

PATHWAYS TO CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE
MODERNIZATION OF CONGRESS
OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

JUNE 8, 2022

Serial No. 117-19

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress



Available via <http://govinfo.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2022

48-600

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION OF CONGRESS

DEREK KILMER, Washington, *Chair*

ZOE LOFGREN, California
EMANUEL CLEAVER, Missouri
ED PERLMUTTER, Colorado
DEAN PHILLIPS, Minnesota
NIKEMA WILLIAMS, Georgia

WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina,
Vice Chair
BOB LATTA, Ohio
RODNEY DAVIS, Illinois
DAVE JOYCE, Ohio
GUY RESCHENTHALER, Pennsylvania
BETH VAN DUYNE, Texas

COMMITTEE STAFF

YURI BECKELMAN, *Staff Director*
DEREK HARLEY, *Republican Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Opening Statements

	Page
Chairman Derek Kilmer	
Oral Statement	1
Vice Chairman William Timmons	
Oral Statement	2

WITNESSES

Dr. Molly Reynolds, Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, The Brookings Institution	
Oral Statement	3
Written Statement	6
Dr. Steven Rogelberg, Chancellor's Professor, Department of Psychological Sciences and Management University Of North Carolina	12
Oral Statement	12
Written Statement	14
Hon. Gregg Harper, Former Member of Congress	18
Oral Statement	18
Written Statement	21
Discussion	23

PATHWAYS TO CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

Wednesday, June 8, 2022

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 210, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Derek Kilmer [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Kilmer, Cleaver, Perlmutter, Phillips, Timmons, Davis, and Latta.

The CHAIRMAN. Okey dokey. The committee will come to order.

Without objection, the chair is authorized to declare a recess of the committee at any time.

I now recognize myself for 5 minutes for an opening statement.

So early last year when members of the committee met for an organizational retreat, I asked everyone to tell their story of why they ran for Congress and what they hoped to achieve. And as you can imagine, the stories that folks shared were deeply personal. No one jumps into a career like this on a whim. Most see problems that need to be fixed and want to help find solutions. That is the common thread that ties us together as Members of Congress, regardless of background or party.

Of course, we are not the only ones who want to fix problems. There are plenty of individuals who share our desire to work hard and find solutions for the American people, yet they opt out of public service.

Understanding why qualified people don't run for Congress is just as important as understanding why they do. The decision is personal, but factors like experience and connections and access to campaign funds also come into play.

During the retreat, we also asked committee colleagues how Congress has so far met or failed to meet their expectations. And I guess it is not surprising that most expressed frustration with political and institutional dysfunction. Despite best efforts, we all sometimes struggle to do the work that we came here to do. But beneath that frustration, there remains hopefulness. I don't think any of us would still be here if we didn't believe on some level that we can solve problems on behalf of the American people.

The challenge is figuring out how to do that, and for every Member the journey is different. Every Member has to figure out for themselves what success looks like. They have to figure out how this place works and what they can realistically accomplish. We all have big goals, but small wins are important too. Solving problems is about give and take, and I would be lying if I said this job didn't

involve a lot of recalibrating. That can be frustrating, especially when it seems like you are doing a lot more giving than taking sometimes. And sustained frustration can definitely take its toll.

And just as the decision to run for office is personal, so is the decision to leave. Some Members decide that they can—that they can be more effective working to fix problems from outside of Congress. Others tire of being away from their families, and I have yet to meet a Member of Congress who actually enjoys fundraising.

Turnover is healthy for any institution, including Congress, but losing Members with the kind of policy and procedural expertise needed to make Congress a strong, coequal branch of government is tough.

I am looking forward to hearing what the experts joining us today have to say about the different phases of public service, especially about effective leadership. The committee will use its rules that allow for a more flexible hearing format that encourages discussion and the civil exchange of ideas.

So in accordance with clause 2(j) of House rule XI, we will allow up to 30 minutes of extended questioning per witness. And, without objection, time will not be strictly segregated between the witnesses, which will allow for extended back-and-forth exchanges between members and witnesses.

Vice Chair Timmons and I will manage the time to ensure that every member has equal opportunity to participate. Additionally, members who wish to claim their individual 5 minutes to question each witness pursuant to clause 2(j)(2) of rule XI will be permitted to do so following the period of extended questioning. Okay.

So, with that, I would like to now invite Vice Chair Timmons to share some opening remarks.

Mr. Timmons. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to welcome the witnesses. Thank you for taking the time out of your schedules to come and be with us.

Congressman Harper, welcome back.

And, Dr. Reynolds, I think you have the unique honor of being—this is your third time testifying before us? That is pretty impressive. I really appreciate all your time helping us do our job.

This is an important hearing, and it is something that we have been focusing on really over the last 3.5 years. And we have been trying to make it easier to serve. Over the last few decades, it seems that Congress has been intent on making it as hard to serve as possible. A hundred Members of Congress sleep in their office, most of those not because they want to but because the cost of an apartment in Washington, D.C., is \$2,500 to \$3,000 a month, and when you are sleeping in it 80 nights a year, that math just doesn't work.

I stay in a hotel. I did this math after my first year, and I realized I can save a couple hundred dollars a night by staying in a hotel. So I have been doing that. I was fortunate enough to move out of my apartment just before the pandemic. A lot of my colleagues were not, and they had an apartment they were paying for for literally 6 or 8 months that they couldn't get out of, and they were staying at home. So, I mean, this is a real challenge.

I do think it actually—I know a lot of people in the State senate that did not consider running for Congress because of the chal-

allenges associated with serving. You need look no further than the outside income bans and you start doing all the math. And, really, Members of Congress make about \$80,000 after taxes, which seems like a lot until you live in two places and your, you know, spouse and children are at home and trying to go to college. And, you know, it just—it really runs out quick.

So I definitely think it is important that every American citizen that wants to run for Congress should be able to run, and that would make this body as productive and representative of our country as possible.

So I think this is an important hearing, and I just appreciate you all taking the time, and look forward to hearing you all solve this problem real quick. Thanks.

I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. So I would like to welcome our three witnesses who are here to share with us their knowledge about how and why Members run and retire and how they can effectively engage and lead while they serve. Witnesses are reminded that your written statements will be made part of the record.

I would like to welcome back our first witness, Dr. Molly Reynolds. Dr. Reynolds holds the distinct honor of testifying before this committee more times and on more topics than anyone.

I will say, when we started off this committee, after having some folks testify multiple times, I said we were going to get punch cards. And if you hit a certain level, you qualified for a free latte. We actually have gotten you the Molly Reynolds inaugural latte as gratitude for actually being the, you know, the frequent flyer of the Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress. So congratulations. We are calling that the Reynolds Latte.

Molly is a senior fellow in Governance Studies at The Brookings Institution, and studies Congress with an emphasis on how congressional rules and procedure affect domestic policy outcomes.

Dr. Reynolds is the author of “Exceptions to the Rule: The Politics of Filibuster Limitations in the U.S. Senate.” She also supervises the maintenance of Vital Statistics on Congress, Brookings’ long-running resource on the first branch of government.

So, Dr. Reynolds, welcome back. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENTS OF DR. MOLLY REYNOLDS, SENIOR FELLOW, GOVERNANCE STUDIES, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION; STEVEN ROGELBERG, PH.D., CHANCELLOR’S PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCES AND MANAGEMENT UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE; AND THE HONORABLE GREGG HARPER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 2009–2019

STATEMENT OF MOLLY REYNOLDS

Ms. REYNOLDS. Thank you. And thank you for the latte.

Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Timmons, and members of the select committee, my name is Molly Reynolds. I am a senior fellow in the Governance Studies program at the Brookings Institution, and I am very appreciative of the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss pathways to and through congressional service.

To start, let me assert that there is no universal right length of a legislative career, but research has revealed several benefits to Members of increased seniority. Members become more successful in advancing their legislative priorities as they serve longer, and committee and subcommittee chairs appear to become more effective the longer they serve in those roles. Importantly, there is reason to believe that some of these benefits to Members of seniority, especially in the majority party, have decreased as power has centralized in the hands of party leaders.

As this committee considers recommendations, one area you might consider are ways to empower rank-and-file members in the legislative process and make clear their contributions to legislation.

While there are clearly benefits to building seniority and continuing to serve, many former Members stress that the cost of remaining in the House eventually outweigh the benefits of doing so. Several decades of research reveal a number of themes about choices to retire that are useful to consider.

In addition to considerations related to the electoral environment, Members are more likely to retire when the job, which Representatives pursue because they having a wide range of goals they want to accomplish, is no longer enjoyable enough to be worth doing. Work on a large wave of retirements in the 1970s emphasized the increased demands on Members' times and the increased workload of the institution.

Congress' collective legislative performance also appears relevant. Higher levels of legislative gridlock have been associated with higher retirement rates. Members' behavior then appears to reflect the same frustration that many of their constituents feel with Congress'.

Institutional practices that shape Members' expectations about their future influence also matter. Members who believe they will either lose existing influence or who think it is unlikely they will gain power are more likely to retire.

As you consider possible recommendations, it is important to recognize that some reforms that respond to this dynamic might be at odds with each other. So encouraging those with committee leadership positions to remain in the Chamber may leave rank-and-file members to feel even less powerful than they do at present. But recognizing that Members' expectation about their future influence shape retirement decision is an important first step.

In addition, more moderate Members of both parties appear more likely to retire than their more ideological colleagues. And there is reason to believe that this dynamic may be one of the contributors to increasing polarization in Congress. The broader forces of partisan polarization in the American political system are likely beyond the reach of your recommendations, but knowing that Members who feel like they are out of step with their parties due to their relative moderation are more likely to retire does have implications for your efforts to foster bipartisan cooperation in the House.

Finally, research also indicates that Members are responsive to shifts in the financial and time costs and benefits associated with service. Decisions to retire appear to be shaped by the financial consequences of doing so. While changes to congressional pay and

pension benefits is a politically difficult topic, research does suggest that present and future compensation does bear on Members' decisions.

In addition, Members appear to weigh other costs such as the time associated with travel to and from Washington in their retirement decisions, which, in turn, suggests that reforms to the congressional schedule or other efforts aimed at reducing the cost of serving might be fruitful.

While decisions to retire are made by individuals, they have consequences for the institution when taken collectively. When considering committee activity, more senior committee chairs can mean more oversight hearings. Within committees, more senior members participate more in oversight hearings. Not all Members respond to the dynamics that animate retirement in the same way. As a result, departure patterns have consequences for the efforts to make the House membership look more like the country as a whole.

These different responses come on top of systematic differences in who chooses to run for public office in the first place. Women, people of color, and people from working class backgrounds all face barriers in running for office. Women, for example, are then also more likely to retire when they have reason to believe they have reached a career ceiling in Congress than men are.

Finally and most generally, Members leaving because they do not perceive the House as a place where they can be influential contributors to—where they can be influential contributes to the perception that Congress is not a place where the hard work of legislating is rewarded. If prospective members see the House primarily an arena in which legislators say things rather than do things, those who value the former will be more likely to seek office than the latter. And that trend can also decrease public trust in the institution.

Thank you again for having me today, and I look forward to your questions.

[The statement of Ms. Reynolds follows:]

Testimony of Molly E. Reynolds¹
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, The Brookings Institution
Before the Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress
June 8, 2022

Chair Kilmer, Vice Chair Timmons, and members of the Select Committee, my name is Molly Reynolds, and I am a Senior Fellow in the Governance Studies Program at the Brookings Institution. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss pathways to and through congressional service.

I want to accomplish three things in my testimony today. First, I will reflect on why individual members might want to build lengthy legislative careers. Second, I will review what several decades of political science research on congressional retirements tells us about what leads members to depart the chamber. Third, I will discuss what the consequences are for the institution as a whole of the retirement trends that we see.

1. Accruing seniority can benefit members, their constituents, and the institution.

To begin, let me assert that there is no universal “right” length of a legislative career, and that the returns to continued service may decrease over time. But research has revealed several benefits to members of increased seniority. Members’ success at advancing bills they introduce over the course of the legislative process tends to increase over the course of their careers.² In addition, more senior members are also more successful at getting their priorities enacted via a reuse of text from a bill they sponsor originally but that eventually included in a different measure that becomes law.³ Committee and subcommittee chairs also appear to become more effective the longer they serve in those roles.⁴

In addition, research also supports the intuitive conclusion that more senior members have more meaningful connections to their colleagues, which can help build support for these legislators’ proposals.⁵ There is mixed evidence on the question of whether more senior members are more successful at directing additional federal funds to their districts; some studies support this conclusion while others do not.⁶ Importantly, there is reason to believe that some of these benefits to members of seniority, especially in the majority party, have decreased as power has centralized in the hands of

¹The views expressed are my own and do not necessarily reflect those of staff members, officers, or trustees of the Brookings Institution. Brookings does not take institutional positions on any issue.

²Craig Volden and Alan E. Wiseman, *Legislative Effectiveness in the United States Congress* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

³Mandi Eatough and Jessica Preece, “Crediting Invisible Work (Horses): Congress and the Lawmaking Productivity Metric,” *Working Paper*, 2021.

⁴Craig Volden and Alan E. Wiseman, “Legislative Effectiveness and Problem Solving in the U.S. House of Representatives,” in *Congress Reconsidered*, 11th ed., Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer, eds. (Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press, 2017): 259-284.

⁵Andrew J. Taylor, “Legislative Seniority in the Partisan Congress,” *Social Science Quarterly* 100.4 (June 2019): 1297-1307.

⁶Austin C. Clemens, Michael H. Crespin, and Charles J. Finocchiaro, “Earmarks and Subcommittee Government in the U.S. Congress,” *American Politics Research* 43.6 (November 2015): 1074-1106; Austin C. Clemens, Michael H. Crespin, and Charles J. Finocchiaro, “The Political Geography of Distributive Politics,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 40.1 (February 2015): 111-136; Alison W. Craig, “It Takes a Coalition: The Community Impacts of Collaboration,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 46.1 (February 2021): 11-48; Erik J. Engstrom and Georg Vanberg, “Assessing the Allocation of Pork: Evidence from Congressional Earmarks,” *American Politics Research* 38.6 (November 2010): 959-985; Anthony Fowler and Andrew B. Hall, “Congressional Seniority and Pork: A Big Fat Myth?,” *European Journal of Political Economy* 40.A (December 2015): 42-56; Frances E. Lee, “Geographic Politics in the U.S. House of Representatives: Coalition Building and Distribution of Benefits,” *American Journal of Political Science* 47.4 (October 2003): 714-728.

party leaders.⁷ As this Committee considers recommendations aimed at changing the conditions that lead members to retire when they still feel like they have much to offer the institution, one area you might consider are ways to empower rank-and-file members in the legislative process and make clearer their contributions to legislation. The Committee's December 2021 recommendations, for example, included one directing congress.gov, the official web site for legislative information, to "provide a clearer accounting of member contributions to legislation."⁸

2. Driven by several factors, some members conclude that the costs of continued service outweigh these benefits and choose to retire.

There are clearly benefits to building seniority and continuing to serve. But many former members, when asked to explain what led them to retire, stress that the costs of remaining in the House eventually outweighed the benefits of doing so.⁹ The political science literature on member retirements is rich and suggests—unsurprisingly—that there is no single account that captures all the nuance present in legislators' decisions to leave the chamber. But there are several themes in the research that are useful to consider as you consider recommendations related to members' pathways to and through congressional service.

One line of research suggests that members may be acting strategically in their decisions to retire, responding to several factors that make it more likely they will lose a campaign for re-election. For example, members appear to respond to the overall electoral environment when choosing to retire; research examining retirements from the House between 1954 and 2004 found higher retirement rates when consumer confidence and congressional approval ratings were lower.¹⁰ An analysis of House races between 1976 and 2000 found that members running in redrawn districts following redistricting were also more likely to retire.¹¹

A second set of findings suggest members are more likely to retire when the job—which representatives pursue because they have a wide range of goals they want to accomplish in Washington—is no longer enjoyable enough to be worth doing. Early work on a large wave of retirements in the 1970s emphasized the increased demands on members' time and the increased workload of the institution.¹² Later research stressed that not all members are dissatisfied with their service in the same way and highlighted the ways in which individual characteristics, like age, also matter.¹³

⁷ Andrew B. Hall and Kenneth A. Shepsle, "The Changing Value of Seniority in the U.S. House: Conditional Party Government Revised," *Journal of Politics* 76.1 (October 2013): 98-113.

⁸ "117th Congress Recommendations," Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress <<https://modernizecongress.house.gov/117th-recommendations>>.

⁹ For rich interview accounts of members' choice to leave, see Amisa Ratliff, Marian Currinder, and Michael Beckel, "Why We Left Congress: How the Legislative Branch is Broken and What We Can Do About It," *Issue One and R Street*, December 2018 <<https://issueone.org/articles/why-we-left-congress-how-the-legislative-branch-is-broken-and-what-we-can-do-about-it/>>.

¹⁰ Jennifer Wolak, "Strategic Retirements: The Influence of Public Perceptions on Voluntary Departures from Congress," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 32.2 (May 2007): 285-304.

¹¹ Jamie L. Carson, "Strategy, Selection, and Candidate Competition in U.S. House and Senate Elections," *Journal of Politics* 67.1 (February 2005): 1-28.

¹² Joseph Cooper and William West, "Voluntary Retirement, Incumbency, and the Modern House," *Political Science Quarterly* 96.2 (Summer 1981): 279-300.

¹³ Michael K. Moore and John R. Hibbing, "Situational Dissatisfaction in Congress: Explaining Voluntary Departures," *Journal of Politics* 60.4 (November 1998): 1088-1107.

Given the current legislative and political environment, it is worth considering a few specific factors that may make service less rewarding and thus make members more likely to retire. One is Congress's collective legislative performance. Research examining House retirements between 1948 and 1994 found that higher levels of legislative gridlock—that is, an inability by Congress to address the issues on the national agenda—were associated with higher retirement rates.¹⁴ Members' behavior, then, appears to reflect the same frustration that many of their constituents feel with Congress's shortcomings at responding to national challenges.

A second specific dynamic that contributes to retirement decisions is institutional practices that shape members' expectations about their future influence in the chamber. The fact that minority party members have less influence in the House leads legislators who expect to be in the minority in the next cycle to retire at higher rates; this includes some members from safe seats, suggesting that even those capable of winning re-election may simply not enjoy serving in the minority.¹⁵ In addition, members who have reason to think it is unlikely that they will acquire positions of power in the chamber because their seniority is not commensurate with their age appear to be more likely to retire.¹⁶ Finally, research on the 2018 cycle specifically highlights the degree to which some Republicans' retirement decisions were driven, at least in part, by their pending loss of committee leadership positions.¹⁷ As you consider possible recommendations to support members' pathways through congressional service, it is important to recognize that some reforms that respond to this dynamic might be at odds with each other; encouraging those with existing committee leadership positions to remain in the chamber, for example, may lead rank-and-file members to feel even less powerful than they do at present. But recognizing that members' expectations about their future influence shape retirement decisions is an important first step.

A third factor in some members' choice to retire is a sense that they do not “fit” with their party in the chamber. Research that examines elections between 1982 and 2010 finds that more moderate members of both parties are more likely to retire than their more ideological colleagues; importantly, this trend is driven by choices made between 1990 and 2010, suggesting that this dynamic may be one of the contributors to increasing polarization in Congress.¹⁸ The broader forces of partisan polarization in the American political system are likely beyond the reach of this committee's recommendations, but knowing that members who feel like they are out of step with their parties due to their relative moderation are more likely to retire has implications for your efforts to foster bipartisan cooperation in the House.

Finally, research also indicates that members are responsive to shifts in the financial and time costs and benefits associated with congressional service. On one hand, members' decisions to retire appear to be shaped by the financial consequences of doing so. Work on the 1992 election, for example, indicates that some members likely delayed retirement from 1990 until two years later because a pay increase enacted in 1989 increased the value of members' pensions if they served at least one additional term.¹⁹ More recent research finds that members with more lucrative expected post-service,

¹⁴ Sarah A. Binder, *Stalemate: Causes and Consequences of Legislative Gridlock* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2003).

¹⁵ Jacob F.H. Smith, *Minority Party Misery: Political Powerlessness and Electoral Disengagement* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2021).

¹⁶ Moore and Hibbing 1998.

¹⁷ Hanna K. Brant and L. Marvin Overby, “Congressional Career Decisions in the 2018 Congressional Midterm Elections,” *Congress and the Presidency* 48.1 (March 2021): 8-24.

¹⁸ Danielle M. Thomsen, *Opting Out of Congress: Partisan Polarization and the Decline of Moderate Candidates* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

¹⁹ Richard L. Hall and Robert P. van Houweling, “Avarice and Ambition in Congress: Representatives' Decisions to Run or Retire from the U.S. House,” *American Political Science Review* 89.1 (March 1995): 121-136. This study

private sector salaries—as measured by the size of lobbying contracts received by similarly situated members who have already retired—are also more likely to depart. This behavior appears to be driven by the fact that there are financial opportunity costs to continuing to hold office and eventually receiving a congressional pension versus taking a private sector position. Members who must, under the age and length-of-service requirements, run for re-election at least once before seeing a higher pension appear to be more responsive to the value of outside employment in making their retirement decisions.²⁰ While changes to congressional pay and/or pension benefits is a politically difficult topic, research does, nonetheless, suggest that present and future compensation does bear on members' decisions whether to remain in the chamber.

In addition to being sensitive to the financial costs and benefits of continued service, members also appear to weigh other costs, such as the time associated with travel to and from Washington, D.C., in their retirement decisions. A study of retirement decisions between 1977 and 2018, for example, found that “gaining an airport with a direct flight increases the likelihood of a member seeking reelection by about 1.6 percentage points.”²¹ While this effect is small in magnitude, it does indicate that members are sensitive to non-financial costs of serving, which, in turn, suggests that reforms to the congressional schedule or other efforts aimed at reducing the transaction costs of serving might be fruitful for the Committee to consider.

3. Members' individual retirement decisions, when taken together, can have negative consequences for the institution.

While decisions to retire are made by individuals, they have consequences for the institution when taken collectively. When considering committee activity, for example, seniority matters; not only are more senior committee and subcommittee chairs more effective legislatively, but, at the full committee level, they also convene more oversight hearings.²² Within committees, more senior members also appear to participate more in oversight hearings.²³ In addition, there is evidence from U.S. state legislatures that members who cannot run again, by virtue of term limits, exert less legislative effort (that is, they sponsor less legislation, contribute less in committee, and miss more floor votes); a similar dynamic, if present in the U.S. House, could also be harmful to the institution.²⁴

There is also reason to believe that not all members respond to the dynamics that animate retirement in the same way—and that, as a result, an environment that encourages members to leave has

also suggests that a desire for a higher pension was a more important factor than the so-called “golden parachutes” available in 1992 and made possible by an amendment to the Federal Election Campaign Act passed in 1979. Under that provision, 1992 was the last year in which a member sworn in before January 1980 could retain his or her campaign funds for personal use upon retirement. For more on this, see Timothy Groseclose and Keith Krehbiel, “Golden Parachutes, Rubber Checks, and Strategic Retirements from the 102d House,” *American Journal of Political Science* 38.1 (February 1994): 75-99.

²⁰ Benjamin C.K. Egerod, “The Lure of the Private Sector: Career Prospects Affect Selection Out of Congress,” *Political Science Research and Methods*, forthcoming.

²¹ Neil Malhotra and Christian Gonzalez Rojas, “Transaction Costs and Congressional Careers: The Effect of Flight Availability on Retirement Decisions,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, forthcoming.

²² Brian D. Feinstein, “Who Conducts Oversight? Bill-Writers, Lifers, and Nailbiters,” *Wayne Law Review* 64 (2018): 127-148.

²³ Nicholas G. Napolio and Janna King Rezaee, “Extremists and Participation in Congressional Oversight Hearings,” *C. Boyden Gray Center for the Study of the Administrative State*, Working Paper 20-20, October 2020 <<https://administrativestate.gmu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/29/2020/10/Napolio-Rezaee-Extremists-and-Participation-in-Congressional-Oversight-Hearings.pdf>>.

²⁴ Alexander Fourniaies and Andrew B. Hall, “How Do Electoral Incentives Affect Legislator Behavior? Evidence from U.S. State Legislatures,” 116.2 (May 2022): 662-676.

consequences for the efforts to make the House membership look more like the country as a whole. Importantly, these different responses come on top of systematic differences in who chooses to run in the first place. The research on candidate entry decisions for a range of public offices is rich and finds, for example, that women are less likely than men to seek elected office for a range of reasons, including because they are recruited less often than men,²⁵ because they believe they will not receive financial support to do so,²⁶ because they feel they cannot balance family responsibilities,²⁷ and because they do not think they are qualified to do so.²⁸

In addition, minority candidates, who tend to emerge in majority-minority districts,²⁹ are also confronted with impediments to running. Indeed, individuals from racial minority groups may wish to run. African-Americans, for example, do not express lower levels of political ambition as compared to whites.³⁰ But when candidates of color run, they may not necessarily receive the same level of support as white individuals. Latino/a candidates, for example, receive less support from party elites,³¹ and Black candidates raise less money.³² Women of color also struggle with both fundraising and attracting favorable media coverage.³³ Evidence that the presence of minority officeholders at higher levels encourages minority candidate entry down ballot, moreover, suggests that perceptions of viability among potential candidates also matter.³⁴ Finally, individuals from working class backgrounds also face barriers in entering elected office—both because of the high financial and time costs of running and because they are less likely to be recruited to do so.³⁵

In the context of departures from Congress, women, for example, are more likely to retire when they have reason to believe they have reached a career ceiling in Congress than men.³⁶ In addition, women

²⁵ Jennifer L. Lawless and Richard L. Fox, *It Still Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

²⁶ Daniel M. Butler and Jessica Robinson Preece, "Recruitment and Perceptions of Gender Bias in Party Leader Support," *Political Research Quarterly* 69.4 (December 2016): 842–51.

²⁷ Nancy Burns, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Sidney Verba, *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality and Political Participation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

²⁸ Danny Hayes and Jennifer L. Lawless, *Women on the Run: Gender, Media and Political Campaigns in a Polarized Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

²⁹ Eric Gonzalez Juenke, "Ignorance is Bias: The Effect of Latino Losers on Models of Latino Representation," *American Journal of Political Science* 58.3 (July 2014): 593–603; Paru Shah, "It Takes a Black Candidate: A Supply-Side Theory of Minority Representation," *Political Research Quarterly* 67.2 (July 2014): 266–79.

³⁰ Paru Shah, "Stepping Up: Black Political Ambition and Success," *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 3:2 (April 2015): 278–294.

³¹ Angela X. Ocampo and John Ray, "Many Are Called But Few Are Chosen: The Emergence of Latino Congressional Candidates," *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 8.4 (2020): 738–761.

³² Gbemende Johnson, Bruce I. Oppenheimer, and Jennifer L. Selin, "The House as a Stepping Stone to the Senate: Why Do So Few African-American House Members Run?," *American Journal of Political Science* 56.2 (April 2012): 387–399.

³³ Ashley Sorenson and Philip Chen, "Identity in Campaign Finance and Elections: The Impact of Gender and Race on Money Raised in 2010–18 U.S. House Elections," *Political Research Quarterly*, forthcoming; Sarah Gershon, "When Race, Gender, and the Media Intersect: Campaign News Coverage of Minority Congresswomen," *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 33.2 (May 2012): 105–125.

³⁴ Bernard L. Fraga, Eric Gonzalez Juenke, and Paru Shah, "One Run Leads to Another: Minority Incumbents and the Emergence of Lower Ticker Candidates," *Journal of Politics* 82.2 (January 2020): 771–775.

³⁵ Nicholas Carnes, *The Cash Ceiling: Why Only the Rich Run for Office—and What We Can Do About It* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018).

³⁶ Jennifer L. Lawless and Sean M. Theriault, "Will She Stay or Will She Go? Career Ceilings and Women's Retirement from the U.S. Congress," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 30.4 (November 2005): 581–596.

appear to be more sensitive to electoral concerns in making their retirement decisions.³⁷ Finally, in at least the pre-2010 period, the fact that moderate members are more likely to retire than their ideological colleagues had particularly strong effects for women in the Republican conference, who tended to be more moderate than their male colleagues.³⁸

Finally, and most generally, members leaving because they do not perceive the House as a place where they can be influential contributes the perception that Congress is not a place where the hard work of legislating is rewarded. If prospective members see the House as a primarily an arena in which legislators *say* things rather than *do* things, those who value the former will be more likely to seek office than the latter. In addition to making it more difficult for Congress to complete the basic work of governing, this notion that the institution is primarily a place for performance over legislating has negative consequences for public trust in it as well. As Yuval Levin of the American Enterprise Institute argued before this committee in 2021, institutions—Congress included—lose public trust when “the people in that institution no longer see it as a mold of their character and behavior but just as a platform for themselves to perform on and to raise their profiles and be seen.”³⁹ Retirement decisions, then, have consequences that reach beyond the individual members who choose to depart the chamber.

³⁷ Jeffrey Lazarus, Amy Steigerwalt, and Micayla Clark, “Time Spent in the House: Gender and the Political Careers of U.S. House Members,” *Politics and Gender*, forthcoming.

³⁸ Thomsen 2017.

³⁹ Yuval Levin, “Building a More Civil and Collaborative Culture in Congress: Some Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reflections,” *Statement before the House Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress*, June 17, 2021 <<https://docs.house.gov/meetings/MH/MH00/20210617/112786/HHRG-117-MH00-Wstate-LevinY-20210617.pdf>>.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Dr. Reynolds.

Our next witness is Dr. Steven Rogelberg. Dr. Rogelberg is an organizational psychologist holding the distinguished title of chancellor's professor at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte. He is an award-winning scholar, with over 150 publications addressing issues around collaboration, leadership, effectiveness, well-being, and engagement. Dr. Rogelberg has engaged with the world's leading organizations. And his newest book, "The Surprising Science of Meetings," was identified by The Washington Post as the number one leadership book to watch for.

Dr. Rogelberg, thank you for being with us. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF STEVEN ROGELBERG

Mr. ROGELBERG. Thank you for inviting me to speak today about strategies for creating a positive and rewarding work environment.

Congress is undoubtedly a unique context, but at its core it is comprised of humans, humans working with humans, humans being organized by humans, and humans being led by humans. While solutions need to be tailored, the fundamental science and learnings of organizational psychology around individual team and organizational health well-being and effectiveness still apply.

I want to briefly discuss three primary strategies for creating a positive and rewarding work environment: leading self, leading others, and leading institution.

Let's start with leading self. This is about the mind and mindset matters. Members should seek to view success in realistic terms to better engender a sense of accomplishment, embrace the concept of challenging but doable small wins rather than defining success through highly elusive legislative home runs.

Examples of small wins could be getting a committee to hold a hearing on a topic you care about; seeing your ideas incorporated into legislation, even if you don't get credit for it; or even improving your constituent mail turnaround time. Small wins are typically under your control. Also, small wins can accumulate into great wins across people and time.

Part of a new success lens is internalizing what it truly means to be a Member of Congress. You have the incredible honor of representing your entire district to better lives. At the core of this is service to others and our country. Let's contrast this orientation with, say, a focus on getting reelected. A reelection focus is not about helping others. A reelection focus is about the Member and their future. This type of focus is counterproductive from an organizational psychology perspective as it creates a values conflict with the essence of the role, and it puts service and helping others as a secondary focus.

The research is clear. Service to others is arguably the greatest path to happiness and life satisfaction when fully embraced and enacted.

Next, leading others. A Member's staff is the engine of their success. Let me share a few key lessons from the engagement research that a Member working in close conjunction with their chief of staff can do to promote a positive work environment.

First, set the stage with vision. Communicate the small wins strategy, emphasize that success is about elevating lives and democracy and not your personal future as a Member.

Second, reflect on your within-office processes that are under your control. Are they as efficient and streamlined as possible?

Third, lead people well. Be a supportive leader, communicate readily, authentically, transparently, and promote voice in others. Help ensure the work itself is meaningful and staff is empowered. Help build a bond among team members, and do not tolerate counterproductive competitiveness among staff. Hold periodic team debriefs with staff to discuss how they are working together.

Actively leading and growing your staff takes time you may think you don't have, but it is truly an investment that pays dividends in terms of collective performance, your performance, and retention of talented staffers.

Last, leading institution. I recognize that this committee is charged with changing the institution for the better. I would like to share with you a process I have used in my client work that could be useful in your efforts. It is a process to identify key operational and procedural pain points undermining collective success. To facilitate the identification of pain points, bipartisan, small cohort groups can be formed. After identification of common pain points, I encourage you to only solve a couple of pain points at a time so the task is more manageable and achievable.

However, and this is key, it is easy to overthink solutions and as a result do nothing as we look for the perfect solution. I encourage Congress to avoid paralysis with a set of time-limited pilot experiments. Time-limited experiments, trying something for, say, 3 months, increases the chances of action. And if the experiment doesn't work, then reflect why, learn, and plan your next time-limited experiment until some reasonable success is found. This process can be part of a long-term strategy, a routine of sorts, to stay as efficient as an organization as possible.

Overall, in any workplace there are things we can readily control and things we cannot control. How we lead ourselves, we can control. How we lead others, we can control. For institutional pain points, we can still make progress by engaging Members, taking reasonable bets, and doing thoughtful experiments.

Thank you.

[The statement of Mr. Rogelberg follows:]

Testimony of

Steven Rogelberg, Ph.D.

Chancellor's Professor
Department of Psychological Sciences and Management
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Immediate Past President
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology

Editor
Journal of Business and Psychology

Chair Kilmer, Vice-Chair Timmons, and committee members, thank you for inviting me to speak with you today.

I was asked to focus my testimony on how members of Congress (members) can maintain a positive work environment for themselves and their staff when work conditions are often difficult, and even toxic at times.

Before addressing this focal question, it is important to first answer the question, "Is Congress, as an institution, so unique that the science and best practices from research on other types of organizations will not apply?" Congress is undoubtedly a unique context, but at its core, it is comprised of humans—humans working with humans, humans being organized by humans, and humans being led by humans. While solutions likely need to be tailored to the specific context of Congress, which I will discuss today, the fundamental science and learnings around individual, team, and organizational health, well-being, and effectiveness still apply.

With this in mind and going back to our focal question, I want to discuss three primary strategies for creating a positive work environment despite difficult circumstances.

1. Strategies focused on the member – Leading self
2. Strategies focused on the team – Leading others
3. Strategies focused on the broader ecosystem – Leading institution

Let's start with leading self.

Members should seek to view success in realistic terms to better engender motivation, a sense of accomplishment, and fulfillment for them and their staff. I encourage members to embrace

the concept of small wins rather than defining success through highly elusive legislative homeruns. Examples of small wins could be:

- Helping a constituent
- Getting your amendment considered in committee/on the floor
- Getting a committee to hold a hearing on a topic you care about
- Developing your staff
- Seeing your ideas incorporated into legislation even if you don't get credit for it.
- Improving your constituent mail turnaround time and casework numbers

Small wins are typically more under your control, thus achievable, and can provide a sense of great accomplishment. Furthermore, over time and across people, small wins may accumulate into great wins. With that said, while these wins certainly matter, the process and journey matter too and can be celebrated by members and the team along the way to promote that sense of forward movement and achievement.

Part of a new and productive success lens is genuinely internalizing what it means to be a member of congress. You have the incredible honor of representing your entire district to better lives. You have the incredible honor of being a steward of our democracy. At the core of these honors is service to others, including those that did not vote for you, and our country. Let's contrast this focus with a focus on getting re-elected. A re-election focus is not about helping others. A re-election focus becomes about the member and their future, and not the future of their district or democracy. This matters as a) it is not aligned with the true essence of being a member thus creating a values conflict and b) it puts service and helping others as a secondary focus. The latter is just so critical as helping of others is a key predictor of life satisfaction, one of the most robust predictors in fact. Furthermore, a helping focus can become incredibly motivating and a source of great fulfillment for your staff. I recognize that this is all easier said than done. But the research is clear, service to others is arguably the greatest path to happiness when fully embraced, elevating self is not.

Next, strategies focused on the team – Leading others

A member's staff is the engine of their success. An engaged staff performs better, helps each other more, is more committed, more collaborative, more innovative, and less likely to turnover. Let me share a few key lessons from the research on promoting employee engagement that a member, working in close conjunction with their chief of staff, can do to promote a positive work environment. To have the greatest effect, however, the member cannot delegate all of this work to their chief of staff. The member also has an important visible role to play.

First, set the stage with vision. Communicate the small wins strategy, and service to others perspective, with passion and energy. Emphasize that success is about elevating lives, and not your personal future as a member.

Second, reflect on your within-office processes that are under your control. Are you as efficient and streamlined as possible? Identify and remove barriers as this promotes a sense of accomplishment which is foundational to engagement. Meetings are also a target of opportunity. Try to eliminate unneeded meetings or at the very least, dial back the time in each meeting given Parkinson's law—the idea that work expands to fill whatever time is allotted to it. So, if a meeting is scheduled for one hour, it will take one hour. But we can use this to our advantage. Don't hesitate to make your meetings 20 or 25 minutes, you will get the work done more times than not. And, importantly, you are returning time to your staff by doing this.

Third, working with your chief of staff, lead people well. Let me share some evidence-based practices of importance.

1. **Be a supportive leader.** Treat people with respect, care, and fairness. Stand up for your staff. Take an active interest in their growth and development.
2. **Communicate readily and transparently.** Leverage 1:1 meetings with your staff to help make connections, build relationships, and sustain alignment. As part of communication, provide ongoing feedback. Praise publicly, criticize privately. Catch staff doing things right. Express gratitude frequently. Encourage two-way communication and voice. Reward people for identifying problems and encourage them to propose solutions.
3. **Help ensure the work itself is meaningful, for the most part.** Also, empower your staff to make decisions. Provide them with tools and resources needed for success.
4. **Help build a bond among team members.** Encourage helping. Bring joy where you can. Make your "house" as positive as it can be. Address conflicts that emerge so they don't undermine the team. If staff are acting competitively with one another in a counterproductive manner, address it actively and stress how much you value collaboration.
5. **Be authentic and kind.** Don't hesitate to apologize, if appropriate.
6. **Hold periodic team debriefs sessions with your team to discuss how they are working together.** Ask them to describe what is working well and any obstacles they face. Identify one or two adjustments you or they can make immediately.

Actively leading and growing your staff takes time. Time you may think you don't have. But, it is truly an investment that pays dividends in terms of collective performance, your success, and retention of talented staffers in the long run.

Last, let's look at strategies focused on the broader ecosystem – Leading institution

I recognize that this committee is in many ways charged with changing the broader congressional ecosystem so that success can better be realized. I would like to share with you a process I have used in my client work that could be useful to your efforts. It is a process to identify key pain points to be solved. A pain point is something procedural or operational that stalls effectiveness and engenders great frustration. To facilitate the identification of pain points, a multiple cohort approach can be taken. A cohort can be a bi-partisan group of junior

members or senior members. And/or a cohort can be identity based, a cohort of women members for example. Forming small bi-partisan groups to identify key pain points can be exciting and bonding for members (it also can service as a form of social support to a member which is a key buffer against burnout). After identification of common, pressing, and overlapping key pain points, I encourage you, however, to only work to solve a couple of pain points at a time so the task is more manageable—this enables you to build momentum. Solutions to pain points can come from cohorts themselves, from others, or through benchmarking with other legislative entities. However, and this is key, it is easy to overthink solutions and as a result do nothing as we look for the “perfect” solution. I encourage Congress to avoid paralysis by addressing pain points with a set of time-limited pilot experiments. Time-limited experiments, trying something for say 3 months, increase the chances of action. And, if the experiment does not work, then reflect why, learn, and plan your next time-limited experiment until some reasonable success is found. This process can be part of a long-term strategy, a routine of sorts, to stay efficient as an organization. Obviously, a person will need to own and champion this process (akin to a managing partner in a law firm) to be sure it is executed effectively.

I want to wind down my remarks by sharing two training interventions, fairly common in other organizations, that could be excellent additions to your Leadership Training Academy, if not already present. I won’t discuss these now but would be happy to do so later if interested.

1. A training on working with difficult people and relationship building
2. A training on interest-based versus position-based negotiation as a way of getting disparate parties to find win-win solutions.

Overall, in any workplace there are things we can readily control and things we cannot. How we lead ourselves, we can control. How we lead others, we can control. For institutional pain points, we can also have control to some extent by identifying the most pressing issues, taking reasonable bets, doing experiments, and moving forward. Each of these approaches helps, ultimately, in achieving success and feelings of fulfillment in a challenging environment.

The CHAIRMAN. Thanks, Dr. Rogelberg.

And last but not least, we are joined by Congressman Gregg Harper. Congressman Harper previously served in the U.S. House from 2009 to 2019, representing Mississippi's Third Congressional District.

While in Congress, he served as chair of the Committee on House Administration and the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress. He also served as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, leading both the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee and the Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection Subcommittee at different points in his tenure.

Congressman Harper, good to see you. Welcome back. You are now recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GREGG HARPER

Mr. HARPER. It is my honor to be here and to be with my friends, former colleagues, some that I might have just worked with on new Member training and orientation. But it is just great to be here.

And I will just say that serving in the House of Representatives thus far is the greatest honor I have had in my life. And I would consider myself an institutionalist, someone that believes that this is an important body. We love the history, and just—you are just in awe when you are here. If you are not, they say you should go—you should go home and do something else.

But I think this is a great hearing. And I appreciate it, Chairman Kilmer, Vice Chairman Timmons, that you guys have put this hearing on. I was going to say “y’all,” but I was afraid that some might not understand that interpretation.

But it is—it is an amazing place. And when we have a hearing like this and we talk about barriers to service, you think back specifically on your own race to get here, what you went through. And Chairman Kilmer living on the West Coast and coming to the East Coast, it is a sacrifice. And people don't take it that way in the public.

And it seems like everything that we have done as an institution, as a House to change this rule, make it more difficult for us, well, it has really improved our favorable opinions in the public when we have done that. So just do what is right for the institution and try—let's try not to worry about what that publicity or that news might be.

But when we look at that decision to run, it is very, very difficult. And you look at what has happened—I mean, we have got all kinds of advice. When it was time for us to—we had won. Everybody would say, well, you have got to move your family up here. Well, I had a high school student and then one just out of high school with special needs. Their base was back in Mississippi. It would have not been good for them to have moved them up here.

What do you do if you have small children? I mean, it is—it is incredibly difficult. If you have small children, you move them up here. You think you are busy, and then you have to go back to the district. So it is a sacrifice.

And then we have our friends in the media, when you are not in session, will say Congress is on vacation. Well, I always wanted some of those to come with me on my vacation and travel the 24

counties that I had in my district and see what a vacation looked like, because we know, and we haven't done a very good job, I think, on occasion of communicating that, that this is a 24/7. You have to escape probably to a foreign country to not be working. It is extremely difficult to have that time. So the family considerations are major on what you are trying to do.

But then, I think we also have to decide, okay, is this going to be a place where only independently wealthy people can serve? Because it is not easy, as has been said already.

When I came in, in 2009, I think there may have been early on a cost of living adjustment. But it has been at \$174,000 since 2009, no chance that that is going to happen. Even if the inflation rate was 7 percent, that means you are losing about a thousand dollars a month right there on your ability to do that.

And the numbers, we don't know for sure how many people sleep in their offices. I was one of those. And it was who could—you couldn't afford \$2,000, \$2,500 a month. And in my situation, you know, my wife, who is a nurse, eventually had to cut back to part time and then retire in order to take care of our son who has special needs.

Livingston has fragile X syndrome, a great young man. Many of—most of you in here have met him. And he is certainly a joy. And all of you know him because the internship program that you operate for students with intellectual disabilities from George Mason University is now named after him, which was just the most amazing moment that he was here with me when Rodney Davis made that announcement in a reception in 2018.

So those things are just an example of what I went through on those decisions, but let's talk a minute about the income.

There are some things that we can do. One is with the fiduciary relationship, as a lawyer, once I was sworn in on January 6 of 2009, I could no longer receive any income off the practice of law. Well, you know, you get elected in November, you have only got a short period of time. Some cases still have to be concluded. And I forfeited a little over \$350,000 in legal fees that I would have gotten otherwise. So, in effect, that first term I worked for free, I guess we could say.

And so why not make a simple change to say Members that come in, newly elected Members, give them some period of time, 6 months at least, maybe a year, where you can conclude existing cases you had and keep that fee. I think that would certainly be a fair thing that we would consider doing.

So leadership positions, of course, pay a little bit more. Speaker makes \$223,500 a year. But when we look at being here and deciding when it is time to leave, it is different for everybody. I am no fan of term limits. I think the voters are smart enough to decide when the Member needs to leave. And I just know that—and I have never said this publicly until today—one of the key factors was I knew that if I stayed, I would not be able to take care of my son and my family. And so I had to at least have the opportunity to try to make more money.

Today, Members of Congress make \$174,000 a year, the same since 2009, while Federal district judges are making \$223,400. If we believe in the Constitution and we have separate but equal

branches, you would think that Members of Congress would make the same thing as Federal district judges. So don't go through this little raise. Just pass legislation that says the pay will be the same. You think Congress will be any less favorable if you do what is right for the institution? Just do what is right.

And I thank you so much for the opportunity to be here, and I look forward to answering any questions that you have and I look forward to getting all of my hate mail on social media.

[The statement of Mr. Harper follows:]

Testimony before the Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress

United States House of Representatives

“Pathways to Congressional Service”

June 8, 2022

Gregg Harper

Member of Congress, 2009-2019

Chairman Kilmer, Vice Chairman Timmons, and Members of the Select Committee, Thank you for inviting me to appear today to testify at this hearing on “Pathways to Congressional Service”.

Serving in the United States House of Representatives is the greatest honor thus far in my life, and I consider myself an institutionalist that treasures the history of the House and will endeavor to make it the strongest it can be now, and in the future.

There are many barriers to running and to ultimately serving, from family to finances. Every Member has a different view on what it will take to serve. Will he or she have enough money, or will they be able to afford a place to live off of the Congressional salary? What about one’s family? Do you move your family to Washington, DC or leave them in the district? If you move them to DC, what do you do with them when you have to travel back home? What if the children are very young? With inflation, how do you afford to fly the family back and forth? All of these questions have to be answered, and the answer may vary significantly among the Members.

One question we have to ask as a body is do we only want wealthy people to be able to hold this amazing office? Regrettably, we are approaching the point that only independently wealthy individuals will be able to serve. Yes, \$174,000 per year looks like a great deal of money, but not when you have to pay for a second home. Combine that now with a high inflation rate, which at 7% will reduce the purchasing power of that amount by more than \$1,000 per month.

Another issue is that anyone who comes from a profession that involves a fiduciary responsibility, such as a doctor or lawyer, can receive no compensation for their services once they take office. For me, once I was sworn in on January 6, 2009, I had a number of cases that still had to be resolved and because of that rule, I forfeited more than \$350,000 in legal fees that I otherwise would have been entitled to receive. Basically, that meant I gave up the equivalent of my Congressional pay for my first term. In fairness, why not

allow a Member who is an attorney a window of six months or a year to conclude existing files they had prior to being elected and keep those fees? It's an unnecessary barrier that could easily be removed.

Congressional salaries haven't changed since 2009. In 2022, most Senators and Representatives collect an annual salary of \$174,000. Leadership positions pay more, with the Speaker of the House receiving \$223,500 per year.

Just as one must consider the various obstacles and barriers to begin serving, the decision to retire from Congress is even more difficult and many factors contribute to the timing of when to leave the House. For my wife, Sidney, and I, the process was impacted by the fact that we have a precious adult son, Livingston, who has Fragile X Syndrome. You know him because the Intern Program you run for students with intellectual disabilities is named after him. He's never been prouder than when that honor was bestowed upon him. This is the first time that I've said this publicly, but I knew that if I stayed where I had not received an increase in pay in 10 years, with no prospects of when that might change, I could not provide for his future.

There's an easy solution to make this more equitable. First, change the Member Handbook so that Members only have one duty station, not two, thereby allowing a per diem.

Second, while there is no constitutional or statutory requirement that Members of Congress and the federal judiciary be paid the same, there is a history of that being the case, until everyone was denied a cost-of-living adjustment. Beer v. United States, 696 F.3d 1174 (Fed. Cir. 2012), cert. denied, 133 S.Ct. 1997, held that the denial of certain cost-of-living adjustments for judges was unconstitutional and violated the Compensation Clause and that a 2001 amendment that kept judges from receiving additional compensation except as Congress specifically authorized did not override the provisions of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, Pub. L. No. 101-194. In an order filed on December 10, 2013, in Barker v. United States, No. 12-826 (Fed. Cl. filed Nov. 30, 2012), this finding was applied to other Article III judges, effective that date. As directed by these decisions, the judicial salaries were reset to include the missed adjustments, and those salary levels have been increased by subsequent cost-of-living adjustments.

Today, Members of Congress make \$174,000 per year, while Federal District Judges make \$223,400 per year and Judges for the Court of Appeals make \$236,900 per year, and those judges only have one duty station. This is not complicated; the House of Representatives and the Senate should pass legislation making the salaries the same and allowing for future cost of living adjustments.

Thank you for allowing me to appear before you today, and I look forward to answering your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Congressman.

I now recognize myself and Vice Chair Timmons to begin a period of extended questioning of the witnesses. Any member who wishes to speak should just signal their request either to me or to Vice Chair Timmons.

I want to maybe just start, Dr. Reynolds, with you but probably weave in Dr. Rogelberg into this, because it seems like these issues around Member efficacy and institutional efficacy are pretty substantial barriers in terms of people coming on board and sticking around.

And, Dr. Reynolds, you testified previously in front of the committee, and you mentioned it this morning, about steps that Congress could take to allow Members to feel more efficacious, for lack of a better phrase, to claim credit for wins. Dr. Rogelberg, you talked about small wins, you know, just as an example, making sure that when someone introduces a bill that gets rolled into another bill, that they—that there is some means through which that gets acknowledged.

Can you talk about some of the other—any other recommendations you think our committee ought to be thinking about in that regard? I know last year you mentioned something that the committee considered and hopefully might consider again, which is dual sponsorship. Talk about that or anything else you think we ought to be looking at so that Members feel a sense of efficacy.

Ms. REYNOLDS. Yeah, absolutely. So as you mentioned, Mr. Kilmer, one recommendation that you all advanced is using Congress backup to make clearer individual Member contributions to legislation. I think this was a wonderful first step. Also, as you mentioned, a proposal to have—to make clear who, say, a lead cosponsor, particularly perhaps if it is someone of the other party.

I think also there is probably room for committees to—in the spirit of Dr. Rogelberg's call for experimentation, I think there is probably some room for committees to experiment with this as well. You know, when a committee is putting together a draft to a piece of legislation, sort of making clear in that draft who contributed which ideas, where did they come from.

And maybe different committees would take slightly different approaches to that but, again, I think in the spirit of sort of trying some different things, to make clear that individuals do make meaningful contributions to the process but need to be able to sort of feel like they are being seen as doing so to make it worth their while.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Rogelberg, I want to kind of weave you into this because I am curious if you have looked at, whether it be organization—you know, businesses, nonprofits, any organizations, where there is a sense of the individual employee feeling frustrated with regard to their sense of efficacy either because of lack of organizational efficiency writ large or concerns around things like centralization of power where the agenda and the impact is not always driven by the kind of rank-and-file worker.

Any observations on that or things that we ought to be looking at that might better empower the kind of rank and file?

Mr. ROGELBERG. The work experience of individuals, be it in a nonprofit or the government or a large tech company, the funda-

mental drivers of employee engagement and feelings of success are pretty common across all those different contexts.

The fundamentals of what leads to an enriching experience comes down to doing meaningful work, working with people who you respect and trust, having leaders who communicate readily and authentically and transparently, having a good collaborative work environment. Those fundamentals help you deal with institutional pressures.

When those core dimensions are not in place, the institutional pressures become even heavier. That is why it is so important to think about the process of change from that leading self, leading others, leading institution perspective. Right? We build resilience by addressing leading self and leading others. And going back to the concept of efficacy, that is where we can be efficacious. Right? We do have control and power. So if every Member really hits those domains effectively, then it gives them the greater ability to positively affect the institution.

The CHAIRMAN. I have got about a thousand other questions, but let me kick it over to Vice Chair Timmons. And then I think Mr. Cleaver probably.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Congressman Harper, you were talking about term limits generally. We also have committee chair term limits for the Republican Conference in our Conference rules.

What are your thoughts on those?

Mr. HARPER. Well, if I was the chairman, at the end of my 6 years, I would say that is a horrible rule and you need to stay on. If you are someone who is trying to make your way through the system and have done the hard work—you know, you can argue it, but I have seen some who were very good chairmen that they were term limited for that and they were able to roll over to be chairman of another committee.

Mr. TIMMONS. I actually think Congressman Conaway who recently retired, in my opinion, is probably one of the most impressive Members I have ever seen, and he was left because he was no longer going to be chair of Ag. Most people don't realize he was the chair of Ag, on HASC, and on Intel at the same time, which is—

Mr. HARPER. Unheard of.

Mr. TIMMONS [continuing]. I mean, just wild.

Mr. HARPER. And such a great person. I agree. But that is one of the factors that you have to look at.

I am not a—would not be a fan of saying you will have a uniform rule for the Democrats and the Republicans. I think internally that is something that the conference should work out in each party.

Mr. TIMMONS. Okay. You were talking about Member salaries. I mean, we are just not going to pass—we are not going to have a vote on the House floor that fixes this, outside of—

Mr. HARPER. Shocking that you would—

Mr. TIMMONS [continuing]. Outside of a Federal judge, you know, addressing it, which is possible. We are not going to do it. So outside of that, what do you think is possible that we could do to make it easier to serve in Congress?

Mr. HARPER. Certainly, you know, on that issue, before I answer your question, I would think that former Members, not that I am

volunteering, but former Members would have standing to bring forth that constitutional argument on the pay.

You know, I agree in the things that have been said about making your office environment better. I was really blessed with a great, great team in my office. It was almost 6 years before my first staffer left in DC. And when I was chairman of House Admin, we had just an amazing team.

And I know what we did in my office was—and it is different for every district, but I made sure we paid our staff as much as we could pay them, and many of you do that. You get down to the end of the year, you have got excess money, you want your team to have extra money during that process to help them. It has become an even more difficult thing to do.

And I—and one thing that not every office, at least when I was here, paid their interns. We paid our interns enough that they could at least starve to death slowly. So it was—and I think that is important. You want to have a good team. The interns, you don't want just somebody to come up on the strength of their parents' money. You want to have anybody that wants to come up here for a semester or summer should be able to do that. So I would hope that we would—we would pay them.

You know, enjoyment of life, the money is a big factor, but enjoyment of life up here is good.

I—to my recollection, I never publicly criticized the other—another Member. Now, if I had a problem with the Member, I would go talk to that Member and have that discussion with them. But, you know, it is difficult if you are friends with somebody and friendly with them and then 30 minutes later that Member is outside in front of the cameras. Yeah, I know it may be good theater and good politics, but it certainly doesn't create a warm, you know, environment. So those are a few things that I would think.

And certainly, look, I have been social media sober for 3.5 years. And, you know, social media is toxic, as you know. And if you are running a campaign, you have got a Facebook page, you don't want your family reading the Facebook page because they are going to get their feelings hurt. So it is a fact of life. I don't know that you can do anything else about it.

But just, you know, it is okay to have friends on the other side of the aisle. And I think it works good for the institution if you can accomplish that.

Mr. TIMMONS. Just a quick followup to that point. Congressman Cleaver and I just worked on some legislation in the Financial Services Committee, and I think most of the committee staff were surprised that we worked it out in about 30 seconds where we had a small disagreement.

Mr. HARPER. That is great.

Mr. TIMMONS. Great to work together.

Dr. Reynolds, one last question. This might be hard, but can you make the counter argument to why we should not have bipartisan cosponsorships? Just like, I don't understand why we shouldn't. So could you make the argument? Like, come up with a reason.

Ms. REYNOLDS. I can't make a good argument, in part, because I really do think the ability for Members to feel like they have the

ability to point to something that they have accomplished is, you know, important to keeping folks invested in doing the hard work.

And I—so the short answer is, no, I can't—I can't formulate a good counterargument for you, Mr. Timmons.

Mr. TIMMONS. The chairman and I have some legislation that is probably going to get signed into law, and his name's on it. I am just a cosponsor. So, you know, I was just trying to see if we could find a counterargument. I am still very happy it is going to pass.

Anyways, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman Cleaver.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good to see you, Representative Harper.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. CLEAVER. I was thinking, you know, you retired, you know, just because you wanted to have a life. I think that is horrible that you abandoned us just to be happy, but it is good to see you again.

Mr. HARPER. You too.

Mr. CLEAVER. And as you were speaking, I was thinking, yeah, I don't ever remember him being nasty to anybody. But it brings to my attentions, there is an issue that we are almost hesitant always to talk about.

And it is, I will never forget, I am in my home in Kansas City, because we couldn't get here. All of the airlines were shut down—I mean, the airports were shut down because of snow. And I am—I turn on the TV, and a reporter is saying, you know, the people are delivering mail but the Members of Congress can't come in and work.

And I am thinking, you know—and the reporter, I don't think, meant any harm. It was, like, you know, it is going to get a good reaction around the country. We couldn't—the air—Reagan was shut down. And so people start thinking, yeah, you know, everybody else is working. These guys are not working.

And then when you add in what the late-night comedians do, and I don't mean any harm anywhere else, but some of the things we do, we have created the environment, I think, where it is—you know, it is difficult to get an increase in our salaries because people are almost always believing, you know, we all have limousine picking us up and, you know, we live in mansions, because if you look at a movie about a Member of Congress, they always have a mansion and they have limousines and so forth.

Mr. HARPER. Private jet. Don't forget your private jet.

Mr. CLEAVER. And so people believe that.

Help us. Help me. What can we—you know, if we started trying to work with the media to—I mean, they would probably think we are just trying to get nice stories out of them if we said, hey, look, you know, let's—I mean, you know, things are not—things are bad enough that we don't have to, you know, add on to it. And I guess we—they may interpret that to be a declaration of war on them. I don't know.

Any thoughts about how—what can we do to begin to change the image? Because there are a lot of good people here.

I mean, Roy Blunt called me 6 months ago, early in the morning. And he said, Hey, what are you doing?

This is 6 o'clock in the morning. I am asleep.

And so he said, You are the sixth person I called.

That is one of the reasons that we are friends, because he is always honest. Most people say you are the first person I called.

He said, You are the sixth person I called to tell you I am not going to run for reelection.

I have been a Democrat all my life. My statement to him, I can say publicly, because I don't care, I said, Roy, please do not retire.

I asked him more than once. He will confirm it, and I don't care. You can put it anywhere in the world. I asked him not to retire for a lot of reasons I won't go into here.

But I think I am interested not with the illustrations and examples. I am just interested in any of your collective thoughts about what can we do to begin to change this atmosphere and how people perceive us, because it is not always accurate.

Mr. HARPER. I will touch that for just a second. And it is always going to be a Member-to-Member and a Member's district where you can have your impact with your local media and try to develop those relationships and be available. Maybe invite them, some of the reporters, to go with you when you are going to one of the cities in your district or one of the areas, particularly if you have a more rural district.

You know, I originally had 28 counties when I started, redistricted to 24, and it is a 5-hour drive tip to tip. So, you know, we always tried, if we went into one of those cities in my district, we would stop in and see whoever was running the newspaper and visit with them for a little while.

So I think we have to do it that way. Radio has always been very effective, radio talk shows as well, to go on there. Public broadcasting, lots of people will go onto news shows in that realm.

But it is—on a national level we are easy to hate, and—but I would think that we know that there will not be a bill passed before the November elections that increases the pay. But stop—let's stop blocking the COLAs. At least let the cost of living adjustments go through.

And, you know, I loved being here. I mean, there are so many great things here, whether it is the excitement of constituents from home, a first time to D.C. and you give them a Capitol tour, and just the amazement that is there, or the Library of Congress that we—that is the most beautiful building here, the Jefferson Building, and the events that we have there. Enjoy those.

And, you know, so part of it is, back home, being with your local media I think is your best bet. It would be nice to have—who is going to go on any of the national news shows that is a current Member and say, Congress needs to be making \$223,400 a year? It is the right thing to do. We should have been doing it all along, but it is very difficult.

And invariably too, Congressman, you know that we are close maybe to doing some things that would be good for the body, and then we have a really bad news story that comes up and you just have to sort of delay any discussion on that.

Ms. REYNOLDS. You think I would know how to use the microphone at this point.

So I will echo everything that Mr. Harper said about Member pay. I think it is important for folks to be compensated better for the hard work that you all do.

But I think I will also point to the story you told, Mr. Cleaver, about your relationship with Mr. Blunt, and the kinds of Members that this institution—obviously, Mr. Blunt is now serving in the Senate—but the kinds of Members that the Congress is losing to retirement are the kinds of Members who have spent a long time here, building reputations as hard legislative workers. And the kinds of folks who are being attracted to service, not exclusively, but I think are more often than it used to be the case, want to sort of come and use Congress as sort of a platform from which to say things.

When I was here before the committee last summer, my good friend from the American Enterprise Institute, Yuval Levin, was here with me, and he has been making this point eloquently for a long time that Congress has become kind of a platform for performance. And it is difficult to convince Americans that there are good people here, that there are good people here from a very wide range of backgrounds, and that, to my mind, it should be a wider range of backgrounds, but there are people here who bring their own life experience to the hard work that they do. And it is more difficult to kind of convince Americans of that when there are folks who, you know, to Mr. Harper's point, go outside and yell about their colleagues on camera.

Mr. ROGELBERG. I am going to just add a couple of things.

So, first, just quickly on the pay, you know, typically in organizations we think about things as compensation packages. And pay is part of a compensation package. So it might be the case that there are other things as part of the compensation package that can serve to increase the standard of living and make it more appealing, whether it is a housing allowance, increasing housing allowances, or providing housing. But probably thinking creatively about a compensation package might be a way of gaining more traction, given that there is probably not an appetite to raise salaries.

The other piece of your question I just want to comment on, and I am not an expert in this area, but media will constantly pounce to the extent that fodder is provided to them. So when the House is not portraying themselves as a collaborative body, respectful body, then when that leaks out, clearly the media will use that as the fodder of the story.

So I think about the expression of, you know, praise publically, criticize privately. Right? Anything we can do to elevate collaborative standards and to create a narrative that is one that the media can't attack as readily. So the media attacks and then there is an ability to find evidence to support that narrative, and then the spiral continues.

So as Congress becomes a place of collaboration, when I look at what this committee is working on, the changes that you all are doing could have such a tremendous impact. Like, that is the story. That is the story that can change that narrative.

So I think to the extent that we can keep curating stories like this, stories like what you talked about with the retirement story,

like, those are really important stories of creating that narrative that I think can convey a different message, a very exciting one.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Chairman, if I could add to what Dr. Rogelberg said about other ways, certainly not only are we frozen in time in 2009 on pay, the fact that as Members of Congress we have two duty stations and we cannot get a per diem or a housing allowance, that is not a difficult fix to change that and provide something. And if a Member is independently wealthy, doesn't want to accept that, then they don't have to.

But we—we are in danger of this being a place that only those that are independently wealthy or those that think this amount of money is like winning the lottery are going to be able to serve. So we need to make sure that we take care of the institution. And I think you raised, you know, a great point that look at that per diem issue and housing allowance.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Ms. REYNOLDS. Can I say one more thing on the housing? I think another reason why this is really important to look at is because—and I—I completely understand the financial reasons why Members sleep in their offices. But I think that also stands to sort of degrade the character of the House as a workplace.

You know, this is a place where people come to work, where you come to work, where your staffs come to work, where all the people who have to work here overnight come to work, you know, the folks who clean your offices. And having folks sleeping in their office sort of sets a—makes it a different environment as a workplace that I think also is—like, could stand to change.

So on top of opening—potentially opening up service for more kinds of individuals, I think that is another reason to try and make some changes that would allow folks to not feel like they have to do that.

Mr. ROGELBERG. I just add very quickly. In organizational psychology, there is a concept of recovery. And sleeping in your office does not allow for recovery. That is an extremely counterproductive approach.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. I can't work the microphone either, Dr. Reynolds.

What were you laughing about, Perlmutter?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. When I see you, it makes me smile.

Mr. DAVIS. I just want to say to Chairman Harper, thank you for not calling me at 6 a.m. to tell me you are retiring. I appreciate that.

Mr. HARPER. I think it was more like 8 o'clock.

Mr. DAVIS. It probably 8 o'clock. And, you know, I wanted your job, so I was, like, good riddance. Take care, buddy. Don't let the door hit you on the way out.

No. But in all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, you taught me how to be a better Member. You were such a great example as the chairman of House Administration, somebody who, you know, even though we were in the majority, you treated the minority members just as well as you treated us. You showed what a true, compassionate Member of Congress who is here to serve was supposed to do. And I was proud to serve under you.

Matter of fact, you gave me opportunities to help fix this place. You know, you let me lead a couple of task forces when I was under your tutelage, one, to fix the Office of Finance when it came to travel. So we are more transparent because you allowed me to work with your team to actually put more transparency in place.

And, frankly, you as the chair don't get enough credit for making the House of Representatives the most transparent part of our constitutional government when it comes to spending that we have. You gave me the chance to negotiate on your behalf.

Go ahead and say bye. You are good.

Mr. HARPER. See you, Congressman.

Mr. CLEAVER. Good to see you again. Blessings.

Excuse me, Rodney.

Mr. DAVIS. See you.

You gave me a chance to lead the effort to where we put our expenses online in a searchable, sortable document. And you know what? There was a news story this week. Oh, the House Statement of Disbursements came out. Good. Did you see one about the Senate? Did you see one about the Supreme Court? How about the executive branch?

You don't get enough credit for what you did to make this place work. Otherwise, those two fixes I just mentioned, among others, would have been part of the some of the things that we would have fixed on this committee, because they were things that were necessary to do.

And I am really proud that your legacy lives on through the Gregg and Livingston Harper Internship Program. That is one that gives so many—so many kids with special needs the opportunity to really get a sense of what government is all about. You have got a long legacy here, and we just hope we can follow.

Some of the questions I had actually for you, sir, were centered around what you just mentioned about, you know, what is Congress going to be like when we kind of push out middle-class Americans from wanting to join this institution? You mentioned in your opening testimony that you probably lost your entire first year's first-term salary because you couldn't recoup some of the legal work that you already did, that you were being paid for.

So is there any more that you want to add on how we can disincentivize just ultra wealthy individuals from making this kind of a social media/Twitter/Facebook whatever playground and, unfortunately, pushing out those who I think are the most serious legislators?

Mr. HARPER. Well, thank you so much, Congressman Davis. And you have been a great friend, and you will forever be well remembered in my house for what you did in 2018 in that reception when you called Livingston to come up and stand next to you.

I you don't know Livingston, he is 32, almost 33. But he has never met a stranger. And, you know, everything that I did here on working to start that internship program back in 2010 was because that was our life, you know, with him.

But, you know, I still cry telling the story about that day, you calling him up and then telling me to come up and stand next to him. It is one of the greatest memories of my life, and I thank you for that.

And I will say that it is easy to be the chairman of a committee when you have got such great staff on the committee. But everything I learned about being a really good chairman of that committee, don't tell him I said it, but I learned from Bob Brady from Pennsylvania. I mean, just a prince of a guy, and we got along so well on that committee and I am just thankful, you know, for that.

So there are a number of things that, you know, we look at on what we can do to make it better. But, again, I am going to go back to the general statement, Congressman, which is, just do what is best for the institution and don't worry about the fallout. If it is the right thing to do for the institution, just—let's just do it.

And there comes a point where you know with—particularly with what we are facing now—Members are no different than others—it is a difficult time right now. And to know that, if we do nothing, then 10 years from now, maybe this committee is still working, we will have another hearing on why there hasn't been a pay raise in the last, you know, 24 years.

So the cost of living adjustment, stop blocking that. Look at changing it to where you don't have two duty stations. I mean, legislative bodies typically in a State legislature, as you know, Congressman, they get paid when they go to the State capitol and they are in session. So there has got to be some way that we can do that.

And if somebody just—I mean, we are going to be hated no matter what. So let's just do what is right.

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, I don't hate Derek.

Mr. HARPER. I understand.

Mr. DAVIS. No. No. Timmons, that is questionable.

Dr. Reynolds, my last question. Regarding your research on Member retirement rates and trends, has your research compared the U.S. Congress retirement based turnover to any legislators in other countries?

Ms. REYNOLDS. I am not familiar with work that looks at the U.S. Congress compared to other countries. There is some work that I am familiar with on Congress compared to State legislatures. State legislatures, as, you know, I don't have to tell several of you who used to be State legislators, it is more common for there to be term limits, which obviously changes retirement decisions. But otherwise, a lot of the same factors do appear to animate when people retire from State legislatures: age, pay, that sort of thing.

Mr. DAVIS. It is interesting. I mean, we hear all the time that people come to Congress and never leave. Well, I mean, there are always the Don Youngs. May God rest his soul. And Don was a great legislator till the day he passed, and was a part of this institution. And I would call him a true friend to this day.

But the truth is, Derek and I got elected in 2012. I am, I think, 150 in seniority probably with some of the specials. 435, and we kind of moved up in seniority. That tells me that we have had a lot of turnover. I attribute some of that to the term limits that we have on our side for committee chairs and ranking members, because that gives—it gives the opportunity to have a fresh start.

And I think that is one of the reasons why I am able to follow in the footsteps of Chairman Harper, who—I long for the days of bipartisanship when you were leading that committee. The place

isn't the same right now, and I certainly hope—actually, I have got to give Derek and William a lot of credit, and even Perlmutter here—it makes me sick to say that—but this committee is trying to do what House Admin used to do in a very bipartisan way of moving the House into a better position long-term for Members, staff, and everyone. And I have got to commend these guys and everybody on this committee for serving.

And great to see you again, Gregg. Give Livingston and Cindy my best.

And I yield back.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. As I call on Mr. Perlmutter, I do want to also give him credit. Part of the reason we are having this hearing is, at his urging when the committee was established and the rule that was put in place to basically give us our marching orders, one of the things that Congressman Perlmutter pushed for was looking at pathways to leadership, looking at how Members come, looking at why they leave, looking at how they advance when they are in the institution.

So I want to give you credit, and invite you to weigh in with your questions.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. And thank you for having this hearing. And thanks to the panelists.

This is both the ability of Members to rise and do good work when they become a chair, you know, because there is sharing across party lines and up and down, just to make the place run better, and to develop, you know, term limits to some degree.

I mean, Gregg, your story is my story. And I hate to say it, but I am going to miss guys like Rodney Davis. You know, he hits me all the time. But this is a wonderful place, and the opportunity to serve our communities, our neighbors, the Nation, you know, it is a fantastic honor.

But—and this—I want to start with you, Dr. Rogelberg, something you said, you know, about being effective, being efficacious. This is a subject—this pay, for instance, is one where if you come from a middle-class background, you know, working lawyer just like you, you know, eventually you have three daughters, you have three graduate colleges, you have three weddings. It takes its toll on the kitty.

And you talked about the—to feel effective, you need to advance the conversation. And this conversation hasn't advanced on pay or housing or per diem or COLAs or really even healthcare. We went backwards on healthcare in terms of the cost of healthcare when we went from the House—or the Federal Employee Benefits Program, you know, to the Affordable Care Act.

You know, when I went to the personnel, I found out that when I retire, I am going to be paying \$500 a month less to go back onto the Federal employee health plan. So one of the things that has been so difficult for me is I would start griping about things. I would start griping about the pay or the housing or whatever, and somebody said, well, do something about it. Oh, okay. I have been trying, but it isn't happening. So, ultimately, well, then, do something else, which is not really what I wanted to do, but what I am—so can you explain about the desire of people to have an effect

on their workplace and then not having any effect, what that does to the morale?

Mr. ROGELBERG. It is not good.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. No.

Mr. ROGELBERG. So a meaningful compensation package is certainly important. But ultimately, it is not the most robust predictor of engagement, feelings of accomplishment, or even retention. It doesn't mean it shouldn't be in place, but really when it comes down to that sense of accomplishment and engagement with the work, it is through feeling that you are doing things that are important, you are moving the ball down the field. It comes from having colleagues that you respect, enjoy working with. It is from having leadership that you feel is supportive, communicative. So all those factors together really create that sense of connection to the institution and embeddedness.

You know, I think about some research on lottery winners, for example. And what they found was that, if you ask people will the lottery change your life, everyone says yes, it will be a complete game-changer. And what they generally find is when someone won the lottery, their satisfaction with life actually did go up, but it was only temporary. It quickly returned to the level that they had before, in terms of satisfaction. Because, ultimately, the foundations, the fundamentals of their life hadn't changed. Right? They are still interacting with the same people. They still had their own personal mindset of how they were viewing life.

So the point being is that when we think about trying to engender a sense of engagement, feelings of satisfaction, accomplishment, the entire ecosystem has to be addressed. And certainly compensation is one part of that ecosystem.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. There was another thing, and then, Dr. Reynolds, I would like you to comment on this. And this will be sort of a policy thing, but I am going to use it as an example.

So, you know, we obviously had these terrible shootings in the last couple weeks. And that is one. So in my district, I have Columbine and I have the Aurora movie theater. And, you know, it is, again, a thing where you are just, you know, pounding away at it, but not making much progress. And that—you know, there are so many other places where we have advanced the ball. But I appreciate your answer.

Dr. Reynolds.

Ms. REYNOLDS. Sure. I will say two things. One, on your point about Member health insurance, I do want to sort of underscore that as something that we haven't talked about yet. I know that in previous discussions the committee has talked about this issue for staff. Mr. Kilmer, I remember you in particular talking about challenges that your district-based staff faced with this requirement. So I will just sort of raise that again as we are trying to think creatively and expansively about different parts of the kind of compensation package.

On your question about Member efficacy, what I would say is that—I will credit the committee for its hard work on the return of congressionally directed spending and community project funding. This is, to my mind, one of the most important reasons for having that mechanism in place. Lots of folks, me included, talk

about sort of the role of Congress in the separation of power system, of having the power of the purse. But I think it—it is equally, if not more important, because it gives you and your colleagues that sense of efficacy that Dr. Rogelberg was talking about.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Absolutely. And I think everybody, since we did in this last round of appropriations, you know, have earmarks that you have to justify, you have to be able to provide support, you know, that are community based. Each of us takes pride in that, you know, that even if—it is a bridge. I can't tell you how many ribbon cuttings I have been to bridges over the last 6 months or a year. And we took that away from ourselves as another way—there is this masochistic streak among us in some respects.

And, Gregg, to your point, I mean, we need to do things that allow us to do good work. Compensation, part of it, being effective and taking pride in things. And sometimes, you know, somebody, Mrs. McGillicuddy may get mad that, you know, why did you build a bridge at, you know, 32nd and Youngfield? It should have been at 38th and Wadsworth. But that is part of the job, is we have got to take some incoming to do good work.

Just general comments.

Mr. HARPER. I will certainly say that the return of the—I don't think I am allowed to say earmarks—congressional—

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I can.

Mr. HARPER. A rose by any other name. It is a great—it is a great opportunity to help people in your district, and so I hope that it remains. It is—I think it has been restricted and explainable and transparent, all the things that the public would want, and they have been—overall, the projects I have seen have been very helpful and particularly a lot—and, you know, we have got certainly big issues in water and treated waste water projects that are just not very glamorous, but everybody is in great need. If a city is over, you know, 20 years old, which almost all are, they have got some infrastructure issues. And so I think it is a great tool.

And, you know, your process for you on this, certainly, again, we did things that—we do things that hurt the institution, hurt the House of Representatives. They give us zero credit in the public eye. That is why I said let's just do what is the best thing and the right thing to do.

And I will tell you, it was going to be a real hardship for my staff to have to go to the Affordable Care Act. And so I know it is a public hearing, but I declared every one of them nonessential so they could stay on their Federal health insurance.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Okay. That makes sense.

The last couple points. One, you know, my dad was in the construction business, and he loved to point out every building he worked on. You know, it was just pride. And the community projects gives me that internal satisfaction, if you will.

Last thing is, it would be very ironic if we had to have a Federal judge tell us what our salary should be. And it may come to that being the outcome of this, that we aren't the masters of our own ship, that we have to go to a Federal judge and say we are unwilling to treat ourselves properly because we are worried that Mrs. McGillicuddy will get mad that we got a cost of living raise, you know, or increase.

So, you know—and obviously, I have had some conversations about bringing the lawsuit, but it really is—“ironic” is the nicest term I can think about it.

Mr. HARPER. I think it is a great idea.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Okay.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay. We have Mr. Phillips via Zoom.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Greetings, everybody.

Many estimate that Members of Congress spend in excess of 10,000 hours per week collectively raising money. It is not just the shameless waste of time—shameful waste of time, I should say, but it is the nature of having to generate that kind of revenue during the work hours.

So my question is to you, Congressman Harper, share with us your experience. How much time did you spend doing that? How did that affect your outlook on this job? And any thoughts you might have about how fundraising and the shameless pursuit of money in this institution might also be affecting people's decisions to run or even stay here.

Mr. HARPER. You know, I guess I am a little bit of an oddity. I loved campaigning. And I told my wife when I got elected, if I enjoyed campaigning that much—if I enjoyed serving half as much as I enjoyed campaigning, I was going to have a great time. I don't know—and, of course, you know, it is district by district. It is different. Our media market was not one of the more expensive ones, so we probably didn't have to have quite as much money. Now, with outside money, it is much more difficult and challenging that you can be in that situation. So I do not really know anybody that truly enjoys going and asking people for money.

And, of course, with the limits we have, you can have somebody who is a very wealthy donor who doesn't want to give that to you. So it is—you know, they will give you the limits, but if it was a statewide race and State government, they could basically write a check for whatever they wanted to. So it makes it much more challenging, I think, for the Members.

But, again, I don't know if I have any advice for the committee on that, except to acknowledge it is no fun to have to go and do that. But it is—sometimes you have to defend yourself against outside groups that misrepresent what your position is. We see it all the time, don't we?

Mr. PHILLIPS. And, sir, yeah, I just want to say I concur with the need for it. I hear from too many potential candidates, outstanding young Americans on both sides of the aisle, who don't consider running for public office because of the shameless pursuit of money that is required, especially in this day and age. That is the root of my question.

I am sorry. Did someone want to opine as well?

Ms. REYNOLDS. Oh, I just want to thank you for this question, Mr. Phillips, because I think it ties in really—in really important ways to the conversation we were having before about middle-class Americans getting shut out of service, because the need to raise large sums of money profoundly shapes the perception of who is a viable candidate for office. And so if folks are not getting asked because they don't seem like the kind of person who can raise the

necessary funds, that then shapes the sort of flow of candidates into the pipeline. And then once folks are running, the sort of time and resource costs of raising all of those funds.

And I will just point out, for example, that it was not until, I believe, 2018 that the Federal Election Commission allowed candidates to use campaign funds to, say, pay for childcare while they were running. So the number of sort of ways in which the campaign finance system also structures who ends up running for office is quite profound.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I couldn't agree more.

Just another quick question, because I only have 2 minutes myself, but—and, Mr. Rogelberg, I would appreciate your perspective on this.

You know, how do we inspire young people to consider careers in public service? I think that interest has eroded for reasons we can all understand. And I think we can all agree, no matter one's politics, if we don't inspire thoughtful, principled young conservatives and progressives to consider serving their country, we are in trouble.

Any thoughts from any of you about how we might do a better job of positioning, if not careers, at least moments of serving the country during one's career?

Mr. ROGELBERG. If you think about any position or any potential career path we considered as children, what was it about it that was potentially enticing? And it came down to we thought it sounded interesting and potentially impactful and meaningful and fun and exciting, and that was what our brains thought of as teenagers. The stories we hear are really important about that institution. Think about these days, now when you are applying for a job, you get on Glassdoor, right, you read all the employee reviews. All those things drive your decision to apply or not to apply. There is so much information from current and former employees.

And when we see a narrative that is inconsistent with our values, our hopes, or aspirations, it just no longer becomes a potential place of employment that is going to attract us. So keep circling back to, you know, the health and well-being of the institution and the narrative that is conveyed and the stories that are conveyed.

You know, one of the gifts of being invited to testify is I actually watched all your hearings that you have done. They are amazing. They are amazing. They represent the best of government and the best of people. Right? So the extent that we can start changing this narrative and really reinforcing and celebrating these types of initiatives and cooperations, the job is more appealing to everyone, including the current holders of the job as well as the potential holders.

The CHAIRMAN. Feel like I should at this point—

Mr. PHILLIPS. Thank you. And, my friends, I unfortunately have to leave now. Please continue the conversation because I think it is an important one.

But, with that, I am going to have to yield back and let you continue. I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. Thanks, Mr. Phillips.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Thank you everybody.

The CHAIRMAN. At this point, I did want to thank the one member of the press core who is here. Thank you for being here. We are glad you are here. Thanks for being here. We are clearly viral at this point.

So I want to maybe touch on a couple more things in a second round, and if other members do as well.

One, Ms. Reynolds, and we kind of just touched on it with regard to issues like childcare and others, you know, research has shown that there are barriers that impact who chooses to try to work here, and then there are some things that represent disproportionate barriers to women, to people from maybe a disadvantaged community.

Can you talk a little bit about what some of those unique barriers might look like and what, if anything, this committee ought to be thinking about in that realm?

Ms. REYNOLDS. Sure. So I will start with recruitment. So the idea that women, candidates of color, candidates from working class backgrounds, are often recruited less frequently to run for office. Obviously, most candidate recruitment, and I think appropriately so, is outside the walls of this institution, but I do think that you inside the walls of the institution can do a lot to make sure that if someone from a marginalized background is interested in running for Congress, feels like Congress will be a place where they could fit in if they come here. You know, I think there are some even pretty small ways to do that.

And you have spent a lot of really good and thoughtful time thinking about new Member orientation. Are there particular kinds of things you might offer candidates from nontraditional backgrounds or candidates who are working parents—I know you are, Mr. Kilmer—to sort of figure out how do I fit into this place? And that sends an important signal to potential candidates. So recruitment is one piece.

There is also, I think, a concern on the part of potential candidates that they won't necessarily receive the necessary financial support to mount a campaign. Again, that may be outside the bounds of what you all can work on. This question of women in particular feeling like they can't balance family responsibilities. I know Mr. Timmons is quite interested in changes to the calendar and the schedule. And I think this is a place, again, where there is some work to be done to make the calendar and the schedule potentially work better for folks who have caregiving responsibilities of various kinds, like Mr. Harper.

Also, you know, as the sort of demographics of this place have changed, there are just more Members from sort of dual-career families in a way that was not true in decades past. And so just sort of thinking about those sorts of considerations.

And then the last thing that I will say is there is a perception on the part of some candidates from marginalized backgrounds that they are not qualified to serve in this institution. I think to Mr. Cleaver's point earlier about sort of sending messages that this is a place where Americans from all walks of life can make meaningful contributions. I think that is important as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The other thing that—and Dr. Rogelberg, you touched on this. So it is always striking to me when I am home,

you know, oftentimes when I am engaging my constituents, they ask me how I am doing as though I have been diagnosed with terminal disease. You know, and it is not because of compensation. It is because a sense that we are banging our heads against the wall here.

You made this comment about rethinking what success looks like and rethinking what wins look like. And I kind of want to double click on that a little bit. I used to say our team, you know, our job is to get pucks into the net. I am told because Seattle has a hockey team now, I am allowed to use hockey analogies.

But I have rethought this. And I think it is a little bit more like the football game at Dave and Busters or Chuck E. Cheese's where there is like the really big, you know, hole that is right near you, and it is like 5 yards. And then there is like kind of the midsized hole that is a little bit further back, you know, which is like 10 yards. And then there is like the long ball, which is like a really tight hole and pretty far away.

And, you know, our job is to try to like land as many as we can get. And some of them are going to be short passes and some of them are going to be midterm passes. And every now and then, maybe you hit the long ball, like maybe, though Congress has not been super about landing the long ball.

But, you know, you have looked at how other institutions, how other organizations sort of navigate how to define success. Give us some learnings that we might be able to drive some recommendations in this.

Mr. ROGELBERG. So what I like about the small wins concept is that it creates a criterion of success that you can control more readily. Having a criterion of success that you don't control is an incredibly frustrating, miserable process and journey. What is key, though, with the small wins is to really recognize that small wins can come from many different places.

They can absolutely be in the legislative bucket, right? There is small wins that can be found there. But there is also small wins with regard to how you develop others. Like, to the extent that you are elevating other individuals in your staff or other Members of Congress, there is tremendous satisfaction that can be derived from those small wins. Like, that is—at the end of the day, really, how you kind of affected a person is what helps you sleep well at night.

And then there is small wins in the constituent bucket. And so to the extent that that individual is constantly really seeking out these small wins, believing that small wins do accumulate, you know, recognizing that the small win narrative could actually be very appealing to others. Right? If you think about what American—the people want is progress. Small wins represent progress.

Furthermore, how could we possibly expect that big vexing challenges could be solved in one swoop of legislation? Small wins is just a natural fit with big vexing problems, and they do accumulate across time and across people. So really embracing this, you know, small wins concept, looking for small wins in multifaceted ways all help you recognize that you are making a difference. And that is what is so critical for retention and that feeling of success and accomplishment at the end of the day.

The CHAIRMAN. And I want to bring Mr. Timmons in, but, Dr. Reynolds, because you have looked at this institution so much, any guidance on how we drive more small wins? I mean, so much in this place happens or, frankly, doesn't happen in big omnibus bills and reconciliations with bills that do or don't happen.

Ms. REYNOLDS. Right. So I think this comes back to why, you know, both today and in previous conversations with this committee I have stressed this ability to find more ways for Members to claim credit for the small wins that make it into those big giant bills.

The CHAIRMAN. Like dual sponsorship.

Ms. REYNOLDS. For example, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Right.

Ms. REYNOLDS. And I think that is—I think that is a really, you know—the way I would see it is that I think the small wins are happening and the structure of the institution is not giving all of you the credit—the opportunity to claim credit for the small wins that it could be.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Timmons.

Mr. TIMMONS. Congressman Harper, I want to talk to you about the schedule and the calendar. So we made a recommendation last Congress to travel less, work more. Going back to 2019, we were in session 65 full days. And most of those days—we had 66 travel days. So most of those days were 2-day workweeks. Some of them were 3-day workweeks, but generally they were 2-day workweeks. And that makes it really hard for us to get all of our committee work, all floor votes—it is just really jumbled. And so it kind of incentivizes—it facilitates a—I call it pinballing. You are just going all over the place.

So I have been thinking a lot about really encouraging the next schedule to include more 5-day workweeks. If you did literally just every other week 26 5-day workweeks, fly in Monday, fly out Friday, you would be working 78 full days and you would be traveling 52 days. So there is some more aggressive schedules that I would like, but I just want to hear your thoughts on that concept generally.

Mr. HARPER. Certainly. This is set up to be a very family unfriendly place if you are not careful. And so the scheduling is certainly—we have seen it, depending on the party in power, that scheduling changes. It can be in different formats. I think the most important thing is that it be predictable, whatever it is, and you certainly mentioned that in that regard.

The thought that I would have to go Monday to Friday without seeing my family is not an attractive idea to me, and it means you can do no events and no business back in the district where you need to be. I like the idea of knowing you are going to have available that full week, but I always resented being up here to do work when there really wasn't anything to vote on. And so I would say, if there are things that need to be done, great. But we don't want to create busy work in that process.

So I think my circumstances were different. If you lived to the east of the Mississippi River, yeah, it is not a problem to fly in in a few hours. But if you lived out west, boy, it is just brutal. It is

absolutely brutal. So I think that it is just a consideration that whatever it is, be predictable.

I just—I can just say personally that would not be a good thing if I knew I couldn't go home Monday to Friday and my family be back there. So at least, you know, if we were Monday to Thursday, I am gone three nights. Being gone four becomes a little less attractive, but I could argue it if you are figuring it out on the backside of that.

But, you know, this year, we are in an election year and it is—so you are not here in October or August. Normally, August is district work period. So it is something that—I mean, I would—certainly if I was a Member, I would be willing to have that discussion, but just—I don't think necessarily it has to be a hard and fast schedule. It just needs to be predictable.

Mr. TIMMONS. Sure. Thank you.

One other question. We have been talking about dual duty station and all those variables. I mean, my understanding is the executive branch, all businesses in the world, and even everybody in Congress, except for Members, when they travel more than 50 miles away from their home, their duty station, they are generally expected to expense virtually everything.

How did this happen? Why are there only 435 people in the world that are expected to pay for everything out of pocket when they travel?

Mr. HARPER. Well, it is so that the public will like us more.

Mr. TIMMONS. That is not going well.

Mr. HARPER. No, it is not working, is it? But, I mean, it is so unfair, if we are talking about doing something that is equitable and fair, I mean, it is—should be treated the same. And it goes, again, to what we were talking about here today, that you—you are sort of boxed in to a certain life or lifestyle in many situations that you really wish you had the flexibility to do that. So it makes zero sense. And so it is something that is not that difficult to change. And it is not perceived as negatively as, say, a pay raise if you are just changing that.

Mr. TIMMONS. I know. I have tried to sleep in my office; my team put the over and under at three nights, and I only made it two nights. There was a gentleman in the middle of the Cannon Office Building that was hitting a hammer for about 4 or 5 hours starting at like 3:00 in the morning. I was like, what is going on? Do you need help? I can help you. Whatever you are hitting, it is not working. Anyways.

Mr. HARPER. Well, you know, when I was in Cannon House Office Building, interior courtyard, it was under construction for years.

Mr. TIMMONS. It still is.

Mr. HARPER. So ear plugs and the masks still didn't quite help. You just did what you had to do.

Mr. TIMMONS. Anyways, thank you again for being here.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Mr. Perlmutter, you have anything else?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Just a story, quick story, and then just one final question.

The story on the sleeping in the office, so friend of mine, Member of Congress from Iowa, I won't give his name, had a place. The washer broke. He just got out of that lease, and he says, you know, other people are staying in their offices. I will stay in my office. So he does. And I see him, and the bags under his eyes just keep getting deeper, deeper, deeper, because the cleaning people came in at 2 a.m. There was construction going on.

We said—I was—had a place over here not too far from the Republican National Committee office, and I said, well, why don't you come over, we have got an empty room. You know, bring your air mattress, and you can, you know, catch up on your sleep for a week or two. He never left. He came and he never left. So he was my roommate for a very long—or, you know, housemate for a long time.

The three of you as students of this institution, if you had one thing to improve the institution or the House of Representatives, what would it be?

Dr. Reynolds, I will start with you.

Ms. REYNOLDS. So I will limit my suggestion to sort of the context of this hearing, because otherwise, you could have me here for quite some time. But I like to say this question of how to improve Members' access to housing is where I would start, both because of the way that it would potentially address some of the compensation issues without directly involving a pay raise, and also because of, as I articulated before, what I think it means—what it says about the institution when a hundred Members sleep in their offices. I don't think that says something good about the institution and its respect for itself as a workplace.

And so that is—if I had a magic wand, that is where I would start.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Dr. Rogelberg?

Mr. ROGELBERG. I guess I would go more macro. So in reviewing the hearings, so much conversation is about collaboration. And in the absence of collaboration comes so much frustration and that lack of a sense of accomplishment. So I am not a political scientist, but we certainly have certain practices that are leading to tremendous polarization within the body. And they would seem to be third rails, no one is going to tackle them.

But ultimately, until some of those broader conversations, be it gerrymandering, the fundraising, the finances, term limits are resolved, it seems like the polarization is going to exist and we are able to dance around the edges. But in terms of truly creating a body that can come together in a meaningful way, we are just limited. So I guess that would be my wish, would be to be focusing on these broader institutional things that lead to the polarization.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you.

Congressman.

Mr. HARPER. I mean, there is so many places you could go with that question, Congressman. But one thing that I think Dr. Reynolds kind of touched on is helping those that are marginalized have a pathway to get here. Well, maybe there is not an initial pathway to become a Member or run because of the timing and the opportunity, but one of the things that we have done with the internship program for those with intellectual disabilities is we give

them to people that had maybe never had an opportunity to work outside of the home in any capacity and come in and be a part of the team. It changes the culture that was there.

And when I became chairman of House Admin, I sat down with our team and I said, we have got the slot, we have got the money in the budget, find me the best recent graduate from Mason LIFE at George Mason University the students were using, and we are going to hire them full time. And we did that with a young man, who is still in a Federal Government position. It changed his life.

So I would say, let's look at—at least on the committee structure, there should be a slot and funds to hire somebody with special needs to come in and work. So that would be mine.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you.

The Chairman. Okay. I would like to thank all three of our witnesses for sharing their expertise with us. I would like to thank our committee members for participating. And also just, I want to shout out to the staff of this committee for once again prepping a terrific hearing with great witnesses. Thank you to them. Thank you to our stenographer for—I am sorry we all talk too fast—and to the Budget Committee for letting us use their room.

And, with that, without objection, all members will have 5 legislative days within which to submit additional written questions for the witnesses to the chair which will be forwarded to the witnesses for their response. I ask our witnesses to please respond as promptly as you are able.

Without objection, all members will have 5 legislative days within which to submit extraneous materials to the chair for inclusion in the record.

And, with that, this hearing adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]