Jessica A. McCloskey

1104 Ohio Apt 3
Lawrence, KS 66044

Phone: (917) 640-5174
Email: jesmccloskey@gmail.com
Homepage: https://jesmccloskey.github.io

United States Citizen

Interests

Public economics, labor economics, inequality, data science

Education

Ph.D. Economics, University of Kansas, 2013 to present (expected completion June 2018)

Specializations: Econometrics, Macroeconomics, Labor Economics

Juris Doctor, University of Kansas, May 2011

Certificate in International Trade and Finance

M.A. Economics, University of Kansas, May 2011

B.A. Economics, Sociology, Hunter College, City University of New York, June 2008

Teaching Experience

Course Instructor, University of Kansas

Intermediate Macroeconomics, Fall 2016, Spring 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018
Economic Appraisal of Chem. & Petroleum Engineering Projects (School of Engineering), Fall 2009

Head Teaching Assistant, University of Kansas

Introductory Economics, Spring 2016
Principles of Microeconomics, Fall 2015

Teaching Assistant, University of Kansas

Principles of Macroeconomics, Spring 2014, Fall 2014, Spring 2015
Principles of Microeconomics, Fall 2013

Summary of student evaluation scores attached.

Select Research Work Experience

Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Economic Research Department Intern, June 2016 - April 2017

Professor Dietrich Earnhart, Research Assistant, June 2014 - December 2015

Riling, Burkhead & Nitcher, Law Clerk, October 2011 - Present

Distinguished Professor Micheal Hoeflich, Research Assistant, October 2008 - May 2011

Computer Skills

Advanced/Regularly Use: R, SQL, LaTex, Git, Excel

Some Experience Using: Python, Tableau, Stata, SAS, GIS

Presentations

The Kansas Tax Experiment: Impacts of 2012 Kansas Tax Reform on Employment, Establishments, and Output

National Tax Association, Annual Conference, Philadelphia, PA, November 2017 (research poster)

University of Kansas, Economics Department, Lawrence, KS, December 2015

The Impact of Unemployment Insurance Receipt on Nonemployment Duration and Subsequent Job Quality: Evidence from the U.S.

Missouri Valley Economics Association, Annual Conference, Kansas City, MO, October 2017

University of Kansas, Economics Department Seminar, Lawrence, KS, October 2017

Manipulating Data Using dplyr and reshape2

University of Kansas, R Club, Lawrence, KS, September 2017

Publication

Ginther, Donna K., Shulamit Kahn and **Jessica McCloskey**. 2016. "Gender and Academics." *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*.

Abstract Although women have reached parity and surpassed men in the attainment of bachelor's degrees (Goldin et al., 2006; Ceci et al., 2014), their representation within academic departments and disciplines depends on the field and rank. Here, we review the literature about women in academia, focusing on the evidence from the economics literature, but supplementing it with notable studies from other disciplines. We also examine the special case of the economics profession, where – surprisingly – women's progress has stagnated. We start by describing the representation of women in science academia and its antecedents in higher education. Since, in mathematics-intensive sciences, the under-representation has its roots prior to the doctorate, we briefly summarise what is known about gender differences related to mathematics and science at earlier ages. In particular, we examine the impact of role models, bias and stereotype threat in explaining the differences. We then transition to research on gender differences in academic career outcomes, considering issues related to work-life balance and bias in the academic hiring process, in academic productivity, in promotion and in salaries. Finally, we discuss how policies influence the representation of women in academia.

Other Research

The Kansas Tax Experiment: Impacts of 2012 Kansas Tax Reform on Employment, Establishments, and Output

Abstract This paper uses the synthetic control method (SCM) to estimate counterfactual policy outcomes following a major tax cutting reform targeted at job creation and economic growth. State tax collections sharply declined following the reform. Results from the SCM analysis and a difference-in-differences model suggest that the tax reform did not have the strong impact expected on employment, real gross state product (RGSP) per capita, or on the overall number of business establishments in Kansas. Results looking at only private sector RGSP are similar to those for the combined private and public sector. Different overall measures of employment show no impact, however when decomposed there is evidence of a positive impact on proprietor employment offset by declining wage and salary employment in the aggregate measure. There is also evidence of positive impact on the number of establishments without any employees. Supplemental analysis looks for impacts on migration into the state and on components of per capita personal consumption expenditures.

The Impact of Unemployment Insurance Receipt on Nonemployment Duration and Subsequent Job Quality: Evidence from the U.S.

State and Firm Level Responses to Water Nutrient Regulation Efforts, *with Dietrich Earnhart*

Academic References

Dietrich Earnhart, PhD (advisor)
University of Kansas
Phone: 785-864-2866
Email: earnhart@ku.edu

Michael H. Hoeflich, JD, PhD
University of Kansas School of Law
Phone: 785-864-9259
Email: hoeflich@ku.edu

Neal Becker, PhD
Boston University
Phone: 617-353-4447
Email: nbecker@bu.edu

Teaching Evaluation Summaries

	Intermediate Macro		
	Fall 2016 $n = 21/25$	Spring 2017 $n = 17/27$	Fall 2017 $n = 20/26$
Content materials were useful and organized	3.62	4.41	4.55
Set and met clear goals and objectives	3.62	4.35	4.50
Expectations were well defined and fair	3.86	4.47	4.65
Expectations were appropriately challenging	3.67	4.06	4.30
Teaching was clear, understandable and engaging	2.71	4.06	4.25
Encouraging, supportive, and involved in learning	3.33	4.12	4.55
Available, responsive, and helpful	3.29	4.41	4.75
Respected students and their points of view	4.05	4.59	4.80
Acquired knowledge and skills that the course promoted	3.62	4.18	4.55

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

	Introductory Economics		Principles Micro	
	Spring 2016 $n = 6/8$	Spring 2016 $n = 7/7$	Fall 2015 $n = 10/23$	Fall 2015 $n = 17/24$
Content materials were useful and organized	5	4.83	4.7	4.71
Set and met clear goals and objectives	5	4.67	4.7	4.59
Expectations were well defined and fair	5	4.83	4.9	4.71
Expectations were appropriately challenging	5	4.83	4.7	4.65
Teaching was clear, understandable and engaging	4.83	4.67	4.9	4.65
Encouraging, supportive, and involved in learning	5	5	4.9	4.65
Available, responsive, and helpful	5	5	4.9	4.76
Respected students and their points of view	5	5	4.8	4.88
Acquired knowledge and skills that the course promoted	5	4.67	4.8	4.71

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

| | Principles Macro | | | Principles Micro |
	Spring 2015 $n = 26/53$	Fall 2014 $n = 35/51$	Spring 2014 $n = 29/53$	Fall 2013 $n = 22/36$
Content materials were useful and organized	4.38	4.63	4.21	4.00
Set and met clear goals and objectives	4.39	4.40	4.21	4.14
Expectations were well defined and fair	4.42	4.40	4.21	4.27
Expectations were appropriately challenging	4.23	4.43	4.03	4.23
Teaching was clear, understandable and engaging	3.85	4.31	3.79	3.44
Encouraging, supportive, and involved in learning	4.23	4.26	4.07	3.82
Available, responsive, and helpful	4.46	4.60	4.28	4.50
Respected students and their points of view	4.46	4.66	4.52	4.77
Acquired knowledge and skills that the course promoted	4.23	4.66	4.10	4.21

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. Combined section averages are weighted by number of respondents.

Last updated: February 5, 2018