



Chair's Message

It is the time of year in which I like to reflect on what has been accomplished the previous academic year and what lies ahead. CWEC/CFÉC had an amazing presence and overall contribution to the CEA Annual Meetings in Banff, Alberta



this year. We hosted three professional development sessions along with our annual luncheon and a mentoring breakfast. *Betsy Stevenson* from the University of Michigan gave the keynote lecture at the luncheon and it was the best luncheon lecture I've ever seen. The topic was "What economics can teach us about working families and what working families means for teaching economics." Not only was the topic on point but she made everyone laugh more than I've ever heard a crowd laugh during an economics talk. If you missed it, you can view the lecture on [our website](#).

We also presented our two CWEC/CFÉC awards at Banff. The 2019 Young Researcher Prize was awarded to *Lucija Anna Muehlenbachs* from the University of Calgary for her amazing environmental economics scholarship. The inaugural CWEC/CFÉC Service Award was given to *Roberta Edgecomb Robb*. This award is given in recognition of having "furthered the status of women in the profession, through example, achievements, increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the profession, or mentoring others." Professor Robb has been an outstanding contributor and indeed pioneer in each of these areas, influencing a generation of women in the profession and, through her policy work, beyond it. We were honored to be able to present Professor Robb the award this year and hear her inspiring acceptance speech at the luncheon (watch the video here if you missed it). The 2019/2020 academic year is going to be an exciting year for CWEC/CFÉC. We are embarking on two major projects. First, we are updating our Survey of the Status of Women Economists. Second, we will be administering a Workplace Climate Survey of Canadian Economists. This survey will be similar to the survey that the American Economic Association administered this past year. Both these initiatives will provide CWEC/CFÉC and the CEA a baseline measurement of where we are at in Canada in terms of gender diversity and workplace climate. With this knowledge, we hope to continue the uphill battle for improvement by targeting specific needs based on the data. Please fill out the survey when it arrives in your inbox in September 2019.

We want to hear from you! Please email CWEC.CFEC@gmail.com! We want to hear about your successes along with your ideas of what we should be doing. We are here to make our profession a better place so please let us know what you need!

Elizabeth Dhuey



Interview with Betsey Stevenson

by M. Connolly



Betsey Stevenson gave the 2019 keynote lecture at the CWEC/CFÉC luncheon at the CEA conference in Banff, entitled “What economics can teach us about working families and what working families means for teaching economics.” Drawing on her extensive research on families and labour markets, as well as her own personal experiences, she delivered an engaging, challenging, and frequently hilarious talk.

Betsey’s slides can be accessed [here](#). Watch Bestey’s address [here](#).

Could you tell us a bit about how you found your way into Economics?

I was the type of person who naturally thought about opportunity costs from a small age. My approach to thinking about the world is in an economics framework: opportunity costs, balancing costs and benefits, thinking on the margin.

When I walked into my first economics class, I thought it was intuitive and natural, and that drew me into it. I’m interested in how people make choices and decisions, so when I was in college I took economics, sociology and psychology. What I really like is the framework that economics gives us for trying to think systematically about how people make choices, and the ways in which society or policy shifts incentives in a way that changes the choices people make. I think of it as diverting a stream: public policy comes in, changes incentives, and people go in another direction in response. A lot of people think of this as unintended consequences, but I think we shouldn’t. It may be unintended by policy makers, but when we shift incentives people are going to reoptimize. So we want to think about all the ways in which they will reoptimize whenever we design public policy.

What is your inspiration for the particular research questions that you ask?

I’m really interested in how people make choices in their lives. For me, it seems like we cannot isolate or separate our personal life from our market or professional life. Who you pick as your spouse will impact your job; what you pick as your job will impact your relationship with your spouse. How are these choices intertwined with what people are trying to achieve with their lives? When public policy changes what you can do in your personal life, it’s going to have an impact on what kind of career you’re going to have. That’s what I think makes the labour market different. When I was in graduate school a macroeconomist said to me “I never understand why economists spend so much time studying labour markets. Why not orange markets? What makes labour so different?” Well, it’s because people have motivation, they have goals, they have flaws, they seek meaning in their lives and work. Oranges have none of these things! And these all impact how productive you are at work. There’s a connection between our mental health and our productivity. For example, people who are unhappy are likely going to be less productive at work than they would be if they were happier. Workers also behave differently depending on whether they believe their boss is fair. Ignoring these connections makes it hard for us to understand how labour markets work.

What are some of the challenges you face in doing your research?

I think the biggest challenge everyone faces is time. How are you going to allocate your time across the many things that you can do? The other challenge is that there are times when a research project is really exciting to work on it, and times when it’s less exciting. You have to get through the less exciting times to be able to work again on something that is more exciting. Most people’s experience is that the cycle of research projects involves some big ups. That’s why we like doing it: we’re driven by curiosity, we want to know the answer. Then there are tedious

parts that are hard to get through, but if you don't get through them, you don't get to move on. You have to be strong-willed through the whole thing.

You have also been involved in policy making and advising, as member of the Council of Economic Advisers and chief Economist at the US Department of Labor. How has your experience in Washington affected the research that you do?

It exposed me to a broader set of research questions that are on policy makers' minds. That's helpful for trying to figure out what it is that I want to work on, driving my research towards questions where I think the answers will have a bigger impact. It's now easier for me to consider a research question and realize that I need to be able to say: What is this question really answering, and why? Is it going to advance our knowledge enough? Particularly with empirical research, we have to avoid the pitfall of answering only questions that we know how to answer. I think that economists too often avoid important questions because they are hard to answer. Instead, an economist might focus on small questions where they have a good identification strategy and so they're going to be able to answer it. It's obviously useful to answer things that you can answer, but it's also important to answer important questions. Trying to think about the balance between the two became much more salient to me coming out of DC, because policy makers want to know answers to the important questions. And somebody is going to give them an answer. So the question is: can we do research in a way that means we give them a better answer than they will otherwise get?



Do you have tips on how to communicate with policy makers?

First of all, think about what the research really says, and boil it down to its main findings. Don't lead with the caveats! People often lead with the caveats, but the problem is that the person that is listening to you doesn't understand what you're saying to begin with. So you want to start with the big idea, and then if you have caveats to add on, you want to add them on. That's not because you want people to overinterpret your research. You just want to make sure that people are following along with the conversation. Another thing is to avoid jargon or acronyms. Remember that the person you're speaking to doesn't spend all their

time doing this, so they are not aware of the language that researchers typically use. When you use unfamiliar language, you're putting up a barrier that makes it harder to get your idea across. There's a balance that you have to strike between giving methodological details and just communicating the findings. There's lots of research where the researchers may not find what they claim that they're finding, so you need to dig in to the details. But I think that researchers can be so worried that they stick too tightly to a technical level of discussion and the result is that we fail to adequately disseminate our findings. Partially I think that the balance is struck by thinking about the order in which you present your results, the methodology, and the limitations of your findings.

You wrote many papers that relate to gender and the place of women in our society. What do you think can be done to promote gender equality in the economics profession?

We're going to have to start thinking hard at every point about whether we're doing enough to promote women. It's become clear over the last couple of years that there's an underlying hostility towards women in the profession that we're going to have to eradicate. Different people have different views on how to do that. I think we need to tackle our seminar culture. We need to tackle our belief that rude and aggressive behavior is necessary to discover truth. I think that we can question people, probe their research, and ask hard questions, but we can do that without being impolite, without belittling people. For economists who push back on that and say this culture isn't that big of a deal, they should really take a look around. Not only do I see people who are unnecessarily aggressive, but I believe that women are more often the targets of that kind behaviour. When it's a woman at the front of the room, the aggression is harsher, it comes in earlier, they're given less benefit of the doubt than when it's a guy. While this is just my personal observations, it seems plausible that implicit gender bias leads to differential effects of our aggressive culture.

We have to tackle our culture as a profession in terms of how we treat people, and how we tolerate people who misbehave. I took for granted for the first 18 years of my career that there are some guys who are just real jerks and we just all know that, and that's who they are. The view seemed to be that they're contributing good research, so we operate around them and leave them alone. The result is that they don't get asked to do as much service. I've even heard people say that being difficult is their strategy to avoid service. That's a strategy only because we tolerate it. Even worse, there are people who are known to be sexual predators, and nothing happens to them.

It's about men and women, standing up and saying that's not ok. It's not just about women. Men can also get bullied and harassed. But the most vulnerable people in the profession bear the brunt of the bullies, and the most vulnerable are women and minorities, so they are disproportionately getting bullied. We have to start holding all our colleagues accountable. It's not enough to not be a jerk, you have to stand up against the jerks.

There are also other small concrete things we can do. For example, there's a really nice paper that showed that when you expose students in introductory economics classes to female economics alumni, women are more likely to take another economics class, with no negative effect on the guys. The examples matter because people need to be able to imagine themselves in that profession.

Have you faced situations as an academic in general and working in your field that seemed to be specific to your gender? If so, would you mind sharing one of these incidents with us?

I moderated a panel at the AEA meetings on gender and Susan Athey said that when she got her first job, she just tried to look like one of the guys. I really identified with that comment. When I was in graduate school, I really wrestled with the fact that it's clear that I'm a woman, but there's a lot of discrimination, so I just need to pretend that I'm not a woman. When it was time to go on the job market, I needed a suitcase. My mom sent me this new suitcase, and it is this purple flowered suitcase, and I cried and cried and cried. I needed a black nondescript suitcase! I needed to look like everybody else! I shipped the suitcase back to my mom because I couldn't imagine letting myself appear that girly. That's a silly example, but the important point is that women shouldn't have to try to fit in with guys. Susan Athey shouldn't have thought that she needed to wear khakis and I shouldn't have worried about a suitcase.

You have to make some peace with the ways in which you're treated differently. If you focus on them too much, you get really frustrated. But if you ignore them completely, then we can't make any change. Do I think that my research has been dismissed more by some people because of my gender? For sure. Have I gotten less credit than my coauthors because of my gender? For sure. There's only so much I can do about it, so those aren't things that I dwell on. Right now I'm at stage in my career where I think my responsibility is to make things better for the next generation, rather than trying to make things better for me.

Here's a fun anecdote for Canadians. I was supposed to go up for full professor this year, but there was some confusion as to whether my time in government was supposed to be counted, and if it didn't count, then I wasn't

supposed to be going up for full yet. But if it counted, then I was supposed to be up. My Dean told me that he hadn't thought that it counted, and that it was so much hassle to reverse course at the last minute so we should just wait. But generously, he said that he'd put me up if I really wanted to go up this year. I felt really bad because it is a hassle for so many people, there's all these reports and letters people have to write. Because it was going to be on a tighter timeline, it was even more hassle and I thought I should let it go. But then an associate professor in Canada won the Nobel Prize [Donna Theo Strickland, then associate professor at the University of Waterloo, now promoted to full professor, won the Nobel Prize in Physics in 2018] and people asked her why she was just an associate professor, and her answer was that she never got around to it. I realized that women put a lot of weight on not wanting to inconvenience others and are more reluctant to insist on promotions and raises. I realized that a man in my situation would ask to be put up for full. So I called my Dean and said I wanted to be put up for promotion. I went up this year, and I just got promoted to full professor.

Congratulations! Would you mind sharing any advice you have for women economists in Canada (and elsewhere!)?

It's important to realize that what's good for you and what's good for women in the profession aren't always going to be the same thing. I tell young women, you should do what's good for you. I was once on a panel where a woman raised her hand and said "I feel like I am judged more harshly when I give a seminar, what should I do?" And this other woman answered that what she does is to prepare extra hard. It might be good advice for you, but for the profession, telling women that they have to work harder than the men is not good advice. It's not sustainable advice. It's not going to close our gender gap. There are tricks you can do as a woman who's right now desperately trying to get tenure, to get promotion, but keep in mind that that might not be what's good for women in the profession. And just make sure that when you reach the goal that you want to reach, you turn around and help make it easier for women coming after you. That is my goal with my career. I tolerated a lot of things that are not ideal to tolerate, and now I feel like I've gotten where I want to go, so it's time for me to do everything I can to make it easier for the next generation.



Inaugural CWEC/CFÉC Service Award goes to Roberta Edgecomb Robb



At the 2019 CEA meetings in Banff, Alberta, Roberta Edgecombe Robb was the first recipient the CWEC/CFÉC Service award. This award is given in recognition of having “furthered the status of women in the profession, through example, achievements, increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the profession, or mentoring others.”

Professor Robb has been an outstanding contributor and indeed pioneer in each of these areas, influencing a generation of women in the profession and, through her policy work, beyond it. Her research and service to the academic and the broader community have centred around understanding the status of women in the workforce and how government or employer policies, including affirmative action, equal pay and

employment equity policy and family policies, can affect the labour force participation of women and should be treated as issues of economic importance.

Her advancement of women spans a wide-range of endeavors, including having, alongside Lorraine Eden, laid out the initial groundwork for establishing CWEN in the early 1990s (later, serving as President from 1997-1999). The representation of women and the climate for female economists in Canada are better because of Professor Robb. Roberta shared her inspiring acceptance speech with us below.

As I grow older, I find that even while enjoying my present life very much, I have started, occasionally, to look backwards – reflecting on the choices I made; roads taken or not; opportunities offered and lost. Not surprisingly, given that it occupied some thirty-three years of my life, a lot of this reflection focuses on my career as an academic economist – was it the right choice for me, did any of that work matter? To anybody?

When I started my career in 1971, not only in the economics profession, but in the broader academy as well, the rules, policies, procedures, values, perspectives, networks, etc. were designed primarily for men’s careers. In those early years, I lived and worked within the context of that culture, building my academic credentials, raising my two children, caring for my aging parents, and in my spare time, trying to chip away at some of the more egregious aspects of the gender inequality I saw around me. While there were, clearly, some wonderful times during that period, it was, on the whole, not an easy row to hoe.

All my research work focused on women’s experience in the labour market – hardly a hotbed of interest to mainstream economists at the time. And even though I would be the first to acknowledge that I benefited immensely from both mentoring and support from some of my male colleagues (there were very few senior females in the discipline at that time) I could never shake the feeling that I didn’t fit, that the work I felt was critically important was generally not regarded as a serious pursuit. The added fact that all the rules and procedures and networks at that time did not serve women well – especially those women in families with children – exacerbated the sense of feeling on the outside, and I had enough contact with other women economists to know that I was not alone in the way I felt.



In one way or another, we all struggled with gender inequality, and by the late eighties, although we had made some headway on some issues, it was clear that simple tinkering at the margins of this problem – each in our own little corner - would not suffice, and nothing short of sustained, well-thought out, coordinated, transformational change would make a dent in the status quo. We needed to pull together. And so, in June of 1990, I joined with a group of some two dozen women economists at a breakfast at the University of Victoria and CWEN – The Canadian Women Economists Network was formed. That began a period of individual and collective activism by both senior and some wonderful junior economists (for whom the costs of speaking out were clearly higher) to restructure the economics profession and the academy in terms of

gender equality which continues to this day. We worked on a number of fronts – networking, organizing CEA sessions of interest to women, initiating challenges to sexist policies and procedures, etc. - but one of the key characteristics of the approach was mentoring – a passionate commitment to making it easier for those who came behind us. I am incredibly proud to have been part of that group and I would like to leave you today with two thoughts: first, despite all the work that has gone on over the years and that clearly, much has been achieved, I don't think either the economics profession, or the academy, or society as a whole has fully achieved gender equality. So I urge those of you who have not already done so, to find your voice, bring it to whatever table at which you find yourself, and make it heard. And second, as I said at the beginning, I am at the stage in my life where I do wonder if the work mattered. To have been told so publicly, by being selected as the inaugural recipient of this award, that the work DID matter, has been a profoundly humbling experience and is the gift of a lifetime to me.

Thank you so very much!

Call for submissions!

Call for submissions!

Call for submissions!

Celebrating the Achievements of Women Economists

We would like to celebrate Women Economists' achievements. Please let us know if you received an award or if you know of somebody who did. Submissions should be sent to egugl@uvic.ca.

Research Highlights

We would like to highlight new research by women economists working in Canada and research at Canadian institutions on gender-related topics. CWEC/CFÉC is happy to give these researchers the opportunity to feature their current work. If your recent work meets our criteria, please provide us with the title, abstract, and URL to the full paper in an email to egugl@uvic.ca.



Another Successful Mentoring Breakfast!

With the stunning view provided by the Banff Centre for Arts and Creativity as a backdrop, junior economists met with more established economists at the 2019 CWEC/CFÉC Mentoring Breakfast. The Mentoring Breakfast provided junior economists the opportunity to speak with the senior economists on a variety of topics, such as publishing, teaching, grant writing, networking, job search, career paths, and the tenure process.

Interview with CWEC/CFÉC Young Researcher Prize Recipient Lucija Anna Muehlenbachs

by E. Gugl



Lucija Anna Muehlenbachs is an Associate Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Calgary. She obtained her PhD from the University of Maryland in 2009, and joined the University of Calgary in 2014. Lucija specializes in environmental and resource economics, with expertise in the oil and gas sector. She has published articles in the American Economic Review, the International Economic Review, the Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, and other prominent journals. Her highly cited and policy-relevant studies using data from the Marcellus Shale have made her a leader in the empirical analysis of the environmental and economic consequences of shale gas development.

Could you tell us a bit about how you found your way into Economics?

I was a third-year science major at the University of Alberta and in order to be in the same class as a friend I took Econ 101---it hit me like no other class had before.

What is your inspiration for the particular research questions that you ask?

I do applied work in environmental and energy economics and I can point to conversations with scientists and reading the newspaper as the beginning of some of my research projects.

What are the biggest challenges you face in doing your research?

Distraction by urgent and unimportant tasks I've just bought the self-help book *Deep Work*, you can ask me later if it helps.

Have you faced situations as an academic in general and working in your field that seemed to be specific to your gender? If so, would you mind sharing one of these incidents with us?

When I get a rejection from SSHRC or a journal or get a poor teaching review, I have wondered if it is because I am a woman. This is an unhealthy way to think but there is so much convincing research on the implicit bias against our gender. On the flip side, when I am in the midst of female economists, such as at a CWEC/CFÉC luncheon, I am proud to have the solidarity of sisterhood.

Would you mind sharing any advice you have for female economists in Canada?

Go to the CWEC/CFÉC brunches/lunches. Juniors, apply to the CSWEP mentoring workshop. Push your hiring committees to hire more women. Encourage female undergraduates to stay in economics. Be a leader---this is advice I got from Molly Macauley before moving to Calgary and it echoes Roberta Robb's advice at the CWEC/CFÉC luncheon---use your voice.

Managing Your Data – Dealing with Data Archives and Complying with Data Policies

Gestion des données: S'occuper des archives de données et respecter les politiques sur les données

by E.Gugl



Our session on data management covered a wide range of topics. As storing data and accessing it via the internet has become much more feasible, journals have an interest in giving readers access to the data and codes that went into an article's results. Our experts on the panel were [Lars Vilhuber](#), [Peter Morrow](#), [James MacKinnon](#), and [Stephanie Lluís](#).

James talked about the time before internet when people could FTP their files and the [Journal of Applied Econometrics](#) was unusual in requesting the background data from authors. Of course, nowadays, many journals request that authors provide supporting material on the journal's website. Providing such material in a user friendly way is fundamental to ensuring academic

integrity. Our panellists spoke at length about the importance of providing readme files and code files that are easily understandable for people who didn't write them. Lars provided us with some slides that highlight the importance of replicability. They can be accessed [here](#).

Our panellists also spoke about preregistration as a way of providing researchers with incentives to follow through with their initial research design even if this leads to insignificant results. P-hacking is the practice of deviating from one's original design and data set until one finds statistically significant results. When an article is preregistered, the authors have their research design and data set refereed. If referees agree with the approach, then the author is assured publication even if the empirical results are insignificant. Referees at the stage of the finished manuscript may reject the paper not on the basis of the results being uninteresting, but only if the execution of the original and approved design is flawed.

Moving forward, we heard that StatCan is working on protocols that allow for vetting of one person's results in the data centre and other suggestions for verifying empirical results based on confidential data. We also heard about challenges when providing code as some programs like STATA will lead to different results when you run the same code on different versions of the software using the identical data set. So there remains the question of how to preserve a record for posterity.

We thank [Marie Connolly](#) for organizing and chairing the session and our panellists for an engaging discussion about an important aspect of our work!

The Ins and Outs of Successful Grant Applications and other Ways to Fund your Research

Tenants et aboutissants des demandes fructueuses de subventions et autres méthodes de financement de la recherche

by E. Gugl

Our panellists ([Sonia Laszlo](#), [Marie Connolly](#), [Luba Peterson](#)) had extensive experience both as successful applicants for various grants as well as reviewers and adjudicators of grant applications. Our panellists shed light on questions like why reviewers of grant applications might score an application differently from the adjudication panel. The explanation that our panellists provided was that referees only see one application, but they lack the information of how well it compares to other submissions.

Our panellists all agreed that it takes time to put together good applications. Successful applications are well written, they contain the information the granting body asked applicants to provide in a well-organized manner, and it provides ample justification for any budgetary requests. Our panellists all advised against budgetary requests that seem excessive. For example, applicants need to explain why it is important that they attend a particular conference and it needs to be consistent with the time line that they provide for their project. Any request for funding research assistants needs a justification; identify the role of the research assistant in your project and assign them duties that seem manageable.



When it comes to specifying employment of students in the research project, our panellists also addressed the question of the quality of students applicants might have access to. First of all, Canadian granting agencies emphasise student engagement of students enrolled in Canadian institutions over students attending institutions elsewhere. If there is worry about the quality of RAs, such questions should be addressed in the notes on the budget. For example, an institution with a small Ph.D. program might not provide Ph.D. students with the same training that is expected at the leading Ph.D. programs in Canada, and an applicant might also not have access to the few students enrolled at their department. In cases like this, it's important to note on the application the limitation that the applicant faces in employing good RAs. Perhaps Honours students or MA students could play a role in surveying the literature or collecting data, but the applicant might then also ask for a budget that identifies a smaller role of student engagement than an applicant from universities with a pool of high-quality Ph.D. students.

All panellists agreed that grant writing and managing grants is a skill and that nobody should assume that just because you can write brilliant research papers you're good at writing and managing grants. Carefully thinking through the tedious aspects of writing a grant may ultimately be very useful in helping the successful applicant to execute the research proposal. Providing a well-thought out timeline not only increases the chances of getting a grant but also helps the researcher to stay on track once the grant is awarded.

Panellists also emphasized the role of grant facilitators in writing good proposals. Use them! Especially when it comes to conveying the non-technical aspects of your proposal.

Our experts also recommended gradually ratcheting up grant proposals. Start with small grants first, build up your CV, demonstrate project management skills by successfully completing projects based on the smaller grants and then go for the bigger ones.

We thank [Kelly Foley](#) for organizing and chairing the session and our panellists for all their great advice!

Mid-Career Mentorship: I've Got Tenure, Now What?

Mentorat en milieu de carrière : J'ai atteint la permanence. Et maintenant?

by E. Gugl

While we're waiting for our latest numbers on women's representation in the associate and full ranks in Canadian Economics departments (stay tuned for this report in our next issue of the newsletter), our [last report](#) released in 2018 and conducted in 2017 documented that women often get stuck in associate rank. This is not just a fact in our discipline, but an across-discipline phenomenon. As Betsey Stevenson mentions in her interview, Donna Strickland, one of three 2018 Nobel Prize recipients in Physics, was an associate professor when the Nobel Prize winners were announced. She has been [promoted to full](#) shortly after the announcement at the age of 60.



Our panellists spoke about the challenges to raise children and maintain an active research agenda and steady stream of publications. They also talked about increased demands to do service. [Frances Woolley](#) noted that some women might welcome a lateral move into administrative positions and [Rose Anne Devlin](#) talked about her experience of becoming chair of her department before going up for full. Rose Anne's approach to service is to ask yourself if it's your turn to chip in without paying attention to notorious free riders in one's department. She said, "You take your turn and then you say no. Play your part, be a good citizen. If somebody is free riding on the side, don't worry about them. Ask yourself who you want to be."

All panellists talked about the benefit of having tenure in terms of reorienting their research agenda and taking on riskier research projects that they felt drawn to. [Nicole Fortin](#) summed it up by stating, "You're more in the driver seat than before tenure."

Frances also talked about her blogging and being on twitter as a way of engaging with people outside academia about economics, an activity she values highly. The other panellists agreed that it was important to be available for interviews both because of what economists have to say but also as making women economists' expertise heard.

[Anke Kessler](#)'s advice was to grab opportunities when they present themselves. She was an associate of the [Canadian Institute for Advanced Research](#) (CIFAR) from 2004 to 2015 but almost didn't take the appointment. Her advice is to take the opportunity, evaluate, and step away later if necessary.

We thank [Mevlude Akbulut-Yuksel](#) for organizing and chairing the session and our panellists for sharing their experience with us!



Fall 2019 Workplace Climate Survey of Canadian Economists

In March 2019, the American Economic Association released results from its survey of current and former members about the professional climate in economics. In discussing the results, the AEA leadership [noted](#):

“many members of the profession have suffered harassment and discrimination during their careers, including both overt acts of abuse and more subtle forms of marginalization. This is unacceptable. Excluding or marginalizing people based on their gender, race, or other personal characteristics is not only deeply unfair to those who are excluded, it damages the field as a whole by limiting the diversity of perspectives and dissuading talented people from becoming economists. It is striking that, in an era when women and members of under- represented minority groups have entered so-called STEM fields at increasing rates, the low rates of participation and advancement of women and minorities in economics have changed little in recent decades.”

The Canadian Women Economists Committee (CWEC/CFÉC) will use the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago to administer a similar survey for economists in Canada in Fall 2019.

The Canadian survey will cover areas similar to the AEA survey: general climate, experiences of discrimination, avoidance, exclusion and harassment. Within the bounds of maintaining confidentiality, we will consider response variation across gender, race, within or outside academia, size of institution, and rank of faculty.

For more information, please contact cwec.cfec@gmail.com

Department Chairs, We Need Your Help!

FUNDS: We are currently fundraising to cover the \$40,000 budget. We are asking departments and faculties for contributions to cover part of the cost. Please email elizabeth.dhuey@utoronto.ca if you would like to consider a sponsorship or have additional questions. We would like to thank our current sponsors:

Bank of Canada – LEAD SPONSOR	University of Ottawa - Department of Economics
Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences	Western University - Department of Economics
McMaster University	UBC Land and Food Systems
WLU - Lazaridis School of Business & Economics	University of Guelph - Department of Economics and Finance
UBC Sauder School of Business	McGill - Department of economics
University of Alberta - Department of Economics	University of Toronto - Department of Economics
Simon Fraser Department of Economics	University of Calgary - Department of Economics
Vancouver School of Economics	University of Waterloo - Department of Economics & UWaterloo HeForShe IMPACT10x10x10

EMAIL LISTS: CWEC/CFÉC needs current email lists of all faculty and current graduate students (if applicable). Please complete [this spreadsheet](#) and return it to elizabeth.dhuey@utoronto.ca as soon as possible.