

Burkhauser, Richard V.; Burkhauser, Susan V.

Working Paper

Policy Research Institutes' role in the development of evidence for evidence-based policy making in the United States

IZA Policy Paper, No. 204

Provided in Cooperation with:

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Suggested Citation: Burkhauser, Richard V.; Burkhauser, Susan V. (2023) : Policy Research Institutes' role in the development of evidence for evidence-based policy making in the United States, IZA Policy Paper, No. 204, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/283422>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

POLICY PAPER SERIES

IZA Policy Paper No. 204

**Policy Research Institutes' Role in the
Development of Evidence for Evidence-
Based Policy Making in the United States**

Richard V. Burkhauser
Susan V. Burkhauser

OCTOBER 2023

POLICY PAPER SERIES

IZA Policy Paper No. 204

Policy Research Institutes' Role in the Development of Evidence for Evidence-Based Policy Making in the United States

Richard V. Burkhauser

University of Texas at Austin and IZA

Susan V. Burkhauser

Austin Community College

OCTOBER 2023

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Policy Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

Policy Research Institutes' Role in the Development of Evidence for Evidence-Based Policy Making in the United States

Policy Research Institutes in the United States play an important role in the creation of evidence for evidence-based policymaking. This is the case with respect to their advocacy for the gathering and broad dissemination of “Big Data” and in the publication of policy analysis in the academic literature using these data. But they play a much more significant role, via non-refereed working papers, in predicting the possible behavioral and distributional consequences of currently proposed policies being considered by the Executive and Legislative branches of government. Historically, however, Policy Research Institutes, both inside- and outside-the-beltway, have also played a less well-understood role. It is the nurturing of those, mostly academic-based economists who, as Members of the Council of Economic Advisers, eventually end up advising Presidents of the United States and their staff on the state of economic knowledge on the economic problems that these policy makers are called to solve via evidence-based policymaking.

JEL Classification: H0, J0

Keywords: evidence-based policymaking, Council of Economic Advisers, U.S. Policy Research Institutes

Corresponding author:

Richard V. Burkhauser
Civitas Institute
University of Texas at Austin
302 W. 24th Street
Austin
Texas 78712
USA
E-mail: rvb1@cornell.edu

“CEA members should see themselves as *partisan advocates of the efficient solution*. Policy debates always include an ample supply of participants who emphasize the concentrated losses and the political dangers that will flow from the efficient decision. If economic advisers do not speak for efficiency, who will?” (Schultze 1996, p. 31).

Charles L. Schultze, who began his academic career as an Assistant Professor at Indiana University after obtaining his Ph.D. in Economics at the University of Maryland was Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the Johnson Administration between 1965-1968 before he became affiliated with the Brookings Institution. This active affiliation, which began in 1968, continued to 1996 when he became senior fellow emeritus until his death in 2016. However it was interrupted by his becoming Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) (1977-1981) during the Carter Administration and included 1984 the year he was President of the American Economic Association.

The quote above comes from an article published in the *Journal of Economic Perspectives* in 1996 he was asked to write commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the founding of the Council of Economic Advisers in 1946. His career is representative of the career path of academically trained economists who begin their careers as providers of evidence for evidence-based policy making. They do so via contributions to the academic literature as well as the publication of timely non-refereed papers that focus on current public policy questions. Often this research occurs while they are affiliated with an inside-the-beltway Policy Research Institute like Brookings or an outside-the-beltway one affiliated with their university. Subsequently, during their time as a Member of the CEA, they use this type of economic evidence as the basis for the advice they provide to policy makers.

Inside-the-beltway Policy Research Institutes like the Brookings Institution and the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) play an important role in providing evidence for evidence-based policymaking and in the maturation of university-based academics appointed by Presidents of the United States to be Members of their Council of Economic Advisers (CEA).

Here, we discuss the steps necessary to provide evidence for evidence-based policymaking to policy makers and the role Policy Research Institutes play in each. The first step is in the creation and dissemination of data necessary for policy researchers to produce and provide such evidence. The second step is in the publication of this evidence in peer reviewed disciplinary journals. The third step is in the publication of this evidence in non-peer reviewed working papers. The fourth and least recognized is in the maturation of CEA Members who use these data as the basis for the advice they provide to Presidents of the United States and their staff on the current policies they are considering.

Step 1: The Creation and Dissemination of Data for Evidence-Based Policy Making

The first step necessary for evidence-based policy making is to create and disseminate the underlying data necessary for policy researchers to produce and provide such evidence. Currently how best to do so is at the heart of the “Big Data” debate.

To date, the single most crucial piece of legislation in this regard is *The Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018*. It is based on the 2017 *Report of the United States Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking*, whose co-chairs were Katharine Abraham (former Member of President Obama’s CEA and former Research Associate at the Brookings Institution) and Ronald Haskins (former Senior Adviser to President Bush for Welfare Policy and long-time Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution). The *Act* requires federal agencies to develop evidence to support policymaking. Agencies must annually submit a systematic plan for identifying and addressing policy questions to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Congress. However, not all the Commission’s recommendations were included in this *Act*.

Most recently, the bottom line of a National Academies of Sciences (NAS) report (NAS 2023a), the first of three on the topic of Big Data, was that statistical agencies (e.g., Census Bureau, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), etc.) should provide useful information and services back to data holders (e.g., the Social Security Administration (SSA), the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Department of Labor (DOL), etc.) that inform these data holders’ decisions, operations, and activities. In turn, the public, data holders, and key stakeholders should support legislation and other changes that facilitate, and support expanded data access and its use.

The report does an excellent job of describing the breakthroughs in moving toward such an infrastructure, focusing mainly on events since 2017, especially with respect to researchers’ access to the data. However, it also reports the work that still needs to be done.

The second NAS (2023b) report in this series makes the point that it was technically possible in the 1970s to link administrative data to survey data in a “modern way.” It references a Kilss and Scheuren (1978) report on SSA’s efforts to link their administrative records as well as IRS tax records to survey records from the March 1973 Current Population Survey (CPS).

As a newly graduated University of Chicago economics Ph.D. working in Washington for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) in 1976-1977, a co-author of this paper was one of the first “outsider” academics to use a subset of this *Exact Match Study* linked data set. However, the data set the co-author had access to excluded IRS data and a complete set of variables from the CPS. The two working papers that Kilss and Scheuren (1978) reference that were authored or co-authored by the co-author (in their list of *Exact Match Study* Reports) were eventually published in 1980 and 1981 in refereed journals (Burkhauser, 1980) and (Burkhauser and Warlick, 1981) as were the working papers of other authors listed there.

However, the Exact Match Study data itself was never updated. In fact, it took decades and possibly the passage of *The Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018* before groups at the Census Bureau gained access to such linked IRS, SSA, and CPS data. They are only now preparing to allow access to these data by outside researchers. Hence, it is far from clear that the promises in *The Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018* will soon overcome the reluctance of government agencies (data holders) to allow such data to be accessed by those outside their agency.

Because of this failure and the failure of the original Retirement History Study linked data project (See: Ireland, 1972 for a discussion of this Study), SSA was reluctant to start a new survey that would link SSA earnings histories to survey data. It took a master “inside-the-beltway player”—Richard Suzman—at The National Institute on Aging (NIA) to convince SSA to do so and to create a “Social Security Center” at the University of Michigan to allow access to a second level of more restricted confidential data in addition to a less restricted first level of confidential data. More importantly, Suzman made NIA funding available to a board of academic overseers to develop the first and subsequent waves of the Health and Retirement Study (HRS) data with SSA. For an early discussion of this effort, see: Burkhauser and Gertler (1995). Today, the HRS remains a significant source of longitudinal data on its original cohort of persons aged 51-61(born between 1931 and 1941). And three subsequent birth cohorts born between 1942-1947, 1948-1953, and 1954-1959.

One advantage of having a data set developed and run by non-government researchers at a Policy Research Institute affiliated with a major university (Institute for Social Research—Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan), with an independent academic Board of Overseers consisting of the major researchers in the aging literature, is that its survey design and data development represented the state-of-the-art knowledge on this aging population. Another is that this Board of Overseers was and continues to be the group most likely to anticipate future policy research topics related to future aging populations. Furthermore, this model of data development (where SSA, the data holder, allows access to not only the HRS survey data but also the administrative record data linked to this survey) is also the most efficient way to distribute the public use version of the data as well as supervise the use of the restricted access data components of it on campus. Note, however, that while SSA and NIA fund the development component of the data set, SSA provides additional funding via a competition between researchers affiliated with the University of Michigan as well as two other organizations, the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) and the Center on Aging and Work at Boston College who compete for these research funds based on their approach to answering policy questions developed by the SSA.

Step 2: Peer Reviewed Publication Based on these Data

The second step in providing evidence for evidence-based policymakers is the policy research found in the disciplinary journals of the academic research community and written for that

academic community using these data. This independent peer-review process subjects an author's scholarly work, research, or ideas to the scrutiny of others who are experts in the same field and is considered necessary to ensure academic scientific quality.

Step 3: Non-Peer Reviewed Publications Based on these Data

What we turn to now is the additional role that United States Policy Research Institutes play by not only contributing to the academic policy literature (especially by researchers from outside-the-beltway Policy Research Institutes primarily affiliated with universities) but also to current policy debates inside-the-beltway. The academic literature has long argued that the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) not only increases the income of low-income single mothers but does so by subsidizing work, thus increasing the employment of these workers (See Nichols and Rothstein (2016) for a review of this literature). The original Child Tax Credit (CTC) used this same design to subsidize work via a tax credit that requires earnings to receive it. However, a NAS (2019) report argued that turning the CTC into a “child allowance” (which provides the full benefit to those who don’t work) was unlikely to have a substantial negative impact on employment and would substantially reduce poverty.

In large part relying on evidence in this NAS report, President Biden signed the American Rescue Plan Act on March 11, 2021, which included such a temporary child allowance but one that would run out at the end of the year. However, the following month, the Biden Administration proposed extending this child allowance through 2025 as part of its Build Back Better Act. But this renewal was eventually stripped from the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 as part of the price for the support of one Senator (Joe Manchin, Democrat), who had supported the March 2021 CTC temporary change but not its renewal.

In doing so, Senator Manchin was influenced by the work of Corinth et al. 2021, which argued that if the refundable tax credit were made permanent, it would have substantial adverse employment effects on single mothers that would considerably offset its predicted reductions in poverty. Corinth et al. (2021) contended that NAS (2019) obtains its much smaller employment reduction because it does not account for the decrease in work primarily of single mothers, despite accounting for such an effect when analyzing reforms to the EITC.

The point of this example is that the Corinth et al. (2021) NBER working paper as of this writing is still not published in an academic journal (i.e., it has not been peer reviewed and accepted for publication based on that positive review) nor have any of the other contemporary or subsequent works criticizing this paper (Bastian 2022; Broadus et al. 2022) or arguing in favor of a permanent child allowance without including the behavioral effects it calls for (e.g., Acs and Werner, 2021, Cullyer et al., 2021, Marr et al. 2021, and Sherman et al. 2021).

Almost all were written by researchers who were funded or employed at an inside-the-beltway Policy Research Institute, progressive-leaning with respect to the Urban Institute’s, Acs and

Werner (2021) paper and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities', Marr et al. 2021 and Sherman et al. 2021 papers. Or an outside-the-beltway university Policy Research Institute, in the case of the progressive-leaning Center on Poverty and Social Policy at Columbia University's Cullyer et al. 2021 paper. Or a progressive combination of the two for the Urban Institute/Brookings Institution/UC Berkeley Opportunity Lab's Broadus et al. 2022 paper, or a conservative combination with funding from AEI and researchers employed at the Harris School of Public Policy at the University of Chicago with respect to the Corinth et al. (2021) and Corinth and Meyer (2022) papers. An exception is the Bastian 2022 paper written while Bastian was at Rutgers University. But soon after, Bastian went on leave to serve as a Senior Economist with President Biden's CEA, a position Corinth held with President Trump's CEA before working at the Harris School, and who is now a Senior Fellow at AEI.

These non-refereed inside-the-beltway papers often draw on the authors' previously published peer-reviewed academic work or on their long experience using economic analysis to predict the behavioral and distributional consequences of past government programs. And are often the best sources policymakers have for the policies they want to pursue or on which they are required to vote. These Policy Research Institute papers, together with the testimony of their authors at House and Senate hearings, and the in-house economic analysis provided by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT), are often the primary sources of evidence Congress has for current policy making. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the CEA play a similar in-house role for the Executive Branch of Government.

Step 4: The Maturation of CEA Members giving advice to the President

A less well-understood role that Policy Research Institutes play has been and continues to be in the maturation of university-based academics subsequently appointed by the President of the United States to be Members of the Council of Economic Advisers over the more than 75 years since the CEA was founded in 1946. Below, using data we collected from various online, public sources described in the data appendix, we consider the characteristics of the 42 Members of the CEA first chosen by incoming Presidents from Harry Truman in 1946 to Joe Biden in 2021. (See the data appendix for a fuller discussion of how we collected our data for each observation.)

As can be seen in Table 1, nearly all CEA Members held a Ph.D. in Economics (90%, or 38 of 42), and half of all CEA Members (21 out of 42) earned their highest degree from three Universities: Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the University of Chicago. The other universities where more than one CEA Member earned their highest degree are Columbia University, Princeton University, and the University of Pennsylvania, all of which, like Harvard University, are members of the Ivy League.

Table 1. Academic institutions where CEA Members earned their highest degree

Academic institution	CEA Members	Economics Ph.D.	Other highest degree
Harvard University*	8	7	1
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	8	8	0
University of Chicago	5	5	0
Columbia University*	3	2	1
Princeton University*	2	2	0
University of Pennsylvania*	2	2	0
All others (n=1)	14	12	2
<i>Total</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>4</i>

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates the academic institution is in the Ivy League. Yale University, also in the Ivy League, is included in “all others.”

Table 2 shows that a majority of CEA Members (76% or 32 of 42) were tenured at a college or university when appointed to the CEA. Of these, 53% (17 of 35) held tenured positions at five universities: Princeton University, Stanford University, the University of California Berkeley, the University of Chicago, and Yale University. The other universities where more than one CEA Member held a tenured position at the time of their appointment are Columbia University, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the University of Michigan. In all, 34% (12 of 35) of CEA Members were tenured at Ivy League Universities. The remaining CEA members (24% or 10 of 42) were affiliated with an inside-the-beltway or outside-the-beltway Policy Research Institute, in government, or at a private consulting firm.

Table 2. Employment at time of appointment to the CEA

Academic institution	CEA Members
Tenured at time of their appointment	32
Princeton University*	4
Stanford University	4
University of California Berkeley	3
University of Chicago	3
Yale University*	3
Columbia University*	2
Harvard University*	2
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	2
University of Michigan	2
All others (n=1)	7
Not tenured at the time of their appointment	10
Inside-the-beltway institution	6
Outside-the-beltway institution	1
Government	2
Private consulting	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>42</i>

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates an academic institution is in the Ivy League. Cornell University, also in the Ivy League, is included in “all others.”

Table 3 reports the affiliations of CEA Members before their appointment to the CEA, even if they were not affiliated at the time of their appointment. Most CEA Members held at least one government job before their appointment (69%, 29 out of 42). Nine CEA Members previously worked at the CEA (as an intern, staff economist, senior staff economist, or former Member), four worked at the Department of Treasury, and three each at the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, the OMB, and the Office of Price Administration.

Nearly one-third of CEA Members (31%, 13 out of 42) were affiliated with at least one inside-the-beltway Policy Research Institute at some point prior to appointment – six worked at the Brookings Institution and four at AEI.

Half (50%, 21 of 42) were affiliated with at least one outside-the-beltway organization prior to appointment. Four were affiliated with the Cowles Foundation (at Yale University), four with the RAND Corporation, and three with the School of Public and International Affairs (formerly Woodrow Wilson School, at Princeton). Two-thirds of affiliations with outside-the-beltway institutions prior to CEA appointment were at Policy Research Institutes at universities (66%, 25 of 38 affiliations within the outside-the-beltway institution category).

Table 3. Affiliations at some point before appointment to the CEA

Institution category	CEA Members	CEA Members (%)
Government	29	69
Council of Economic Advisors	9	21
U.S. Department of the Treasury	4	10
Federal Reserve Board of Governors	3	7
Office of Management and Budget	3	7
Office of Price Administration	3	7
Joint Economic Committee	2	5
U.S. Department of Health & Human Services	2	5
All others (n<2)	11	26
Inside-the-beltway	13	31
Brookings Institution	6	14
American Enterprise Institute	4	10
Committee for Economic Development	2	5
Economic Policy Institute	2	5
All others (n<2)	5	12
Outside-the-beltway	21	50
Cowles Foundation (Yale University)	4	10
RAND Corporation	4	10
School of Public and International Affairs, formerly Woodrow Wilson School (Princeton University)	3	7
Cowles Commission (University of Chicago, now at Yale University)	2	5
George J. Stigler Center (University of Chicago)	2	5
Hoover Institution (Stanford University)	2	5
Institute for Economic Policy Research (Stanford University)	2	5
MDRC	2	5
National Bureau of Economic Research	2	5
All others (n<2)	15	36

Note: Because some CEA members were affiliated with more than one institution during their careers before their appointment, the sum of CEA Members assigned to the three general categories of institutions in bold exceeds 42. The same is the case for the sum of the CEA Members assigned to institutions listed within each institution category.

Table 4 reports affiliations with inside-the-beltway institutions after leaving the CEA. Most inside-the-beltway appointments were with the Brookings Institution (11 of 21) or AEI (8 of 21).

Table 4. Inside-the-beltway affiliations at some point after appointment to the CEA

Institution	CEA Members	CEA Members (%)
Brookings Institution	11	26
AEI	8	19
CATO Institute	2	5
Center for American Progress	2	5
Council on Economic Progress	1	2
Washington Center for Economic Growth	1	2
<i>Total</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>50</i>

Note: The sum of CEA Members assigned to each institution exceeds the total number of inside-the-beltway affiliations, as CEA Members could be affiliated with more than one institution. In addition, not all affiliations are the same person who was affiliated with the institution prior to their appointment.

A final indicator of the link between CEA Members and academic institutions that provide evidence for evidence-based policymaking is their affiliation with the National Bureau of Economic Research (<https://www.nber.org/>). The NBER was founded in 1920 (See: NBER 2023 for the history of the NBER), and its non-peered reviewed working paper series, in which each working paper is authored by at least one NBER affiliate, is an important source of economic analysis of public policy questions prior to their publication in peer review journals. A total of 17 of 42 or 40% of CEA Members were affiliated with the NBER before or after they served on the CEA. This is substantially more than the number associated with any other single inside- or outside-the-beltway Policy Research Institute. Along with the Brookings Institution (13 of 42 or 31%) and AEI (10 of 42 or 24%), these three organizations historically have by far more CEA Member connections (affiliations before or after the CEA) than any other Policy Research Institute.

Conclusions

Policy Research Institutes in the United States, inside and outside the beltway, play important roles in the creation of evidence for evidence-based policy making via contributions to peer-reviewed publications but, more importantly, in evaluating current policy issues and providing economic analysis of the behavioral and distributional consequences of those current policies. But they also play a role in nurturing those mostly academic-based economists who eventually end up advising Presidents of the United States and their staff on the state of economic knowledge on economic problems that they are called to solve via evidenced-based policy making.

In 1996, Charles Schultze wrote an article for the *Journal of Economic Perspectives* on the 50th Anniversary of the establishment of the CEA in 1946. In it, he provides his view of the type of academics who Presidents chose for this role:

“While the macroeconomic policy advice of CEAs under different administrations can to some extent be differentiated according to the prevailing views of the administrations they served, there is another side to the story. Most of our modern presidents, almost immediately after election, moved away from their campaign rhetoric toward the center. As one consequence, they usually appointed CEA chairs who were pragmatists and centrists, and the chairman in turn tended to have a major voice in picking the two other members of the council, who in turn had a voice in picking staff members. This process is unlikely to select those who have embraced either radical activism or inactivism.” (Schultze 1996, p. 34).

And his view of the unique role that CEA Members should play in that process:

“CEA members should see themselves as *partisan advocates of the efficient solution*. Policy debates always include an ample supply of participants who emphasize the concentrated losses and the political dangers that will flow from the efficient decision. If economic advisers do not speak for efficiency, who will?” (Schultze 1996, p. 31).

Approaching the 80th Anniversary of the CEA, the need for Presidents to select CEA Members who have embraced neither radical activism nor inactivism and see themselves as *partisan advocates* of the efficient solution is even more important.

Data Appendix

Table 1A below lists United States Presidents and the CEA members they appointed at the beginning of their first term in office 1946-2025.

Appendix Table 1A. United States Presidents and CEA Members appointed at the beginning of the President's first term in office, 1945-2025

President's first term	President	CEA Member
1945-1949	Harry S. Truman (D)	Edwin G. Nourse* John D. Clark Leon H. Keyserling
1953-1957	Dwight D. Eisenhower (R)	Arthur F. Burns* Neil H. Jacoby Walter W. Stewart
1961-1963	John F. Kennedy (D)	Walter W. Heller* James Tobin Kermit Gordon
1963-1965	Lyndon B. Johnson (D)	Gardner Ackley* Arthur M. Okun Otto Eckstein
1969-1973	Richard M. Nixon (R)	Paul McCracken* Hendrick S. Houthakker Herbert Stein
1974-1977	Gerald R. Ford (R)	Alan Greenspan* Burton G. Malkiel Paul W. MacAvoy
1977-1981	Jimmy Carter (D)	Charles L. Schultze* Lyle E. Gramley William D. Nordhaus
1981-1985	Ronald W. Reagan (R)	Murray L. Weidenbaum* Jerry L. Jordan William A. Niskanen
1989-1993	George H. W. Bush (R)	Michael J. Boskin* John B. Taylor Richard L. Schmalensee
1993-1997	William J. Clinton (D)	Laura D. Tyson* Alan S. Blinder Joseph E. Stiglitz
2001-2005	George W. Bush (R)	R. Glenn Hubbard* Mark B. McClellan Randall S. Kroszner
2009-2013	Barak H. Obama (D)	Christina D. Romer* Austan D. Goolsbee Cecilia E. Rouse
2017-2021	Donald J. Trump (R)	Kevin A. Hassett* Richard V. Burkhauser Tomas J. Philipson
2021-2025	Joseph R. Biden (D)	Cecilia E. Rouse*

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates the Member served as Chair of the Council of Economic Advisors at the beginning of the President's first term in office.

Methodology

We relied on online, publicly available sources to develop the dataset we used in our Tables. Our first-choice source was a current curriculum vitae; however, these were not always available. We also sourced information from newspaper articles (including obituaries), biographical statements on organizational websites (e.g., a university faculty website), and other seemingly reputable websites. Appendix Table 1B lists our data sources, accessible as of September 22, 2023.

Appendix Table 1B. Data Sources, Accessed September 22, 2023

Source subject	Source website
Edwin G. Nourse	https://www.nytimes.com/1974/04/10/archives/edwin-nourse-90-dies-trumans-economic-aide-sought-anonymity-top.html
John D. Clark	https://nufoundation.org/a-scholarship-in-memory-of-a-great-man-her-great-grandfather/
Leon H. Keyserling	https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/keyserling-leon-hirsch/
Arthur F. Burns	https://www.federalreservehistory.org/people/arthur-f-burns
Neil H. Jacoby	https://www.nytimes.com/1979/06/01/archives/neil-jacoby-69-dies-economist-eisenhower-aide-and-professor.html http://texts.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb1j49n6pv&chunk.id=div00049&brand=oac4&doc.view=entire_text
Walter W. Stewart	https://www.ias.edu/scholars/walter-w-stewart https://read.dukeupress.edu/hope/article-abstract/14/4/583/11185/The-Mysterious-Career-of-Walter-W-Stewart?redirectedFrom=fulltext https://prabook.com/web/walter_w.stewart/1046915
Walter W. Heller	https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/local/1987/06/17/walter-w-heller-dies/b05ae5d0-28fb-4722-b8cc-4861dede92e6/
James Tobin	https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/economic-sciences/1981/tobin/biographical/
Kermit Gordon	https://www.nytimes.com/1976/06/23/archives/kermit-gordon-59-dies-was-head-of-brookings-never-wrote-a-book.html
Gardner Ackley	https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/local/1998/02/22/economist-gardner-ackley-dies/83892e1c-da34-4203-8507-f262fd343d1c/
Arthur M. Okun	https://www.britannica.com/print/article/1950404
Otto Eckstein	https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/local/1984/03/23/otto-eckstein-economist-adviser-to-presidents-dies/d3d7b76c-759b-45f4-b578-ac832dd11f39/
Paul McCracken	https://news.umich.edu/remembering-paul-mccracken-u-m-economist-and-adviser-to-many-u-s-presidents/ https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/paul-w-mccracken-dies-economic-adviser-to-presidents-was-96/2012/08/05/05fd0b72-df12-11e1-a19c-fcfa365396c8_story.html
Hendrick S. Houthakker	https://www.newnetherlandinstitute.org/history-and-heritage/dutch_americans/hendrik-samuel-houthakker/
Herbert Stein	https://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/stein-herbert
Alan Greenspan	https://www.federalreservehistory.org/people/alan-greenspan
Burton G. Malkiel	http://www.princeton.edu/~bmalkiel/LongVitaec-update%20March%201,%202017.pdf
Paul W. MacAvoy	https://som.yale.edu/news/2016/02/professor-emeritus-and-former-dean-paul-macavoy-dies
Charles L. Schultze	https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/28/business/economy/charles-l-schultze-91-dies-advised-presidents-on-economic-policy.html https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/charles-l-schultze-economist-in-two-administrations-dies-at-91/2016/09/27/4ee65d52-84ef-11e6-a3ef-f35afb41797f_story.html https://www.brookings.edu/articles/remarks-from-the-memorial-of-charles-schultze/
Lyle E. Gramley	https://www.federalreservehistory.org/people/lyle-e-gramley
William D. Nordhaus	https://williamnordhaus.com/bio

Murray L. Weidenbaum	https://wc.wustl.edu/about-murray-weidenbaum https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/kt1000345j/entire_text/
Jerry L. Jordan	https://www.cato.org/people/jerry-jordan https://www.federalreservehistory.org/people/jerry-l-jordan
William A. Niskanen	https://cato.org/people/william-niskanen https://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/29/business/william-a-niskanen-a-blunt-libertarian-economist-dies-at-78.html
Michael J. Boskin	https://web.stanford.edu/~boskin/mjb%20cv.pdf
John B. Taylor	https://web.stanford.edu/~johntayl/cv.pdf
Richard L. Schmalensee	https://mitsloan.mit.edu/shared/ods/documents/?doc=1&DocumentID=10675
Laura D. Tyson	https://media-speakerfile-pre.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/7f40da94737fcde4202b928167a87d821629309701.pdf
Alan S. Blinder	https://www.princeton.edu/~blinder/BlinderVita.pdf
Joseph E. Stiglitz	https://www0.gsb.columbia.edu/mygsb/faculty/research/pubfiles/6069/Joe%20Stiglitz.pdf
R. Glenn Hubbard	https://www0.gsb.columbia.edu/mygsb/faculty/research/pubfiles/4572/Hubbard%20Curriculum%20Vita%20-%20complete.pdf
Mark B. McClellan	https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/mcclellanm_cv.pdf
Randall S. Kroszner	https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/-/media/boe/files/about/people/randy-kroszner/randy-kroszner-cv.pdf
Christina D. Romer	http://emlab.berkeley.edu/~cromer/vitae.pdf
Austan D. Goolsbee	https://faculty.chicagobooth.edu/-/media/faculty/austan-goolsbee/vita/cv.pdf
Kevin A. Hassett	https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Kevin_Hassett_CV.pdf
Richard V. Burkhauser	https://publicpolicy.cornell.edu/people/richard-burkhauser/
Tomas J. Philipson	https://harris.uchicago.edu/files/2016-10/philipson_cv_oct2013.pdf
Cecilia E. Rouse	https://jrc.princeton.edu/people/cecilia-e-rouse https://www.brookings.edu/news/brookings-institution-announces-dr-cecilia-rouse-as-president/
Heather Boushey	https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/02/14/president-biden-announces-key-members-of-his-economic-team/
Jared Bernstein	https://socialwork.columbia.edu/news/cssw-and-us-politics-government/jared-bernstein/
NBER affiliations	https://www.nber.org/affiliated-scholars

References

- Acs, Gregory, and Kevin Werner. 2021. "How a Permanent Expansion of the Child Tax Credit Could Affect Poverty." Urban Institute.
- An, Chong-Bum. 2023. "Policy Evaluation Reform in Korea: Right Evaluation for the Right Policy" PERI Policy Series #2: Policy Evaluation Reform.
- Bastian, Jacob. 2022. "Investigating the Effects of the 2021 Child Tax Credit Expansion on Poverty and Maternal Employment." Working Paper.
- Broadus, Joseph, Hilary Hoynes, Elaine Maag, and Danny Rose. 2022. "Perspectives on the Impact of the Expanded Child Tax Credit and the Development of a New Research Agenda on Child and Family Economic Well-Being: Key Takeaways from a Convening Gathering Stakeholder Input." Urban Institute/UC Berkeley Opportunity Lab.
- Burkhauser, Richard V. 1980. "The Early Acceptance of Social Security—An Asset Maximization Approach," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 33(4) (July): 484-492.
- Burkhauser, Richard V. and Paul J. Gertler (eds.) 1995. The Health and Retirement Survey: Data Quality and Early Results, *Journal of Human Resources*, 30 (Supplement), (December).
- Burkhauser, Richard V. and Jennifer L. Warlick. 1981. "Disentangling the Annuity and Redistributive Aspects of Social Security in the United States," *Review of Income and Wealth*, 27 (December): 401-421.
- Collyer, Sophie, Megan A. Curran, Robert Paul Hartley, Zachary Parolin, and Christopher Wimer. 2021. "The Potential Poverty Reduction Effect of the American Families Plan." Poverty and Social Policy Fact Sheet. Center on Poverty and Social Policy at Columbia University.
- Corinth, Kevin and Bruce Meyer. 2022. "Correcting the Employment Participation Elasticities Reported in Hoynes and Patel (2018, 2022)" CID Research Note Series no. 2 December. Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago.
- Corinth, Kevin, Bruce D. Meyer, Matthew Stadnicki, and Derek Wu. 2021. The Anti-Poverty, Targeting, and Labor Supply Effects of Replacing a Child Tax Credit with a Child Allowance. NBER Working Paper 29366 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w29366> (October, revised March 2022)
- Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018.
<https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/4174/text>
- Health and Retirement Study. <https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/about>
- Ireland, Lola M. 1972. Retirement History Study: Introduction. *Social Security Bulletin* 35(11): 2-8. <https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/ssb/v35n11/index.html>

- Kilss, Beth and Frederick J. Scheuren. 1978. "The 1973 CPS-IRS-SSA Exact Match Study" *Social Security Bulletin* 41(10): 14-22.
- Marr, Chuck, Kris Cox, Stephanie Hingtgen, and Katie Windham. 2021. "Congress Should Adopt American Families Plan's Permanent Expansions of Child Tax Credit and EITC, Make Additional Provisions Permanent." Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
- The National Academy of Sciences. 2019. *A Roadmap to Reducing Child Poverty*. Edited by Greg Duncan and Suzanne Le Menestrel. Washington, DC.: National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25246>.
- National Academies of Science. 2023a. *Toward a 21st Century National Data Infrastructure: Mobilizing Information for the Common Good* National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. .
- Nichols, Austin and Jesse Rothstein. 2016. "The Earned Income Tax Credit." In *Economics of Means Tested Transfer Programs in the United States*, edited by Robert A. Moffitt, 137-218. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- National Academies of Sciences. 2023b. *Toward a 21st Century National Data Infrastructure: Enhancing Survey Programs by Using Multiple Data Sources*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/26804>.
- Report of the U. S. Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking.*
<https://www.acf.hhs.gov/opre/project/commission-evidence-based-policymaking-cep>
- Schultze, Charles L. 1996. "The CEA: An Inside Voice for Mainstream Economics." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 10(3) Summer: 23–39.
- Sherman, Arloc, Chuck Marr, and Stephanie Hingtgen. 2021, "Earnings Requirement Would Undermine Child Tax Credit's Poverty-Reducing Impact While Doing Virtually Nothing to Boost Parents' Employment." Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.