EDI Committee Meeting
12 January, 2-4 pm

Present: Francesco Caselli (FC, Chair), Gilat Levy (GL), Nava Ashraf (NA), Maitreesh Ghatak (MG), Dimitra Petropoulou (DP), Lorna Severn (LS)

In Attendance: Andy Wilson (AW)
Apologies: Rachael Meager

1. **Preliminary Data Analysis of Job Market (JM) applicants by ethnicity and nationality**
   a. NA presented data analysis of the JM applicants for the last six years (files attached), using the 'predict race' R package. Based on the analysis of their names and surnames, applicants were assigned to racial groups and nationalities. NA stressed two shortcomings of these data. First, the categorization by ethnicity or nationality was too coarse. Second, Predict-Race was unable to confidently assign race to many applicants. In order to partially correct for this second shortcoming, it was decided to try to complement the imputed ethnicity from names/surnames with self-reported data on applicants' self-identification in the application form.
   b. There was consensus in the Committee that the current focus on "non-white" as an indicator of ethnic diversity is too coarse. It is hoped that, after integrating the self-identification data, a more disaggregated approach may be possible. There was consensus that the EDI Committee should aim at such a more disaggregated approach by the 2023-24 job market.

   Action: FC - to contact Deborah Adams to obtain historical self-identification data of applicants. NA - subsequently to produce updated analysis.

   Action: **EDI's Committee revised advice to the Junior Recruitment (JR) committee to be included in an EDI Committee agenda in the summer.**

2. **Preliminary Analysis of MRes admission data by gender, race, and disability status**
   a. FC presented data on MRes admission which had been circulated before the meeting. A surprising but welcome fact was that only 5% of applicants did not report self-identified ethnicity. Broadly speaking the percentages of non-male, non-white, and disabled students receiving an offer were historically in line with their percentage weight in total applications. The question remained whether the Admission Committee should not seek to achieve percentages of admitted students with protected characteristics in excess of their percentages in applications – just as is currently done for job market candidates. No conclusive position emerged on this issue, but the MRes Admission Committee was encouraged to err on the side of trying to slightly increase the percentage of admitted students with protected characteristics.
   b. The discussion also highlighted further data work which could enrich the picture. Firstly, include data on registration numbers to check that student acceptance rates by protected characteristic are in line with admission rates. Secondly, include an analysis of the departmental long list (the list of applications long-listed by the Selection Committee to review at the selection meeting). The departmental long list is not included in the HR dataset and cannot be linked with it by the anonymized nature of the HR files. Nevertheless, ethnicity can perhaps be predicted using "predict race," as in the analysis of job market candidates. Thirdly, produce further data on combined protected characteristics, namely the percentage of long-listed, admitted, and registered applicants who are non-male *and/or* non-white *and/or* disabled.

   Action: LS – to send historical info about long-listed MRes applicants, with ethnicity imputed by "predictrace" to FC. FC to update the analysis.

Action: The EDI Committee to review the issue of possible targets for admission for 2023-24 entry.

3. **Discover Economics Initiative**

   FC reminded the committee about the initiative and invited its members to participate or/and send their additional thoughts and ideas to him. DP, FC, and some faculty members have been involved in the organisation of the event. Schools with a large number of underrepresented groups have already been invited. The event aims to change the perception of Economics and encourage broader groups of people to apply to study this subject.

4. **Possible introduction of a new EDI-related course on the Economics of Race, the Economics of Gender, or the Economics of Diversity**

   FC floated the idea of adding a full/half-unit undergraduate course in economics related to diversity, covering topics such as race, gender, disability, inequality, emancipation, and discrimination. He thought that it could enhance the inclusivity of our curriculum; potentially attract more minority applicants; and be a way for the LSE to exercise leadership in the field. The committee was strongly supportive of this idea. FC asked whether the EDI committee members could recommend anybody who could design this course or be interested in doing it by themselves. The provisional title of the course would be Economics of Diversity but it is understood that colleagues who would design the course would not be bound by this title.

   Action: recruit potential instructors for the economics of diversity course.

5. **Diversity of seminar speakers**

   The committee discussed the diversity of the presenters in the Department's seminar series and that not all seminar series seem to make a conscious effort to ensure diversity. The committee agreed that it would be appropriate to encourage seminar organizers to keep an eye on this. FC also noted that some universities (e.g. Virginia) ask speakers with protected characteristics to meet their students (for an honorarium). This could perhaps be explored in the future.

   Action: FC -to bring this topic to the DEC meeting.

6. **Procedures to increase the diversity of pre-doc intake**

   The Committee noted that there does not seem to be there a joined-up approach to monitor diversity of the pre-doc student intake, which is highly decentralized. This was somewhat concerning as pre-doc make up an increase share of entering PhD cohorts, and thus Pre-doc programmes have a significant impact on the pipeline of future economists. It was decided that FC would try to approach the recent centres to see if it was possible to gather data on this matter.

   Action: FC to query research centres

7. **Analysis of rejected Junior Recruitment (JR) flyouts.**

   NA presented a follow up on her presentation of rejected flyout candidates from the previous meeting. The additional information confirmed that there had been a number of ex-post exceptionally successful candidates (some of whom of EDI relevance) who had been turned down by the department despite being strongly interested in coming to the LSE. It was decided to recommend to future JR committee not to discount signals of interest from these candidates.

8. AOB

GL confirmed that the final version of the paper on discrimination would be ready for the next DEC..