## OVERVIEW

1. "Third, if all other things were equal, one would expect that the percentage of a state’s tech sector that was Black would be about the same as the percentage of the state’s total population that was Black. One would would expect similar parity for the percentages of Hispanics. But all of things were not equal, so I found that the percentage of the tech sector of most states that was Black or Hispanic was substantially smaller than the percentage of the state’s total population that was Black or Hispanic. By contrast, I found that the percentage of state tech sectors that was Asian ranged as high as 4.4 times the percentage of the state’s total population that was Asian.”
   1. I have two issues with this section:

1) It’s too long. Since this is the executive summary, just start with “the percentage of the tech sector of most states that was Black…..”

2) I generally disagree with this argument and you have in the past. We’d expect the % of blacks or Hispanics in a tech sector to be the same as the % black or hispanic in a given state with a college education, not the same as the population in general. If I recall, you were disappointed in a Dean at Howard who had asserted there should be an equal percent of black professors as there were black people. I think this is the same issue.

## FINDINGS

1. Table 1A needs to be cleaned up. The numbers are too close together and it looks like the numbers are centered but the headings are not. I’d suggest adding gridlines
2. Same formatting issues for Table 2A
3. I’d actually rather see one Table (Table 1) and one Q&A for this vs. number then percentage. You can answer it that way, but it seems too cut up when there are two separate questions and two separate charts. People want to be able to see them closer together.
4. Same issues for Questions and Tables 2A and 2B as for 1A and 1B
5. Question 3A and its answer should be a footnote for #2 vs. a separate question
6. I’d rather see Table 3 be a breakdown of each category by race and gender and discussed that way. It is a bit confusing to see only gender in this table since no doubt lots of people want to know what the gender breakdown is for each racial group.
7. I think the maps need to be a little larger. It’s hard to make out the details of Eastern states.
8. The maps should be discussed as the percentage or proportion rather than the number.
9. “Map 4A shows that White techs are spread across a large number of states, with the highest number living in California, second highest in Texas.”

Perhaps reword to: “Map 4A shows that White techs are spread across a large number of states. California has the highest percent followed by Texas.”

1. “Map 4C shows that Asian techs are highly concentrated in California where their concentration is higher any other group in any state. Otherwise Asians are spread out over other states with much smaller Asian residencies.”

I think you should leave out the part about “smaller Asian residences” since these maps don’t show anything about the general population and you haven’t mentioned anything about the general population with regards to other racial groups so far.

1. Tables 4 could use a little formatting like gridlines and shading
2. Consider renaming S\_%, T\_% and P\_%. I know you’re crunched for space, but they aren’t intuitive names: better to wrap the text to two lines with longer headings.
3. “The numbers in the third (S\_%) and fourth (WhiTech) columns of this table, i.e., the percentage of the nation’s Black techs who lived in each state and the estimated number of techs (WhiTech) in each state are equivalent to the colors on Map 4A. Indeed, the colors on this map are based on the numbers in these columns.”

Drop the last sentence.

1. “Column 4 (BlkTech) of Table 4B (above) shows that in 2014 the largest number of Black techs lived in Texas, second largest in Georgia, third in Virginia, fourth in New York, fifth in Maryland, sixth in Florida, and California placed seventh. Why? Because in 2014 the vast majority Black Americans still lived in Eastern and Southern states; so that’s where most of the Black techs were found. This put most Black techs at a considerable disadvantage with regards to learning about and/or being recruited for tech jobs in Silicon Valley.”

I’d drop the last sentence or say “This may have put Black techs at a considerable disadvantage….”

1. “Perhaps California’s 2,220,275 Black population was too small compared to its largest-in-the-nation 38,952,193 total population to produce enough qualified Black techs to earn a larger slice of the pie? Unfortunately, this hypothesis is undermined by even worse numbers for Hispanics in Table D. By 2014 Hispanics had become the largest racial/ethnic group in the state, larger than Whites. But as will be seen in Table 4D (below), the Hispanic parity values were much lower than the Black parity values.”

I think I know what you are trying to say, but this paragraph is a little confusing. On the one hand you are saying that they just don’t have the numbers to in CA to have a greater share in the tech sector there. But then you go into the issue of Hispanics. This first part will get picked up by tech companies that say “I told you we didn’t do anything wrong”. So perhaps make it clear you aren’t saying that. Or if you are, then don’t mention anything about Hispanics until you get to their section and perhaps tone it down so Facebook won’t be as glib as it is now.

1. “Question 5 – Was the size of a racial/ethnic group related to the group’s share of the tech jobs in a stte?”

Last word should be “state”

1. Under “Comments about Table 5” I’m a little confused. Are the parity ratios and betas you reported literally country population to tech population, or did you do an average of the ratios by state? It seems like the latter is what you would have done, but it doesn’t read that way. If it is just for the country as a whole, Question 5 needs to be reworded or Table 5 moved to a separate section since that would be a national figure in a section about states.
2. Rename the headings for Table 6. Again, they should be clearer.
3. I like the content of the conclusion section, but I think it needs an introductory paragraph or at least two sentences. Othewise it starts out reading like another section and as a reader, it’s not clear why this is a “conclusion”
4. Maybe move the motivation section or part of it to the start of your report (or after the overview but before the findings.