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The Risks of Privatizing Social Security for Women
Sunhwa Lee, Ph.D.

IWPR, in partnership with other policy research and women’s organizations, is working to educate both the public and Congress about how crucial current Social Security benefits are for women and their families. As part of this effort, IWPR has launched regular email alerts on women and Social Security to provide women-oriented analysis of proposed changes in Social Security, up-to-date developments in the debate, and current research and statistics. IWPR has also developed a new website dedicated to Social Security issues, http://www.womenandsocialsecurity.org. Heidi Hartmann currently serves as co-chair of the National Council of Women’s organizations.

Why is current Social Security so important for women and their families? Recent proposals to privatize Social Security and cut guaranteed benefits would leave potentially disastrous consequences for women.

As research by IWPR and others shows, the current Social Security program is a mainstay for the elderly, the disabled, and survivors. Social Security provides monthly benefits to nearly 48 million Americans, and women represent 57 percent of adult beneficiaries. For both women and men 65 and older, Social Security is their largest source of income, and women rely more heavily on Social Security than men. For never

(cont’d on p. 8)

Fighting Poverty with Higher Education

Avis A. Jones-DeWeever, Ph.D.

No anti-poverty program matches the payoffs associated with acquiring higher education. While the benefits associated with degree completion are applicable to everyone, its poverty-buffering effects are especially critical to the well-being of women. In the forthcoming report, Reaching for More: The Fight to Acquire Higher Education in the Context of Welfare Reform, IWPR examines the issue of expanding access to higher education to one of America’s most disadvantaged populations—its welfare participants. The study utilizes survey research, focus groups, and a survey of approximately 100 individuals to document the challenges and payoffs associated with access to post-secondary education among current and former welfare participants in California.

Although it is true that balancing the responsibilities of parenthood and college life is no easy task even under the best circumstances, for parents mired in poverty and under the direction of largely restrictive welfare policies, the pursuit of a college degree not only becomes a challenge, but a pursuit replete with per-

(cont’d on p. 9)
Feminist public policy is alive and well in many countries around the world. As I've traveled outside the United States in the past two years lecturing (in Greece, China, New Zealand, and Japan), I've come to realize that terms we rarely use in Washington are commonplace in other countries. Gender mainstreaming, gender budgeting, and gender impact statements, for example, are common terms in Europe, throughout the British Commonwealth, and beyond. Not to mention the phrase, “feminist public policy,” itself.

Professor Mari Osawa, who recently invited me to speak at Tokyo University at a conference co-sponsored by IAFFE-Japan (the Japan chapter of the International Association for Feminist Economics), has written about how an official government advisory body on which she served, the Council for Gender Equity, adopted the framework developed by Christine Delphy, the well-known French feminist theorist, to set its goal the making of a gender-free society in Japan. This advisory committee, although convened by a conservative government, included Professor Osawa, a well-known Marxist economist, because, as she explained it, proportional representation usually results in the involvement of other political parties in forming a governing coalition. This same point was made to me in New Zealand; proportional representation, introduced in 1996, allows people with minority viewpoints to be heard. Ideas from “fringe” or “radical” groups surface more easily and may be taken up by more mainstream parties later on.

In addition to having more open political systems than the United States (for example, most also have public financing of campaigns), many countries have introduced quotas for women to ensure that candidate slates are more balanced between men and women. In Mexico, in 2003, the first election subject to the new quota (which requires that no more than 70 percent of a party’s candidates in single-member districts be of the same sex and that one of three candidates on the proportional representation lists be women), women’s representation in the national parliament increased 6 percentage points to nearly 23 percent from about 17 percent.

Ironically, the United States was instrumental in ensuring that Iraq would have a quota for women--25 percent in the interim constitution. According to UNIFEM, the recent elections for the National Assembly there resulted in 31 percent of the 275 seats going to women, a far greater percentage than in our own U.S. Congress (seemingly stuck at 14-15 percent of the seats held by women). New Zealand’s switch to proportional representation resulted in an increase in the proportion of women in parliament as well, from 21 to 29 percent between the 1993 and 1996 elections.

Women in many of these other countries, too, can rely on international bodies, such as the United Nations and the European Union, and international treaties, such as CEDAW and various ILO conventions, to pressure their national governments to make changes to improve women’s status. The United States has still not ratified CEDAW, nor many of the ILO conventions related to women’s and children’s working conditions.

Statistical offices in many countries, including the Philippines, produce and disseminate women-friendly data, such as national income satellite accounts that estimate the contribution women’s unpaid labor, such as care giving, makes to the national economy. Meantime, our own Bureau of Labor Statistics is, as of this writing, sticking with their plan, announced last fall, of eliminating an important data set on women workers, de-
It’s Almost Time for IWPR’s Eighth International Women’s Policy Research Conference!

Liz Mandeville

IWPR’s Eighth International Women’s Policy Research Conference When Women Gain, So Does the World is coming together and is sure to be our most informative and exciting conference yet! Co-sponsored by the Women’s Studies Program at The George Washington University and the Friedrich Ebert Foundation Washington Office, the conference will take place at the historic Omni Shoreham Hotel in Washington, DC, on June 19-21, 2005.

Online registration is now available at our conference website: www.iwpr.org/Conference2005. Please be sure to register early in order to take advantage of our early bird rates!

The conference highlights include sessions on the privatization of social security; the challenge of obtaining work-life balance; women in business and in science; women and international development; women in non-traditional employment; women, conflict, and war; sex work and sex trafficking; family-friendly policies around the world; women, campaigns, and elections; women and prisons; elder care; women and organizing; women and welfare reform; and many more. Plenary speakers confirmed thus far include Arizona Governor Janet Napolitano, Wisconsin Lieutenant Governor Barbara Lawton, Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro (D-CT), and Ambassador Inonge Mbikusita-Lewanika, Republic of Zambia.

One major feature of this year’s conference is a set of panels organized by IWPR Study Director, Dr. Amy Caiizza, on the results of her research on women activists in religious and interfaith organizations. The panels include discussions by leaders in the interfaith, feminist, and policymaking communities about questions of religion, morality, and politics.

Other exciting sessions at our conference include a mini-conference organized by the Research Network on Gender, Politics, and the State (RNGS) concerning their research on feminist policymaking around the world, a session on employment policies supporting workers and families in the United States and Europe, organized by the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, and a set of sessions addressing issues of importance to women in business, including sex discrimination in employment, workplace benefits, and women in management.

In addition to participating in IWPR’s conference, participants should note that the International Association for Feminist Economics (IAFFE) will host its 14th Annual Conference on Feminist Economics in Washington, DC, on June 17-19, 2005, at American University (please note change in location). The meeting’s focus will be “Women’s Education and Empowerment in a Global Economy.” A discount of $25 off the registration fee for each conference is available to individuals who register for both events. Information on registering for IAFFE’s conference is available at www.iaffe.org.

Hotel accommodations at the Omni Shoreham are available at a discounted rate for IWPR conference attendees, and housing is also available in the dormitories at The George Washington University. For more information about all aspects of the conference, including registration, conference scholarships, travel, accommodations, sponsorship, and advertising and exhibiting opportunities, please visit our conference website www.iwpr.org/Conference2005, or contact Dianne Munevar, IWPR Conference Fellow, at conference@iwpr.org or (202) 785-5100. We look forward to seeing you there!
Women’s educational attainment has increased considerably in the U.S., but not enough to close the gender wage gap, and many racial and ethnic groups still lack adequate educational opportunities. New research by IWPR and the American Association for University Women provides state data on women’s educational attainment and documents the persistence of the earnings gap between women and men at all educational levels. In 2000, 29.6 percent of women, compared with 31.9 percent of men, had a four-year college degree or more. However, according to the new reports, the typical college-educated woman who works full-time still earns $17,600 less per year than a comparable man, despite having completed the same level of education. There are also large differences in women’s educational attainment by race and ethnicity, and by geographic region.

The project, a partnership between IWPR and the American Association for University Women Educational Foundation, includes state and national data from the 2000 U.S. Census on women’s educational attainment and earnings, as well as in-depth profiles of women’s educational status in four states: California, Georgia, Michigan, and Texas.

Women’s educational attainment varies substantially across the states, with the District of Columbia boasting the highest proportion of women with four-year college degrees, at 36.5 percent, and West Virginia, the lowest, at 14.0 percent. Hispanic, Native American, and African American women are much less likely to have completed college than white and Asian American women, with 10.8 percent of Hispanic women, 12.1 percent of Native American, and 15.3 percent of African American women holding a four-year college degree, compared with 24.8 percent of white women and 39.8 percent of Asian American women in the nation as a whole.

While an earnings gap between college-educated women and men exists in all states, the size of the gap differs substantially across the states. Nevada is the state with the most similar earnings between women and men with a four-year college degree, followed by the District of Columbia, Hawaii, New York, and Alaska. The worst states for earnings inequality between women and men with a college degree are Utah, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Mississippi.

The earnings of women with a four-year college degree also differ substantially by race and ethnicity. Among full-time working women in the United States with a four-year college degree and no advanced degrees, Asian women have the highest median earnings at $39,000, followed by white women at $37,600. African American women earn $35,000, Hispanic women earn $34,000, and Native American women have the lowest earnings at $31,500.

Despite the continuing gap in earnings between women and men, the new reports do show substantial earnings benefits for higher education for women. In fact, college-educated women earn about 80 percent more than women with only a high school diploma.

These data and the full reports are available on AAUW’s website, http://www.aauw.org/research/statedata, where links to an online press kit and a guide to taking action are also available.
Jean Sinzdak

IWPR's press coverage has been extensive in the past few months and continues to cover a wide variety of current topics affecting women and their families.

Social Security is a major media topic at the top of 2005. The Wall Street Journal ran an article about online Social Security benefits calculators and highlighted IWPR's calculator as an example. IWPR President Dr. Heidi Hartmann and Study Director Dr. Sunhwa Lee were quoted, and IWPR's reports on the topic were cited in several articles, including in the Los Angeles Times, USA Today, the Chicago Tribune, the San Antonio Express-News, the Topeka Capital Journal, Louisiana Weekly, the Tennessee Tribune, and Women's eNews, among others. On February 8, Dr. Hartmann moderated a panel on Social Security and its impact on women at the National Press Club in Washington, DC; the session has been shown several times on C-SPAN. The event was sponsored by the National Council of Women's Organizations Task Force on Social Security, of which Dr. Hartmann is co-chair. On February 22, IWPR also participated in another press event at the National Press Club on a new Social Security benefits calculator co-released by the Center for Economic Policy Research, IWPR, and Rock the Vote.

Access to paid leave to recover from illness or care for family members has also been the focus of media attention for the past several months. IWPR Study Director Dr. Vicky Lovell and her report on paid sick leave, No Time To Be Sick: Why Everyone Suffers When Workers Don't Have Paid Sick Leave, continues to receive national media attention. Statistics from the report and quotes from Dr. Lovell were published in the Los Angeles Times, the Christian Science Monitor, BusinessWeek, the Kansas City Star, the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer, the Toronto Star, the Grand Rapids Press, the Recorder (NY), the Wisconsin State Journal, the Charleston Gazette (WV), the Paradise Post (CA), the State News (DE), the Free Lance Star (VA), the Trenton Bergen Record, and the Arizona Republic.

A report by Dr. Sunhwa Lee on the need for work supports, including child care and employer-provided health care, to help low-income mothers retain jobs was cited in several news outlets, including the Boston Globe, the San Antonio Express-News, the Kansas City Star, the Washington Business Journal, the Greensboro News & Record (NC), the Coldwater Daily Reporter (MI), the Poconos Press Journal, the Intelligencer Journal (PA), and the Louisville Courier-Journal.

In December, IWPR issued a statement opposing a decision announced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) to discontinue collecting data on workers by gender in its Current Employment Statistics series. As a result, the BLS opened a public comment period that ran until February 22, 2005. Nearly 100 members of Congress in both the House (62 members) and Senate (30 members) urged the BLS Commissioner to continue to gather these data on women workers. The Washington Post and BusinessWeek both reported on this story and quoted Dr. Hartmann. The BNA's Daily Labor Report notes that more than 5,000 comments were received by BLS, 9 of 10 protesting the amended plans.

An IWPR report, The Children Left Behind, Deeper Poverty, Fewer Supports, which examines the effects of welfare reform on low-income children in single-parent families, received media attention. In particular, articles in the Lakeville Journal, the Republican American, and the Kent Good Times Dispatch noted that the share of extremely poor children with health insurance decreased and the number of poor children receiving food stamps also decreased post-welfare reform.

If you are interested in hosting an event or becoming involved in the formation of the IWPR advisory group in New York City, please contact Regan Chemsiki via email at chemsiki@iwpr.org or (202) 785-5100 x38.

At the event, Heidi Hartmann and Amy Caiazza of IWPR released the findings of the report along with Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro (D-CT), National Congress of American Indians; and Alma Morales Riojas, MANA, A National Latina Organization. The reports were covered by national outlets such as Newsweek, the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Boston Globe, Harper’s Magazine, the Nation, Indian Country Today, the Native American Times, Ms. Magazine, and the Miami Herald. The reports also received coverage in local outlets, which ran the headline, “Uncle Sam Uncool to His Women.” The reports were covered on NBC News, ABC News, Markoe stations reported on their states’ rankings and grades all over the country. Some headlines include:

“Working Women: State Gets an ‘F’” – Birmingham News


“Head to DC, Young Lady, If You Want (Almost) Equal Pay” – Honolulu Star-Bulletin

“Call to Equity for Indigenous Women” – Indian Country Today

“Faring Better? Indiana Females Ahead in Politics, Lose Ground in Health” – Vidette Times (IN)

“Minority Women in State Face Big Hurdles” – Lansing State Journal

“Status of Women in State Still Abysmal” – Clarion Ledger (MS)
new releases
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Congress of American Indians, at podium with (from L to R) Alma Morales, National Women’s Alliance; Heidi Hartmann, IWPR; Amy Caiazza, IWPR; and Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro (D-CT)

Heidi Hartmann, IWPR

Rosa DeLauro (D-CT); Nicole Mason, National Women’s Alliance; Jacqueline

The reports were cited in over 500 news outlets around the country, including the San Francisco Chronicle, BusinessWeek, AOL Personal Finance, The Naved coverage in several international newspapers, including the Times of India, marketplace, and the Telemundo television network. State newspapers and radio

“Women’s Earning Power in Montana: State’s Women Lagging” - Helena Independent Record

“No R-E-S-P-E-C-T: New Report Indicates that the Silver State is Unfriendly to Women” - Las Vegas City Life

“Oklahoma Ranks Poorly for Women in Poverty” - The Oklahoman

“Such a Long Way, Baby” - Brattleboro Reformer (VT)

“Economic Outlook Troubles Governor” - Wyoming Tribune-Eagle
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Research-in-Brief
Family Child Care: Recent Trends and New Directions by Katie Hamm and Avis Jones-DeWeever, Ph.D. October 2004. Available at http://www.iwpr.org/pdf/G716.pdf or contact IWPR. (IWPR# G716)

Reports
Privatizing Social Security
(cont’d from p. 1)

married, divorced, or widowed women—who make up the majority of elderly women—Social Security accounts for more than half of their total income. Without Social Security, two-thirds of these women would live in poverty.

The current system includes several features critical for women’s income security in old age. Since women live longer than men, its guaranteed lifetime benefits with full cost of living adjustments protect women against inflation as they age. As low earners, women benefit from its progressive, more generous replacement rate at the lower end of the earnings distribution. Despite women’s increasing employment and higher lifetime earnings in recent years, the overwhelming majority, still rely on access to benefits based on their husbands’ earnings records. Of all women beneficiaries 62 and older, one-third have access to benefits only as a wife or a widow. Another 28 percent are “dually entitled”—those whose own worker benefits are supplemented based on their husbands’ earnings records, which are generally higher.

Instead of strengthening current Social Security, the President’s plan would weaken the nation’s retirement system and bring tremendous economic insecurity to women and men. Private accounts that allow investing in the stock market inevitably involve risk—a risk that people should not take with the most basic component of retirement income. Workers already have many vehicles available to invest in the market; IRAs, etc. Experts also agree that private accounts would not generate as high returns as claimed by the proponents of privatization, once potential administrative fees are accounted for. More importantly, the President’s plan would involve deep cuts in guaranteed benefits for all future beneficiaries (except for those currently 55 and older), regardless of whether one opts for private accounts or not. These cuts would come from changing the way initial benefits are calculated (from wage indexing to price indexing). According to non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates, this change would reduce the promised annual benefit for a median-income person retiring in 2055 by nearly 40 percent, from $23,300 under current law to $14,500.

Moreover, establishing private accounts, even according to administration officials, does nothing to solve the long-term financial shortfall in the system. The Trust Fund, which has been growing in preparation for the retirement of the baby boomers, is expected to be exhausted in 2042 according to the Social Security Trustees, or in 2052 according to the Congressional Budget Office. Instead, this plan would require new federal borrowing (on top of an already large federal deficit) to pay for the transition cost to a new system and for the benefits promised to those 55 and older who would not be included in the privatization plan. While many consider it important to act on the possibility of a long-term financial shortfall in current Social Security sooner rather than later, it is clear that the President’s privatization proposal will neither solve the financial problem nor improve the economic well-being of the future generations of retired Americans.

Stay informed!
visit womenandsocialsecurity.org for News, Fact Sheets, Email Alerts, and more...

IWPR General and Project Support
Rebecca Sager

Support for IWPR’s research, education, and outreach activities comes primarily from foundations, organizations, and individuals. We are able to fulfill our mission of providing information about economic indicators, social trends, and the effects of significant public policies on women and their families with the generous support of: the Ford Foundation and the Sister Fund for a project on women’s involvement in faith-based organizing; the Annie E. Casey Foundation for work on job quality, paid leave, welfare programs, and work supports; the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation for a study on home-based childcare; the Ford Foundation for work on paid family leave and job quality; AARP and the Retirement Research Foundation for research and public education on women’s poverty and Social Security reform; the Metro America Foundation for public policy analysis; the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Family Foundation for The Status of Women in the States project; the National Institute for Early Education Research for work on the Cost of expanding pre-kindergarten the Russell Sage Foundation, American Institutes for Research, and IBM for sponsorship of IWPR’s Eighth International Women’s Policy Research Conference; and to Pfizer, Inc. and the New Prospect Foundation for general support funding.

As always, IWPR is grateful for the generous and loyal support of our members and donors. Without you, the Institute’s accomplishments and victories would not be possible.
An Historic Meeting of Younger Women

Misha Werschkul

On January 29th and 30th, younger women from across the nation came together in Washington, DC, to articulate their concerns about the future of the women’s movement and their priorities for younger women’s involvement. The women did not come to join a group with a pre-set agenda and mission. Instead, they came to set their own agenda and to create their own mission, as new members of the Younger Women’s Task Force (YWTF), a project of the National Council of Women’s Organizations.

The need for a group like the YWTF became clear when a group of younger women came together in the fall of 2004 with a common desire to strengthen younger women’s involvement and activism. The first priority for the YWTF was to bring together as many voices as possible to lay out the goals for the new organization.

The YWTF hopes to provide a strong voice in the policymaking process for younger women, increase the impact of younger women activists through the articulation of, and collaboration on, a common agenda, and develop the next generation of the women’s movement. In less than a year, the YWTF has grown from a few committed volunteers in DC to a nationwide coalition of progressive women, ages 19-39, from over 40 states in the country. During the Meet Up, regional task forces were formed and each participant was motivated to carry the momentum from the weekend back to her community.

To find out more information about the YWTF, please visit the website of the National Council of Women’s Organizations, http://www.womensorganizations.org. Also, to read an article published in Women’s eNews about the YWTF Meet Up, visit http://www.womensenews.com/article.cfm/dyn/aid/2172.

Fighting Poverty with Higher Education

(cont’d from p. 1)

Personal sacrifice. Roughly 95 percent of our survey respondents indicated that they made sacrifices to pursue higher education. The most often cited sacrifice was time with their children (73 percent); followed by the loss of employment/income (65 percent); and a reduction in leisure activities (61 percent). Although significant sacrifices were made, more than 9 in 10 indicated that they believed education was worth it.

One woman stated, “I know that my situation is only [temporary]. I hate being on welfare, and I will sacrifice anything for a degree and a great paying job with benefits.” Another’s comments encapsulated the payoffs associated with degree completion when she said, “My sacrifice to attend school was extremely worthwhile. I have since graduated and have been gainfully employed for almost four years. My income has grown dramatically, and my family is benefiting from the finances that we share.”

On a broader scale, many women described how higher education affected their sense of self and provided a feeling of empowerment. One mother proclaimed, “You know, I really like the person that I’ve turned into being because of education. I’m not going to be nobody’s punching bag no more. I’m not going to be nobody’s floor anymore.”

And while many shared the personal benefits associated with exposure to higher education, most indicated that the educational benefits they received also filtered down to their children. Nearly 8 in 10 respondents indicated that their children’s educational experiences had been influenced by their post-secondary enrollment. Almost two-thirds (65 percent) indicated that their children were now more likely to express a desire to go to college and nearly a third (32 percent) said their children were now making better grades. Interestingly, for many of the respondents, the change experienced by children was the change that mattered most. As one respondent put it, “…the most significant thing for me is my kids and seeing future generations move in this direction rather than the direction of oppression and poverty, and being stuck in that negative place.”

The findings from this study paint a picture of an extraordinarily resilient, determined, and hopeful population struggling through challenging circumstances in search of a better future for themselves and their children. With both the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families and Higher Education Acts on the verge of reauthorization, we hope that this study can help inform policymakers of the importance of expanding access to post-secondary education to this often overlooked, yet capable and eager population. The full report will be released at IWPR’s June conference.
Rachel Korycan

Dr. Evan Stark is a widely published researcher, a social worker with decades of group work experience, a forensic specialist who has served as an expert in over 100 cases involving battered women and their children, and a founder of the New Haven Project for Battered Women—one of the nation’s first shelters for battered women. Dr. Stark currently teaches in the Graduate Department of Public Administration at Rutgers University-Newark, where he holds a joint appointment in Women and Gender Studies and is Chair of the Department of Urban Health Administration at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ) School of Public Health.

After serving nine years as a member of IWPR’s Board of Directors from 1991-2000, Dr. Stark rejoined IWPR’s board in 2002, and in 2005 is moving to Emeritus status. Having been active in community-based activities with women, Dr. Stark saw IWPR as a natural fit for him. “I very strongly believe in the kind of feminism IWPR represents,” he says, “IWPR addresses the kinds of issues women’s activism was built around, and the interface between family and the larger capacities of women to express themselves is unique about IWPR.”

According to Heidi Hartmann, IWPR’s President, “Evan brings a strategic analysis to IWPR’s board meetings, focused on how IWPR can work with others to make sure its research has the greatest impact in improving women’s lives.”

Regarding IWPR’s future, Dr. Stark firmly believes that because IWPR “took seriously the dictum that the personal is political,” the organization has been enormously successful, and this philosophy will guarantee its continued success in the future.

Member Profile: Lynn Gitlitz

Lynn Gitlitz, a member of the Institute, has made it her life’s work to empower women. Whether in the dance studio or in the boardroom, she believes that women’s leadership can empower women in all facets of their lives. The former Avon executive knows firsthand the power of women leaders. At Avon, she was responsible for the global branding of Avon products. Ms. Gitlitz believes the value of IWPR publications like The Status of Women in the States reports makes IWPR an important source of information for a wide audience.

Currently, Ms. Gitlitz is the general manager and a board member of the Gina Gibney Dance Company, a renowned all-female dance company that serves a unique purpose: relating artistry to community outreach. The company couples community service with the arts, creating modern dance pieces and volunteering at New York area domestic violence shelters. Once a dancer herself, Ms. Gitlitz sees dance as an “opportunity for women to connect to their own physical power, self-confidence, and self-esteem.” Ms. Gitlitz believes that “IWPR is a powerful vehicle; through its connections to policymakers, advocates, and other stakeholders, and through its high quality research, the Institute is truly making a difference in the lives of women and their families.” For more information on the Gina Gibney Dance Company, please visit http://www.ginagibneydance.org. Please also visit www.iwpr.org to become a member of the Institute!
Spotlight on IWPR Fellows

Lara Hinz

IWPR is excited to introduce five Fellows who have been making significant contributions to the work of the Institute. Katie Hamm is this year’s Mariam K. Chamberlain Fellow. Katie is a recent graduate of the University of Virginia where she majored in Psychology and Political and Social Thought. She brings a great deal of research experience to IWPR, where she is currently working on home-based care and TANF and higher education studies.

Dianne Munevar is IWPR’s Conference Fellow. She is planning IWPR’s Eighth International Women’s Policy Research Conference to be held in June 2005 in Washington, DC. Diane is a graduate of Colgate University where she received a B.A. in International Relations with a minor in Latin American Studies. She replaces Elizabeth Mandeville, a Wellesley College graduate who served as IWPR’s conference fellow in 2004 and has recently taken a position at the United Nations.

Karli Swift joins IWPR as this year’s Development Fellow. Karli is a recent graduate of Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts. She majored in both Government and African American Studies, and also studied abroad at the University of Cape Town in South Africa. Karli is providing key support for IWPR development activities, including membership, major donor, and foundation fundraising.

IWPR is also pleased to have two George Washington University/IWPR Research Fellows at the Institute this year. Jody Herman is currently pursuing the Ph.D. in Public Policy with a concentration in Women’s Studies. She received her undergraduate degree in English and History with minors in Women’s Studies and Spanish at Illinois State University.

As a former intern at IWPR, Jody assisted with The Status of Women in the States reports and is now working on a research project focused on older women’s poverty. Misha Werschkul was the 2003-2004 Mariam K. Chamberlain Fellow and is continuing work on employment and earnings and work-family projects this year as a GWU/IWPR Research Fellow. Misha is pursuing a Masters degree in Public Policy. She has a B.A. in Economics and Political Science from Macalester College in Minnesota.

Anne Mitchell of Early Childhood Policy Research (ECPR) presenting the IWPR/ECPR universal preschool cost estimate model at the November 2004 NAEYC conference. Dr. Mitchell was recently elected President of NAEYC.

Gifts of Remembrance and Tribute

In 2004, some of our members chose to pay tribute to important people in their lives with these special gift designations:

In memory

Bella Abzug (Brownie Williams Ledbetter)
Antonia Alexander (Lenora Cole)
Maynette Reid Crothers (Diane Crothers)
Sandra S. Tangri (Martha Mednick)

In honor

Barbara Bergmann (Dr. Andrea H. Beller)
Sally Bould Stan (Sally Bould)
Brenda Chandler (Susan Hoffman)
Jane Dalment Holbrook (Christine DiStefano)
Marjorie Lightman (Cordelia Reimers)
Harva Shearer (Brooke Shearer)
Blanche Walch (Drs. Ruth Rosen & Wendel Brunner)

If you are interested in designating your next IWPR donation in this way, please contact Regan Chemski via email at chemski@iwpr.org or (202) 785-5100 x38.
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