

Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

The American Economics Association (AEA) has charged the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) with monitoring the position of women in the profession and with undertaking activities to improve that position. This report presents information on the position of women in Ph.D.-granting and liberal arts institutions. In addition, this report discusses the Committee's activities during 1999.

Women Economists in and from Ph.D.-Granting Departments

For the past seven years, CSWEP has worked on making and maintaining contacts with CSWEP representatives at 120 Ph.D.-granting economics departments in the United States. One of the tasks of the CSWEP representative is to report on the status of women in their departments. In order to facilitate that reporting, a one-page questionnaire is sent every September to each CSWEP representative to complete and return by the end of November. Using its representatives, CSWEP has been able to acquire more complete and continuous data sets than are available currently through the AEA's Universal Academic Questionnaire (UAQ) which is also mailed each fall to all department chairs.¹ Tabulations of data from CSWEP's seven annual surveys allow for an examination of recent trends in the status of women graduate students, job applicants, and faculty members in Ph.D.-granting economics departments in the United States. Enough data have been finally collected to examine the pipeline of women in the profession.

In addition to the Ph.D.-granting survey, CSWEP has also made contacts over the past two years with representatives at 160 liberal arts institutions. In the fall, the surveys are sent to

the liberal arts representatives to be completed and returned. While the data in both sets of these surveys contain a great deal of "noise," the information is useful and some trends are discernable.

Information from the CSWEP Ph.D.-Granting Institutions Questionnaire on the Status of Women Graduate Students in Economics.—Table 1 provides information on the percentage of female students at various stages of a graduate career: first year, ABD ("all but dissertation" completed), and Ph.D. In 1993, 30.5 percent of all first-year students were women. In 1999, that figure had increased to 35.6 percent. In 1993, 27.2 percent of all ABD's were women. In 1999, that figure had increased to 33.0 percent. In 1993, 24.2 percent of students earning a Ph.D. who were women, and in 1999, that figure was up to 34.2 percent. Comparing the percentage of first-year students in 1993 with the percentage of women who earned a Ph.D. five years later in 1997, suggests that the dropout rate in graduate school is improving for women. For example in 1993, 21.9 percent of the students who entered graduate programs were women, and in 1997, 24.9 percent of those who earned a degree were women.

Table 2 has the same set of percentages for the top 20 economics departments in the country.² There is one discernable pattern in this table. Most of the percentages of students who are women at various points in their graduate studies are lower than those found in Table 1. Table 3 presents the same percentages for the top 10 economics departments in the United

¹ CSWEP's sample contains all U.S. economics departments plus the University of Toronto, while that of the AEA UAQ includes a few more non-U.S. economics departments. The most recent versions of the AEA UAQ are much shorter and have received a much greater response rate.

² The top 20 departments are Brown University, University of California—Berkeley, University of California—Los Angeles, University of California—San Diego, University of Chicago, Columbia University, Cornell University, Harvard University, University of Maryland, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, New York University, Northwestern University, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, University of Rochester, Stanford University, University of Wisconsin, and Yale University.

TABLE 1—THE PERCENTAGE OF ECONOMISTS IN THE PIPELINE WHO ARE FEMALE, ALL PH.D.-GRANTING DEPARTMENTS, 1993–1999

| Pipeline | 1993 (n = 81) | 1994 (n = 111) | 1995 (n = 95) | 1996 (n = 98) | 1997 (n = 95) | 1998 (n = 92) | 1999 (n = 77) |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Graduate School | | | | | | | |
| First year | 30.5 | 29.0 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 31.3 | 32.2 | 35.6 |
| ABD | 27.2 | 25.7 | 27.8 | 28.3 | 26.8 | 28.2 | 33.0 |
| Ph.D. | 24.2 | 26.8 | 23.2 | 24.1 | 25.0 | 29.9 | 34.2 |
| Overall | 27.7 | 27.4 | 27.8 | 28.2 | 27.7 | 29.6 | 34.0 |
| Job market | | | | | | | |
| Academic Ph.D. | 35.0 | 28.4 | 25.9 | 20.2 | 20.2 | 24.4 | 30.5 |
| Academic non-Ph.D. | 25.8 | 35.7 | 34.7 | 26.4 | 35.5 | 36.9 | 31.3 |
| Public sector | 31.1 | 25.8 | 28.7 | 29.5 | 35.5 | 36.5 | 31.9 |
| Private sector | 24.2 | 27.7 | 20.5 | 28.0 | 34.6 | 29.4 | 28.7 |
| Non-U.S. academic | 19.4 | 25.2 | 19.7 | 21.1 | 19.6 | 32.0 | 30.8 |
| Non-U.S. nonacademic | 13.6 | 12.3 | 11.9 | 16.7 | 8.6 | 17.5 | 31.7 |
| No job | 20.0 | 17.5 | 15.6 | 28.0 | 19.9 | 18.0 | 26.2 |
| Overall | 25.5 | 25.5 | 23.0 | 24.5 | 25.4 | 28.4 | 30.4 |
| Academe | | | | | | | |
| Non-tenure-track full-time (U) | 30.4 | 25.2 | 39.2 | 50.8 | 38.0 | 31.8 | 31.8 |
| Non-tenure-track full-time (T) | 16.7 | 6.8 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.6 | 23.1 |
| Assistant professors (U) | 24.0 | 22.9 | 24.2 | 23.8 | 26.0 | 25.9 | 27.8 |
| Assistant professors (T) | 34.6 | 24.5 | 11.8 | 30.8 | 17.9 | 9.1 | 14.0 |
| Associate professors (U) | 7.4 | 6.4 | 14.1 | 9.1 | 11.1 | 15.9 | 27.3 |
| Associate professors (T) | 14.5 | 13.6 | 12.9 | 15.4 | 13.4 | 14.0 | 15.1 |
| Full professors (U) | 12.1 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 2.94 | 0.0 |
| Full professors (T) | 6.7 | 6.3 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 6.5 |
| Overall | 13.5 | 12.0 | 13.3 | 14.8 | 13.0 | 13.3 | 14.1 |

Notes: U = untenured; T = tenured. The number of departments reporting (n) is given at the top of each column.

States.³ Again, all of the percentages of students who are women at various points in their graduate studies are lower than those found in Table 1. In addition, most of the percentages are smaller than those found in Table 2. In terms of a pipeline of qualified women making it over the first hurdle (graduate school), these findings are encouraging. The percentage of women entering graduate school is up. The percentage of female graduate students who entered a graduate program in 1993 compared to the percentage female among those who left with a Ph.D. five years later indicates that female graduate students make it proportionately through the programs.

³ The top 10 economics departments are University of California–Los Angeles, University of Chicago, Columbia University, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Stanford University, and Yale University.

Information from the CSWEP Ph.D.-Granting Institution Questionnaire on the Status of Women Job Applicants in Economics.—The fate of women in the job market is seen in the percentages found in the second section of Tables 1, 2, and 3. As shown in Table 1, 35 percent of the jobs in Ph.D.-granting departments went to newly minted female Ph.D.'s in 1993. That percentage fell to 30.5 percent in 1999. Female Ph.D.'s received more than their fair share of new job offers in 1993, but they received less than their fair share in 1999 at these institutions. Women received disproportionately more jobs at non-Ph.D.-granting departments in 1993 and fewer in 1999. In terms of public- and private-sector jobs, female Ph.D.'s in economics received a larger proportion of the new job offers in the public sector and a smaller proportion of jobs in the private sector in 1993. Newly minted female Ph.D.'s received a smaller proportion of both public- and private-sector jobs than did their male counterparts in 1999. In terms of non-U.S. jobs, a disproportionately smaller per-

TABLE 2—THE PERCENTAGE OF ECONOMISTS IN THE PIPELINE WHO ARE FEMALE,
TOP 20 PH.D.-GRANTING DEPARTMENTS, 1993–1999

| Pipeline | 1993 (n = 18) | 1994 (n = 20) | 1995 (n = 19) | 1996 (n = 19) | 1997 (n = 17) | 1998 (n = 16) | 1999 (n = 15) |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Graduate School | | | | | | | |
| First Year | 21.9 | 27.8 | 26.1 | 30.2 | 21.5 | 28.8 | 31.1 |
| ABD | 23.4 | 22.6 | 26.8 | 26.4 | 28.6 | 24.1 | 25.4 |
| Ph.D. | 25.4 | 28.4 | 21.8 | 22.7 | 24.9 | 27.1 | 28.1 |
| Overall | 23.4 | 26.3 | 25.7 | 26.6 | 26.4 | 25.6 | 27.8 |
| Job Market | | | | | | | |
| Academic Ph.D. | 30.8 | 24.4 | 19.4 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 17.5 | 32.7 |
| Academic non-Ph.D. | 25.0 | 31.0 | 57.1 | 42.3 | 54.3 | 70.0 | 50.0 |
| Public sector | 26.9 | 25.6 | 20.4 | 32.5 | 47.5 | 34.0 | 35.0 |
| Private sector | 29.0 | 20.0 | 23.5 | 25.9 | 27.3 | 20.0 | 31.3 |
| Non-U.S. academic | 16.7 | 29.3 | 15.2 | 9.8 | 15.2 | 29.6 | 25.0 |
| Non-U.S. nonacademic | 20.0 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 20.0 | 4.4 | 9.1 | 28.6 |
| No job | 16.7 | 12.8 | 11.8 | 31.2 | 27.5 | 6.3 | 10.0 |
| Overall | 24.9 | 22.1 | 20.7 | 24.7 | 26.1 | 23.7 | 31.5 |
| Academe | | | | | | | |
| Non-tenure-track full-time (U) | 40.0 | 19.0 | 57.1 | 50.0 | 39.1 | 36.0 | 35.5 |
| Non-tenure-track full-time (T) | 12.5 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Assistant professors (U) | 20.4 | 18.9 | 17.5 | 18.2 | 17.8 | 16.4 | 21.6 |
| Assistant professors (T) | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 17.4 |
| Associate professors (U) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 36.4 | 46.2 |
| Associate professors (T) | 9.0 | 10.7 | 12.1 | 16.7 | 16.0 | 8.3 | 16.3 |
| Full professors (U) | 12.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Full professors (T) | 3.8 | 4.2 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 4.7 | 4.8 |
| Overall | 10.3 | 9.4 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.0 | 9.9 | 11.9 |

Notes: U = untenured; T = tenured. The number of departments reporting (n) is given at the top of each column.

centage of female economists took non-U.S. jobs in 1993. However, the percentage of women taking non-U.S. jobs increased considerably in 1999. Similarly, a disproportionately smaller percentage of female Ph.D.'s did not find jobs in 1993. By 1999 that figure had increased.

As indicated by the percentages found in Tables 2 and 3, women graduating from the top 20 departments meet with less success than women who earned a Ph.D. at lesser-ranked institutions. While the overall trends are the same as those found for the aggregate, there are some interesting differences. For example, in 1993 recent female graduates from the top 20 departments received 30.8 percent of the new jobs in Ph.D.-granting departments and 32.7 percent in 1999. Over the seven years, however, that percentage decreased before it rose again. Moreover, the percentage of women from the top 20 departments who found jobs in non-Ph.D.-granting institutions increased from 25.0 percent in 1993 to 50.0 percent in 1999. The top

10 departments exhibited a similar pattern. The overall trend is for women who are receiving Ph.D.'s from one of the top 20 economics departments to be able to find a job and in more areas of the market. In terms of the public and private sector, the overall percentages indicate that women have begun receiving a disproportionate share of both public and private jobs. In contrast, a disproportionately smaller percentage of jobs abroad are going to women in each tier and in the aggregate. Finally, women are finding jobs. The percentage of women with no jobs is small or zero. Over the past few years women economists have moved increasingly into non-Ph.D. and nonacademic areas.

Information from the CSWEP Ph.D.-Granting Institutions Questionnaire on Women Faculty in Economics.—Overall, as demonstrated in Table 1, the proportion of faculty who are women in non-tenure-track full-time jobs at Ph.D.-granting departments increased and decreased significantly over the past seven years from a

TABLE 3—THE PERCENTAGE OF ECONOMISTS IN THE PIPELINE WHO ARE FEMALE,
TOP 10 PH.D.-GRANTING DEPARTMENTS, 1993–1999

| Pipeline | 1993 (<i>n</i> = 8) | 1994 (<i>n</i> = 10) | 1995 (<i>n</i> = 9) | 1996 (<i>n</i> = 9) | 1997 (<i>n</i> = 8) | 1998 (<i>n</i> = 7) | 1999 (<i>n</i> = 7) |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Graduate School | | | | | | | |
| First year | 19.5 | 23.8 | 24.5 | 26.5 | 20.3 | 27.2 | 29.6 |
| ABD | 20.0 | 20.2 | 24.1 | 23.9 | 25.0 | 22.0 | 25.2 |
| Ph.D. | 22.8 | 27.9 | 19.6 | 18.6 | 16.5 | 25.9 | 24.3 |
| Overall | 20.4 | 23.8 | 23.4 | 23.4 | 22.5 | 23.7 | 26.0 |
| Job market | | | | | | | |
| Academic Ph.D. | 27.8 | 20.5 | 17.2 | 19.6 | 9.3 | 17.0 | 34.9 |
| Academic non-Ph.D. | 30.8 | 16.7 | 57.1 | 30.8 | 42.9 | 75.0 | 50.0 |
| Public sector | 13.6 | 17.4 | 24.0 | 21.1 | 45.5 | 41.7 | 29.4 |
| Private sector | 32.0 | 21.1 | 23.8 | 25.0 | 27.3 | 20.8 | 29.2 |
| Non-U.S. academic | 21.4 | 36.0 | 12.5 | 12.0 | 11.8 | 20.8 | 20.0 |
| Non-U.S. Nonacademic | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 7.7 | 25.0 | 22.2 |
| No job | 14.3 | 14.8 | 5.6 | 28.9 | 26.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Overall | 22.9 | 20.0 | 18.1 | 22.6 | 23.0 | 34.0 | 30.4 |
| Academe | | | | | | | |
| Non-tenure-track full-time (U) | 33.3 | 21.5 | 50.0 | 45.5 | 44.4 | 33.3 | 41.7 |
| Non-tenure-track full-time (T) | 12.5 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Assistant professors (U) | 22.5 | 18.8 | 14.1 | 21.1 | 20.0 | 17.7 | 14.7 |
| Assistant professors (T) | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
| Associate professors (U) | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 36.4 | 45.5 |
| Associate professors (T) | 20.0 | 18.6 | 12.0 | 20.0 | 12.5 | 7.7 | 28.6 |
| Full professors (U) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Full professors (T) | 3.5 | 2.9 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 3.9 |
| Overall | 10.7 | 10.2 | 8.9 | 11.9 | 10.9 | 9.7 | 10.9 |

Notes: U = untenured; T = tenured. The number of departments reporting (*n*) is given at the top of each column.

low of 25.2 percent in 1994 to a high of 50.8 percent in 1996 and back down to 31.8 percent in 1999. The percentage of assistant professors without tenure who are women is approximately equal to that of those earning a Ph.D. for the year, except for the last year. Unfortunately, the data also show that a disproportionate number of female assistant professors are not promoted to associate professor. The percentage of women among those at the associate professor rank hovers around 14 percent. Similarly, the percentage of full professors who are women with tenure has not improved much over the past seven years, remaining at around 6 percent. The percentage of faculty who are women holding appointments at the 120 Ph.D.-producing departments remains around 13 percent.

Tables 2 and 3 exhibit the same information as that exhibited in Table 1, but the trends are once again more pronounced. There tend to be larger percentages of women in non-tenure-track full-time positions in the highly ranked departments. The percentages of the assistant,

associate, and full professors who are women are all less than those of otherwise ranked institutions in Table 1. In addition, the top 10 departments in general have smaller percentages of women.

The availability of qualified women to serve the economics profession has definitely increased. The data that CSWEP has collected indicates that women have hit a glass ceiling early in their careers, at the time of tenure and promotion. In terms of the pipeline, in 1993, 24.0 percent of the new assistant professors were women. Seven years later, only 15.1 percent of the tenured associate professors were women. At the top 20 departments, in 1993, 20.4 percent of the untenured assistant professors were women. By 1999, only 16.3 percent of the tenured associate professors were women. At the top 10 departments, the situation was in marked contrast, 22.5 percent of the untenured assistant professors and 28.6 percent of the tenured associate professors in 1999 were women. Even though the number of schools in

TABLE 4—PERCENTAGE FEMALE FOR LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTIONS, 1998

| Faculty composition, 1998–1999 academic year (excluding visiting faculty) | Untenured | | | Tenured | | |
|--|-----------|-------|---------------------|---------|-----|---------------------|
| | Women | Men | Percentage women | Women | Men | Percentage women |
| Assistant professor | 58 | 59 | 49.6 | 5 | 17 | 22.7 |
| Associate professor | 7 | 14 | 33.3 | 57 | 131 | 30.3 |
| Full professor | 2 | 11 | 15.4 | 37 | 249 | 12.9 |
| Other (non-tenure-track) | 17 | 33 | 34 | 1 | 0 | 100 |
| <i>Student Information, 1998–1999 academic year:</i> | | | | | | |
| Senior majors ($N = 103$) | 1,203 | 2,082 | 37.6 | | | |

TABLE 5—PERCENTAGE FEMALE FOR LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTIONS, 1999

| Faculty composition, 1999–2000 academic year (excluding visiting faculty) | Untenured | | | Tenured | | |
|--|-----------|-------|---------------------|---------|-----|---------------------|
| | Women | Men | Percentage women | Women | Men | Percentage women |
| Assistant professor | 54.6 | 68.6 | 44.3 | 5 | 9 | 35.7 |
| Associate professor | 6 | 8 | 42.9 | 58 | 132 | 30.5 |
| Full professor | 1 | 4 | 20 | 40 | 219 | 15.4 |
| Other (non-tenure-track) | 31 | 40 | 43.7 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| <i>Student Information, 1999–2000 academic year:</i> | | | | | | |
| Senior majors ($N = 100$) | 1,427 | 2,368 | 37.6 | | | |

the top 20 that report varies over time, the percentages do not depart markedly from the 1994 data, where every department reported. For most women in economics, tenure and promotion are the stumbling blocks. It is also important to keep in mind how few women are in these institutions. In 1993, there were 79 female full professors at the reporting Ph.D.-granting departments and in 1999 that number was 68. In 1993, there were 61 female associate professors at the reporting Ph.D.-granting departments, and in 1999 that number was 54. In 1993, there were 79 female out of 110 assistant professors at the reporting Ph.D.-granting departments, and in 1999 that number was 102. While a greater percentage of young female economists are going to non-Ph.D.-granting institutions and into public and private careers outside of academia, there is no reason to suspect that they are being any more successful. However, data in Tables 4 and 5 suggest that women may have a higher probability of getting tenure and promotion at liberal arts institutions. In Table 5, 44.3 percent of the new assistant professors were

women in 1999, 30.5 percent of tenured associate professors were women, and 15.4 percent of the full professors were women.

The Committee's Activities

CSWEP Ongoing Activities.—CSWEP is involved in a wide range of activities to help promote women in the profession and to increase the probabilities that they will earn tenure and be successful. As part of its ongoing efforts to increase the participation of women on the AEA program, CSWEP organized six sessions for the January 2000 ASSA meetings. Barbara Fraumeni organized three sessions on gender-related issues and History/History of Economic Thought. Lisa Lynch organized three sessions on a variety of non-gender-related microeconomic issues. In addition, CSWEP organized a roundtable discussion on “CSWEP into the Future: Men and Women in Economics” to begin to chart the role that CSWEP will play in the profession in this millennium. Susan Collins (Georgetown University), Hank Farber (Prince-

ton University), and Marianne Ferber (University of Illinois) took part in a lively discussion. CSWEP also held a business meeting to report to its associates and other interested AEA members about its activities and to hear suggestions from those present for future activities. The business meeting also served as the venue for the premier showing of "CCOFFE: Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists" a video of the 1998 CCOFFE workshop. CCOFFE participants from the national and regional meetings were invited to attend. Several of the workshop veterans reported having received tenure, having had grant proposals funded, and having had their work published. The AEA should commit to the funding of future workshops as part of its continued commitment to the promotion of women in economics. To encourage networking and to support junior women meeting senior women, a hospitality suite was provided every morning and afternoon at the meeting and staffed by members of the Committee.

New CSWEP Initiatives.—CCOFFE workshops were organized and conducted at the Eastern and Western Economic Association meetings. Barbara Fraumeni (Bureau of Economic Analysis) and Daphne Kenyon (Simmons College) organized and facilitated the CCOFFE workshop at the Eastern Economic Association meetings in Boston in March. Rachel McCulloch (Brandeis University), Amy Schwartz (New York University), and Lisa Lynch (Tufts University) all served as the workshop's senior women. Kathy Keil (College of the Holy Cross) helped with the logistics of the workshop. Helen Popper (Santa Clara University) organized the CCOFFE workshop for the Western Economic Association meetings in July. Mary Deily (National Science Foundation), Joyce Jacobsen (Wesleyan University), Arleen Leibowitz (University of California–Los Angeles), and Valerie Ramey (University of California–San Diego) all served as the workshop's senior women. Andrea Ziegert (Denison University) helped coordinate the regional meetings.

Finally, the two national awards for women economists that were first established two years ago at the 25th Anniversary celebration of CSWEP continued. Barbara Fraumeni orga-

nized the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award. This award is given to a woman who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, through her example, through her achievements, through increasing our understanding of how woman can advance through the economics professions, or through her mentoring of other women. Last year Alice Rivlin (Federal Reserve Board of Governors) was awarded the first Carolyn Shaw Bell Prize. This year the prize went to Sandra Ohrn Moose (Boston Consulting Group). The winner of that prize receives not only the public recognition for her accomplishments, but is also given a 2 × 3-foot plaque with her name and that of previous winners on it to display prominently at her place of work. Catherine Eckel headed up another committee that founded the Elaine Bennett Research Award. This award is given in memory of Elaine Bennett and was initially funded by her husband William Zame (University of California–Los Angeles). The prize is intended to recognize and honor outstanding research by a young woman in any area of economics and is awarded every other year. The recipient gives a 45-minute lecture after the CSWEP business meeting. Last year's recipient was Judith Chevalier (University of Chicago).

CSWEP's Regional Activities.—To assist women in the profession who cannot make it to national meetings, CSWEP's regional representatives organize sessions at the Eastern, Southern, Midwest, and Western Economic Association meetings. As at the national meetings, sessions are on gender-related research and on a non-gender-related field to showcase the work of younger women economists. CSWEP is increasing its efforts to broaden the base of its organization by encouraging a closer liaison between the regional governing boards and the formation of regional CSWEP committees to attend to the work of the region associations. The Eastern Economic Association has voted to make its CSWEP representative an ex officio member of its executive committee.

Several Words of Thanks

The Committee thanks several people who have made major contributions to its effort. First, the Chair of CSWEP, on behalf of the

Committee, thanks all of the senior women who helped with the CCOFFE workshops and the junior women who participated in them. Everyone gave of their talents and expertise in a concerted effort to catapult women into the upper ranks of the academy. As always Joan Harworth, the Membership Secretary, and her staff have served CSWEP well by maintaining the Roster, sending out annual membership reminders, and creating customized listings for potential employers.

Two CSWEP members will leave the Committee at the end of 1999: Catherine Eckel and Henry Farber. Catherine Eckel (Virginia Tech University) was instrumental in shepherding the CCOFFE proposal through the National Science Foundation and instituting the Elaine Bennett Award. As CSWEP's Southern representative, she organized several sessions and held business meetings and receptions at the Southern Economic Association meetings. Henry Farber (Princeton University) lent his expertise and advice on several occasions during the grant-writing process for CCOFFE and participated in the 2000

roundtable. He was an active member of the board with flawless attendance. Both of these Committee members also organized sessions for the national meetings and edited an issue of the newsletter. They deserve our deepest thanks for a job well done.

Finally, the Chair of CSWEP thanks Sally Scheiderer for keeping the Chair, the Committee, and all of its paper and cyber work on track. Additional thanks go to both Denison University and its Department of Economics for substantially supporting the work of CSWEP with office space, paper, telephones, and postage. Mary Winer and her staff at the AEA offices also deserve a word of thanks for all of their help with budgets and general information. Marlene Height was also a tremendous help arranging for meeting rooms at the national meetings. All of these people have been wonderful to work with, and the Committee could not have been as successful and productive as it was without their dedication.

ROBIN L. BARTLETT, *Chair*