris Causa Ph.D. in Humanistic Sciences from the University of New Rochelle, NY, in 1996. She has published nine books on Mexican politics, finance, economy and education.

Chris M. Golde has published an article, "After the Offer, Before the Deal: Negotiating a First Academic Job," *Academe*, Jan-Feb 1999, p 44-49.

How to Become an Associate

CSWEP

THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE ECONOMICS PROFESSION

CSWEP depends on all of its dues-paying associates to continue its activities. In addition to publishing the Newsletter, we maintain a Roster of women economists that is used by associates, employers, organizations establishing advisory groups, and the like. We also organize sessions at the meetings of the AEA and the regional economics associations and publish an annual report on the status of women in the profession.

If you have not paid your dues for the current member year (July 1, 1999 - June 30, 2000), we urge you to do so. Questionnaires and dues reminders were mailed in September to associates.

If you have paid, please pass this newsletter page on to a student, friend, or colleague and tell them about our work. Thank you!

NOTICE: STUDENTS DO NOT HAVE TO PAY ASSOCIATE DUES!!!
JUST SEND IN THIS APPLICATION WITH A NOTE FROM A
FACULTY MEMBER VERIFYING YOUR STUDENT STATUS

To become a dues-paying associate of CSWEP and receive our Newsletter and Roster, send this application, with a check for $20 payable to:

CSWEP
c/o Dr. Joan Haworth
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Name ____________________

Mailing Address ____________________

City ____________________ State ____________ Zip ____________

Check here if currently an AEA member ________

Check one: Renewal of CSWEP associate ________ New CSWEP associate ________ Student ________

If you checked student, please indicate what institution you attend ____________________

Check here if you wish a copy of the Special Reprint Issue ________

The Special Reprint Issue of the newsletter contains reprints of ten articles designed to help women economists advance in the profession. The cost for non-paying members is $8.00.

CSWEP: People to Contact

General Policy Matters and Items for Newsletter .... **Robin Bartlett**, Department of Economics
Denison University
Granville, OH 43023
bartlett@denison.edu

Dues, Change of Address, Roster .... **Joan Haworth**, Membership Secretary
Economic Research Servicces, Inc.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
jhaworth@ersnet.com

CSWEP East .... **Barbara Fraumeni**
Bureau of Economic Analysis
BE-3
1441 'L' Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20230
barbara.Fraumeni@bea.doc.gov

CSWEP Mid-West .... **Jean Kimmel**
W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
300 South Westnedge Avenue
Kalamazoo, MI 49007
kimmel@we.upjohninst.org

CSWEP South .... **Catherine Eckel**, Department of Economics
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0316
eckelc@vt.edu

CSWEP West .... **Helen Popper**, Department of Economics
Santa Clara University
Santa Clara, CA 95053
hpopper@scu.edu