PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS: HOW PRACTICING CIVILITY, COLLABORATION, AND LEADERSHIP CAN EMPOWER MEMBERS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION OF CONGRESS

OF THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 23, 2021

Serial No. 117–10

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

Available via *http://govinfo.gov*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

48–601 WASHINGTON : 2022

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

WITNESSES

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS: HOW PRACTICING CIVILITY, COLLABORATION, AND LEADERSHIP CAN EMPOWER MEMBERS

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2021

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

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9:00 a.m., in Room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Derek Kilmer [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Kilmer, Cleaver, Perlmutter, Phillips, Williams, Timmons, Latta, Van Duyne, and Joyce.

The CHAIRMAN. There we go. Okay.

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. I won't use all five.

Earlier this year, this committee made a conscious decision to explore some topics that aren't always easy to discuss. It is one thing to acknowledge conflict in the workplace. It is unpleasant, but it is quite another to really dig into that unpleasantness to ask why it exists and what we can do to address it. These conversations are hard because they force us to consider our own actions and to think about the roles we play in an institution that has become increasingly polarized.

None of us want to shoulder the blame for Congress' low approval ratings, but every Member bears responsibility. As one of our witnesses, Shola Richards, has said, there has never been a drop of rain that believed it was responsible for the flood. I thought of that on my walk to the Capitol this morning as I got drenched. So, while these conversations are tough, we need to keep having them. We need to address the institution's problems instead of acting like they will somehow resolve themselves because they won't.

The bottom line is that, if we want things to work differently, we need to do things differently. The good news is that this committee gives us an opportunity to do just that. We are providing a forum for discussing some of the thorniest issues Members confront on a day-to-day basis. Our mission is to make Congress work better for the American people. And, in order for that to happen, Members of Congress also need to work better.

Institutions are a reflection of the people who work for them, and nearly every Member I know is here because they want to solve problems and make things better for the folks they represent. But the desire to do good isn't reflected in the dysfunction that is more often on display.

Our committee held a planning retreat earlier this year, and we kicked things off by talking about why we ran for Congress in the first place and whether Congress has met our expectations. And there was a lot of hopefulness expressed. One member said she was here to open doors for more people to have a voice in politics. Another spoke about her strong desire to be part of the solution. And one member summed up the congressional experience best when he said, "I have never been more disappointed or more inspired."

There is so much desire to get things done and so much frustration with the process. The system often feels top-down, which makes it hard for rank-and-file Members to feel empowered. What is more, as we have discussed in this committee before, the incentive structure can sometimes feel out of whack. Members are recognized more for racking up social media hits than they are for hard work.

The frustration is definitely there, but today we are going to focus on harnessing that desire to get things done. Every Member wants to be effective and productive on behalf of the people they serve. The trick is finding out how to turn that desire into tangible action.

The experts joining us today know a lot about the tools and approaches that lead to success in the workplace. They have researched and advised top business leaders all over the world and understand how to build and maintain successful teams. They understand what factors motivate people to produce at high levels, as well as the connection between job satisfaction and success.

The research shows that leaders who practice civility and who take a collaborative approach to their work are able to produce and achieve at higher levels. So I am looking forward to talking about how Members can apply these principles to their own work in Congress and figure out creative ways to move their policy and political goals forward.

As with our past few hearings, the committee will once again make use of the committee rules we adopted earlier this year that give us the flexibility to experiment with how we structure our hearings. Our goal is to encourage thoughtful discussion and the civil exchange of ideas and opinions.

This is the wonky part.

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 the witnesses. Okay.

Vice Chair Timmons and I will manage the time to ensure that every member has equal opportunity to participate. Any member who wishes to speak should signal their request to me or Vice Chair Timmons, and I know we have got some participating virtually. So just give us the, you know, tug of the ear, as you wish, Mr. Latta.

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

Mr. TIMMONS. Good morning.

Thank you all for traveling a great distance to be with us today. This is our third hearing on civility and how we can get Congress to actually do the job the American people want to us do, which is working together to solve the biggest challenges we face.

It has been years that we have been talking about immigration and healthcare and debt and spending, and we really haven't gotten very far on many of these issues. And it is definitely not the right path forward. It has been a destructive experience. We can see the challenges we are facing now. We have to find a way to work together. And I think that this issue, civility, and how we have really fact-based collaborative policymaking, we have to figure this out. We really have to figure this out, and I think that this committee has the potential to make recommendations that will make Congress work better for the American people.

So this subject, in my mind, has been divided into three categories. The first is time. The second is incentive structures. And the third is relationship-building.

Time is one that we have talked about for the last 2-1/2 years. In 2019, we had 65 full working days, so 65 full working days. We had 66 travel days, fly-in/fly-out days. The 6:30 vote we took on Monday, we call it—I call it a bed-check vote, making sure you are here. That is not a working day. We didn't do any work on Monday. So, you know, this week we have Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, full working days, and then we fly out on Friday.

So we can't have 65 working days every year and think that we are going solve problems. We just have to have a way to be here more, and we talked about that. And, you know, it is not just physical presence. It is what we do when we are here. I call it pinballing. You know, you have got committees, one, two, sometimes three or four. You have subcommittees, two, three, four, seven. And then you have votes. And then have you fundraising. And then you have constituent meetings. There is just so much that you can do. And, generally speaking, people that run for Congress try do everything. And when you try to do everything, sometimes you either let things slip through the cracks or you don't do some of the things very well.

So time is one really important one. We have to free up time for Members to do their job and to engage in this fact-based policymaking.

Incentive structures is the second. We have a lot of conflict entrepreneurs. The loudest voices are heard and rewarded often. And the people that are working to solve the problems are—it is just a tough road. And it is not nearly as rewarding as yelling from the top of the mountain. So we have got to find a way to incentivize collaborative fact-based policymaking. We have to find a way to facilitate an exchange of ideas from a position of mutual respect and not use the often-provided political talking points and have—you

have no idea what is in the weeds. But, if somebody gave me a piece of paper, I can talk about it in a mildly angry way. So we got to get away from that. And we got to find a way to actually dig—dig deep on these issue because the answer to these problems is not going to be on one page of paper with bold font. ‘

Last is relationship-building. This kind of ties into the first two, and it is embodied in the term “civility norms.” We don’t have opportunities for relationship-building across the aisle, largely because of our schedule. That is the time, and the incentive structure doesn’t reward it.

We have to create physical space in the Capitol. We had a dinner a couple of weeks ago, months ago. And it was wildly challenging to get 12 Members to have a dinner on this complex. It was wildly challenging. And when we thought we figured it out, they wanted $7,000. And that is just not going to work. So, you know, there is physical space all over the Capitol. You should be able to walk off the floor and have a cup of coffee with a Member and have a conversation about these things, not go home turf, home turf. “Come to my office.” “I don’t want to go to your office.” “Come to”—you know, it is—the physical space cannot be overlooked in this conversation. And, again, you got to have more time. You got to have incentive structure.

So that is where I have been thinking about these things. I would love to have—can’t wait to hear your thoughts on these issues and how we can really fix this problem. It is, I believe, the most important thing that this committee will do. And I just really appreciate you-all taking the time to travel this far distance and look forward to hearing from you.

And, with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

So we are joined today by three experts who are here to discuss how Members who pursue a civil, collaborative, and leadership-oriented approach to their work in Congress are better able to achieve success.

Witnesses are reminded that your written statements will be made part of the record. Our first witness is Dr. Allison Craig. Dr. Craig is an assistant professor in the Department of Government at the University of Texas at Austin. Her current book project, “The Collaborative Congress,” examines how rank-and-file Members of Congress work together to craft substantive and successful policy proposals in a polarized Congress.

Dr. Craig worked for several Members of Congress, both on the Hill and in district offices, from 2001 to 2012.

Dr. Craig, you are now recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENTS OF ALISON CRAIG, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN; SHOLA RICHARDS, CEO AND FOUNDER, GO TOGETHER GLOBAL; AND LIZ WISEMAN, FOUNDER, WISEMAN GROUP.

STATEMENT OF ALISON CRAIG

Ms. CRAIG. Thank you, Chair Kilmer, Vice Chair Timmons, and committee members for inviting me here to speak with you today on an issue I care a great deal about.

So, when I tell people that I study collaboration in Congress, it usually prompts a joke along the lines of "how can you study something that doesn't exist?" So I always like to start by just saying that, you know, despite what people think, you know, there is actually a lot of evidence of Members do—looking for opportunities to work together both within their own party and across the aisle.

You know, nearly every Member of Congress engages in at least some degree of collaboration. And the average Member has about 15 people that they work with in a given Congress. And that is going to include both policy, working on legislation—includes everything from writing legislation to chairing a caucus.

But, obviously, there is a lot of room to grow. About 7 to 8 percent of bills introduced are the result of bipartisan collaboration. Given the substantial benefits of collaboration, of working together on legislation, that number should be significantly higher. Bills that are presented as the work of a pair of Members are significantly more likely to pass and significantly more likely to be enacted. So, if you just exclude post offices and all commemorative legislation, the average House bill has about a 10-percent chance of passing the House over, you know, a lengthy period of time. And it goes up to about 15 percent if it is a partisan collaboration, so if it is two Members of the majority party working together, and 20 percent if it is a bipartisan collaboration.

So, yeah, so Members and staff know that bipartisanship is how you get things done in Congress. You hear Members say that all the time, that, you know, this is how you get things done around here is to be bipartisan. And so then the question is, why don't we see more of it?

You know, I have had a lot of conversations with Members and staff on how they decide to reach out to other offices to work together on a bill or a letter. Over and over again what I hear is that Members wants to collaborate more. They want to work across the aisle, but they don't think they can find someone in the other party to work with. They assume it is not going to be worth the hassle. And, at the end of the day, it is easier to just write the bill that you want to write and introduce it yourself.

So then thinking about how to get a more collaborative Congress, you know, Members work together when you expect that the payoff is going to be worth the effort. Right? It is cost and benefit. So you need to both increase the incentives, as Vice Chair Timmons said, and also remove obstacles of working together.

In term of incentives, obviously "your bill is more likely to pass"' is going to be a bill one. But whether it passes or not, you know, the sponsor is going to get most of the recognition there. It is their bill. So someone who is the, like, lead cosponsor may not get credit for passing or even introducing the bill unless they promote it themselves.

So one of the things that I would suggest to kind of improve the incentive structure is allow two Members to be listed as the sponsors of the bill. It is going to significantly increase the benefits of being the number two and let them get more substantive recognition for their work. You could even limit it to bipartisan pairs and say this is the sponsoring Democrat and this is the sponsoring Re-

publican. Or you could say any two Members to—in the first case to highlight that it is a bipartisan bill.

Other incentive-based strategies could include committee chairs prioritizing bipartisan legislation, promoting the benefits of collaboration to new Members, and increasing transparency around the suspension calendar.

On the other side of the equation is making it easier for Members to work together, and this is where I think that there is a lot of work that can be done. You know, Members need to be able to find someone to work with and ideally before there is even a bill, because collaboration is a lot easier behind closed doors. But this requires connections, which is one of the reasons that collaboration actually significantly increases once Members are in their third term because now they have the personal connections and the relationships that they can tap into more easily.

When you start thinking about how who you could team up with from the other party, you naturally go first to your friends. You go to the people that you have worked with before. And so what do you do when your connections are limited? Maybe you are in your first term. Maybe your go-to guy on energy just retired. You know, there are a lot of situations in which, you know, Members need some help facilitating those connections.

So my other set of suggestions revolve around providing tools to make it easier for Members and staff to find someone to work with. You know, committees could create, like, a nonpartisan Member liaison position who Members and staff could reach out to if they are looking for someone else on the committee to work with, like, who would be good on this issue? The committee staff would be kind of a matchmaker. And since I am on a "collaboration is like dating" kick, you could also set up an anonymous but moderated sort of messaging board where staff could go out and post things like "in search of Democrat on E&C interested in cybersecurity for possible letter" and try to facilitate that sort of, like, very early collaboration in that regard because staff also really do play a big role here.

Vice Chair Timmons mentioned the issue of time. Well, the staff are here a lot more than the Members are. And a lot of the times, if a Member doesn't have a connection, you naturally then go to your staff and say, "Okay, well, who do you know that we could work with?" And so anything that can facilitate additional connections among staff would also, I think, translate to the Member level. And so, you know, creating a sort of, like, coworking space, places for staff, improving the ability of staff to get together would also I think be helpful.

The Members in all these cases still have to decide to work together. They still have to agree on what a bill or a letter would look like. But this is going to get over that first hurdle of scrolling through 435 Members and cold calling someone that you think might be interested.

And that brings me just to my final point, which is that collaboration breeds collaboration. You know, one of the things I find pretty consistently is that once—you know, the Members who start to collaborate then collaborate more because mutual friends facilitate connections. If you have a lot of relationships, you will make more. Members who work together successfully on one project are more

likely to work together on another, and Members who have more extensive personal networks or staff that have more extensive personal networks are more likely to know, you know, the right person to go on an issue. And that is going to, again, really increase the collaboration.

So the easiest thing—it is not actually that easy—but for individual Members to do is to start by reaching out to someone that they want to work with.

So, thank you.

[The statement of Ms. Craig follows:]

Dr. Alison Craig
Assistant Professor, University of Texas at Austin
Testimony for September 23, 2021 Hearing

Thank you, Chair Kilmer, Vice-Chair Timmons, and committee members, for inviting me here to speak with you today. I have spent the last several years studying collaboration in the House of Representatives, examining why some members are more likely to collaborate, why some issues are more likely to be collaborative, and ultimately, how members benefit from working together.

Contrary to expectations, members routinely look for opportunities to find common ground on policy and seek colleagues to work with, including members of the other party. In my research, I identify collaborative relationships as members signing Dear Colleague letters together. I find that nearly every member collaborates with at least one other member, and the average member has between 15 and 20 colleagues they work with in a given Congress. Members introduce legislation together, coauthor letters to agencies, host briefings, and more.

There is also significant room for growth. I've had many conversations with members and staff on how they decide to reach out to other offices to work together on an issue. A consistent theme throughout those conversations has been that many members want to collaborate more than they do. They want to write bipartisan legislation but believe it will be too difficult to find someone they can agree with on the other side of the aisle. Based on these conversations and my observations of where collaboration already exists, I believe a more collaborative Congress is within reach.

When deciding whether to collaborate, members naturally consider how difficult it will be to work with someone on an issue and if that work will pay off. Of course, this is largely unknown, so you develop your expectations based on past experiences and facilitating more collaboration requires changing this calculus. Members need increased incentives and fewer challenges to work together.

There are already significant incentives of collaboration. First and foremost, collaborative legislation is more likely to succeed at every step of the legislative process. It attracts more cosponsors, is more likely to be reported out of committee and is more likely to pass on the floor, particularly when it is bipartisan. Members and staff know that collaborative legislation is more successful. You're going to have a much easier time getting your bill through if you can get it on the suspension calendar, and you're going to need bipartisan support to get anything through the Senate. I have a collection of quotes from interviews that boil down to, "working together is the only way to get anything done around here."

Collaboration can have significant benefits beyond passing legislation. Members who have formed more relationships with their colleagues, are more successful in other ways as well. Those with larger personal networks bring more federal grant money to their district and do

better in their elections. Having more relationships within Congress increases the likelihood that you will have a connection with the right person when you need it.

That said, there are still ways to increase collaboration incentives, or at least make them more obvious. One of the challenges is that most legislation doesn't pass. Even when a bill is collaborative, it's still hard to get through the process. So members frequently talk about how they've introduced legislation to address an issue, signaling that they're aware of a problem and are putting effort into solving it. But it's harder to get credit for introducing a bill when you aren't the one who sponsored it. You can promote your involvement in your outreach, but it isn't obvious to interest groups and media who look up the bill. Allowing two members to be listed as the sponsors of a bill is one possible way to address this. This change would also encourage members to work together before introducing a bill and it is much easier to collaborate behind closed doors.

Increasing the visibility of the benefits would also facilitate collaboration. Committee chairs could prioritize bipartisan legislation. New members could learn how collaborating makes it easier to get their bills through the process in orientation. The leadership could establish a process for individual members to submit their bills for consideration under suspension if they can demonstrate that they're likely to get the necessary 2/3 support. Scheduling would still be up to the leadership, but this would provide members with an opportunity to promote legislation that might otherwise get lost among the thousands of bills introduced.

The other consideration for increasing collaboration is making it easier for members to work together. There are two main obstacles; members need to be able to find someone to work with and work out an agreement with them. The first element -- finding someone to work with -- requires connections. Collaboration increases significantly once members are in their third term, partly because they have seen the value of working together, but partly because they've built up the necessary relationships by then. When members start thinking about who they could get on a bill or letter from the other party, they naturally go first to their friends and the people they've worked with before. But if they don't know someone who would be good on that issue, or if their staff don't have a connection they can tap, they'll most likely introduce the bill on their own.

It's hard to make new relationships in any context. But making it easier for members to make these connections and find other members to work with would significantly lower the obstacles to collaboration. Members who have been around for a while often talk about how they all knew each other when everyone lived in DC, making it easier to work together. That doesn't mean it's impossible to form relationships now, it just has to be done differently.

One of the most common dynamics in any social network is that mutual friends facilitate connections, which is as true in Congress as in high schools. Members introduce their colleagues to each other all the time. Certainly, a member looking for someone to work with can go to one of their friends and say "hey, do you know anyone I can work with on this idea." But members are busy and bumping into the right person at the right time is far from

guaranteed. Also, this is much easier for more senior members with more connections. But we're looking for ways to make this process easier.

One way to facilitate this sort of connection-making would be through committee staff. If every committee created a designated staff member – ideally non-partisan – whose job it is to be a liaison to the personal offices, they could facilitate these sorts of connections. For example, if you want to find someone in the other party to work with but you don't know who else is interested in an issue, you -- or your staff -- could reach out to the liaison. Ideally, the liaison would connect you with a member on the other side of the aisle who is interested in the issue. Of course, that doesn't guarantee success; the members still have to agree on what the letter would look like but finding someone else who cares about the issue is always a good starting point.

Which brings me to my final point, which is that collaboration breeds collaboration. Members who work together successfully on one issue are more likely to work together on another. Members who have larger personal networks have more opportunities to find someone to work with on a particular issue. They're more likely to know the right person. Collaborating on smaller issues can lead to collaborating on bigger concerns. There are things Congress can do as an institution to make it easier or more rewarding for members to work together, as I've described, but at the end of the day, the easiest thing for an individual member to do is to reach out to someone they might want to work with.

The CHAIRMAN. Thanks very much.

Our next witness is Shola Richards. Mr. Richards is an award-winning director of training and organizational development, as well as a sought-after keynote speaker for commencements, conferences, and government events. He is the author of two books—this is part of this committee's Amazon.com sales effort—"Making Work Work" and "Go Together," which introduce strategies for replacing divisiveness and incivility to create positive living, working, and leading communities. Prior to starting his own consulting businesses, he served as the director of training and organizational development for UCLA Health.

Mr. Richards, you are now recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF SHOLA RICHARDS

Mr. RICHARDS. Thank you, Chairman Kilmer, Vice Chair Timmons, members of the select committee, and staff and personnel who helped to make this very important hearing a possibility.

As a keynote speaker and consultant, I am often asked why I choose to engage in the difficult work of civility. There will always be mean and rude people. A drama-free and respectful committee meeting won't travel as far on social media as a 15-second sound bite would. And, you know, as they say, nice guys finish last. Right?

That is why when it comes to civility specifically in Congress, when I told my friends that I was coming here, they said to me, what is the point? What is the point?

To me, that is like asking, what is the point in showering? You are only going to get dirty again. True, right? Well, similar to showering, civility also is best used when it is done consistently.

So what is civility? Civility in its simplest form is a sincere and consistent demonstration of respect. Without a baseline of respect, there can be no trust. And, without trust, communication among team members will deteriorate rapidly. And, without trust, respect, and effective communication, committee meetings will devolve into dysfunction; highly-skilled staff members will quit; and, most importantly, the American people who rely on this institution to improve their lives will become disillusioned, and they will lose faith in their elected officials.

On the other hand, people who consistently demonstrate and practice civility are not only viewed more positively by others based on the research and are more productive, they are also more effective leaders as well. More on that to come.

So, in this hearing, I would like to share a recommendation on how Congress can use civility to create a more positive and productive institution that truly serves the American people. It is my hope that every committee will consider beginning each new session of Congress with what I call civility norms. To be clear, this is not a code of conduct. Code of conducts traditionally are created by the leaders of an organization with the expectations that those within the organization will follow said codes.

Civility norms, on the other hand, are very different. They would be created by the members of each committee for the members of each committee. This would ensure that each committee's norms

would be specific to that committee's needs. So, for example, it is likely that the civility norms for—that are created in the Ways and Means Committee could be very different than the civility norms created in the Armed Services Committee.

And that is exactly the point. Generic civility rules for large organizations such as the House of Representatives, for instance, rarely work in the long term due to their lack of specificity. In my experience in the work that I have done, I have seen much greater commitment to actively practicing these norms when a smaller group of people, for example, a committee or a subcommittee within the House, play an active role in creating those norms. Additionally, there is greater willingness to hold their peers accountable to those norms because they are the once who agreed to these norms in the first place.

To create these norms is simple, and the process is simple. Ideally in a committee's first organizational or planning meeting of the new Congress—and, of course, to be very clear, this meeting would be bipartisan—the members should answer two very simple civility questions. The first one: What are the behaviors that demonstrate respect and should be reinforced during each of our committee hearings? Some examples of responses that I've seen in my work here, for example, can be actively listening and showing respect while others are talking. It could be something as simple as disagreeing with an idea without attacking the idea who presented the idea.

The second question, equally important, is: What are the behaviors that do not demonstrate respect and should not be tolerated during any of our committee meetings? Some examples could be making derogatory remarks about other Congress people during a meeting or on social media, disrespectful body language, like eye rolling while another member is speaking, or intentionally ignoring another committee member.

The answers to these questions should be agreed upon by the committee members, recorded, and used as the committee's civility norms going forward. Additionally, each committee should also determine how they will incentivize behavior that promotes civility in the committee meetings. An example, for example, would be posting a civility score on the committee's website or on their social media for committee members who consistently adhere to the committee's norms.

Let's be real. Committing to this process may seem time-consuming. I get that. But couldn't the same be said about sitting in committee meetings where toxic conflict, incivility, grandstanding, and dysfunction is the norm? Civility is too important to be left to chance. That is why it needs a real process.

I am deeply grateful to the select subcommittee for ensuring that civility is finally given the attention and respect that it deserves.

And, with that, I yield back.

[The statement of Mr. Richards follows:]

INTRODUCTION

Thank you Chairman Kilmer, Vice Chairman Timmons, members of the Select Committee, and to the staff and personnel who helped to make this important hearing, a possibility.

As a keynote speaker and consultant, I'm often asked why I choose to engage in the hard work of civility. There will always be mean and rude people. A drama-free and respectful committee hearing won't spread as quickly as a 15-second "gotcha" sound bite will travel on social media. As they say, nice guys finish last.

That's why when it comes to civility, I'm frequently asked, "What's the point?"

To me, that's like asking, "What's the point in showering? We're only going to get dirty again."

Similar to showering, civility is most effective when it is practiced consistently.

So, what is civility? Civility, in its simplest form, is a sincere and consistent demonstration of respect. Without a baseline of respect, there can be no trust. Without trust, communication among team members will deteriorate rapidly. Without respect, trust, and effective communication, committee meetings devolve into dysfunction, highly-skilled staff members quit, and most importantly, the American people who rely on this institution to improve their lives, will become disillusioned and lose faith in their elected officials.

On the other hand, people who consistently practice civility are not only viewed more positively by others and are more productive, but they're also more effective leaders as well.

In this hearing, I would like to share a recommendation on how Congress can use civility to create a more positive and productive institution that truly serves the American people.

RECOMMENDATION

It is my hope that every committee will consider beginning each new session of Congress by creating Civility Norms. To be clear, this is not a Code of Conduct. Traditionally, Codes of Conduct are created by the leaders of an organization, with the expectation that those within in the organization will follow the codes that they created.

Civility Norms, on the other hand, would be created BY the members of each committee FOR the members of each committee. This would ensure that each committee's norms would be specific to that committee's needs. For example, it is likely that Civility Norms created in the Ways and Means committee could be very different than the Civility Norms created in the Armed Services committee.

And that is exactly the point. Generic civility rules for large organizations (like the House of Representatives, for instance) rarely work in the long-term, due to their lack of specificity. In my experience, I have seen much greater commitment to actively practicing these norms when the members of a smaller group (i.e., a House Committee or subcommittee) play an active role in creating the norms. Additionally, there is a greater willingness to hold their peers accountable to those norms, because they agreed to them in the first place.

The process to create these norms is simple. Ideally, in a Committee's first organizational or planning meeting of the new Congress (which must be bipartisan), the members should answer two basic civility questions:

1) **What are the behaviors that demonstrate respect, and should be reinforced during each of our committee meetings?** Examples of this could be:
    a. Actively listening, and showing respect while others are talking
    b. Leading by example by modeling the respectful behaviors that you would like to see from others
    c. Disagreeing with an idea, without attacking the person who presented the idea
2) **What are the behaviors that do NOT demonstrate respect, and should not be tolerated during any of our committee meetings?** Examples of this could be:
    a. Making derogatory remarks about other Congresspeople during a meeting or on social media
    b. Disrespectful body language like eye-rolling while another member is speaking
    c. Intentionally ignoring another committee member

The answers to these two questions should be agreed upon by the committee members, recorded, and used as the Committee's Civility Norms going forward.

Additionally, each committee should also determine how they will incentivize behavior that promotes civility in the committee meetings. An example could be publicly posting a "Civility Score" on the committee's website or social media accounts for committee members who consistently adhere to the committee's norms.

CLOSING

Committing to this process may seem time-consuming, but couldn't the same be said about sitting in committee meetings where toxic conflict, incivility and dysfunction is the norm?

Civility is too important to be left to chance, that's why it needs a process. I am grateful to the Select Committee for ensuring that civility is given the attention and respect it deserves.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Richards.

Our final witness is Liz Wiseman. Ms. Wiseman is a researcher and executive advisor who teaches leadership to executives around the world. She is the author of, "Multipliers: How the Best Leaders Make Everyone Smarter," and, "Rookie Smarts: Why Learning Beats Knowing in the New Game of Work." Her forthcoming book, "Impact Players," will be available this October. Ms. Wiseman is the CEO of The Wiseman Group, a leadership, research, and development firm headquartered in Silicon Valley, California. She has been listed on the Thinkers50 ranking and in 2019 was recognized as the top leadership thinker in the world.

We are grateful that you are with us. Ms. Wiseman, you are now recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF LIZ WISEMAN

Ms. WISEMAN. Chairman Kilmer and Vice Chair Timmons and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to share a few ideas.

I have been asked to share a few of the best practices of what leaders and the business world and the nonprofit world do to build an environment where work is productive, where people are empowered, where people are deeply engaged, and where people find work fulfilling. And I want to start by sharing a few principles that I think underlie some of those practices. And these are truths that I have learned studying some of the best leaders in the organizations in the world, as well as studying some of the worst.

And what we find is that, even in organizations that are deeply hierarchical, where there are very clear reporting lines and rules, the best leaders don't lead with formal authority. They don't lead with threat of repercussions. And they lead through influence. And they lead in a way where people volunteer their best thinking and where people hold themselves to the highest standard. The best leaders clearly lead through influence.

The second is that people in all types of jobs at all levels and all types of organizations come to work wanting to contribute everything that they have. They want to do work that is meaningful, and they want to do work that has an impact. It is like deeply embedded in us to have this kind of impact, and the best leaders in some ways simply allow that to happen. They remove the barriers for people to make a contribution.

And the third principle that we find is that people tend to do their best work in a climate that is both comfortable and intense. And so what the leader's job is to create an environment where there is an equilibrium between safety, where people feel they can speak out and contribute, where they feel accepted, but also where they feel compelled, where they are stretched, where they need to do their very finest work.

Let me share a few of the practices we see from the very best leaders on this.

The first is that, instead of just giving people work, the best pleaders delegate leadership and ownership and accountability. Most leaders want to involve people, give them sort of a say and participation. But when ownership is unclear, people tend to default to the leader; they tend to stall and tend to get disengaged.

What we find that the best leaders do is they give members very clear portions of work, so even small portions of the larger committee's work, and they give them full ownership of this.

One of my favorite practices on this comes from John Chambers, the former CEO of Cisco. When he was a fairly new CEO to Cisco, he was making his first executive—he was hiring a vice president of customer support. And he says to him: Doug, when it comes this part of the business, you get 51 percent of the vote, and you get 100 percent of the accountability.

And I just don't know a clearer or a simpler way to tell someone else that you own this, that you are in charge. Just give someone 51 percent of the vote.

The second is that the best leaders tend to encourage their members to set and achieve stretch goals. You know, it is very easy for a manager to assign work based on people's current ability and to give people goals or objectives. But we find that, in that case, when you give people goals and it is in their wheelhouse, people tend to do the usual. And we know what the usual looks like in this setting. But people are most deeply engaged when they are given a challenge, something that is a question, not a directive, and something that is beyond their current capabilities. It is something that feels a little bit like a mission impossible.

One of my favorite examples of this is the former CEO of Gymboree, the children's clothing company. When he took over the helm, he could see that there was room for improvement on earnings per share. And, rather than give targets out to his management team to cascade through the organization, he set a mission impossible. And he said: What would we need to do across the organization to improve our earnings per share by a dollar this year?

And people got thinking. And soon everyone had a mission-impossible goal, something that could contribute to this larger goal. That year they massively overachieved. They set a new mission impossible, which the next year they massively overachieved. And, within 4 years, they had five times increased their earnings per share.

So, you know, a good practice for doing this is to not give people goals or objectives but to give people puzzles to solve. And maybe the most visual example I can give is to ask you to remember the scene from the "Apollo 13" movie where they are trying to return the astronauts back. It is the iconic scene from this movie, not "Houston, we have a problem," a different one. It is the one where the engineering manager pulls together his team. He dumps out on the table all of the parts that are available in the lunar module that is now filling up with toxic gas. And he says to his engineering team: We have got to find a way to make this fit into the hole for that with nothing but these resources.

And it is actually the architecture of a great way to issue a challenge, is to give people a puzzle. How do we do X by Y with nothing but Z resources? And what happens is people tend to respond because they don't know how to do that, actually. And so people start to find answers. And it puts the ownership on the team, rather than it sitting with the leaders. So the best leaders ask the questions rather than give directives, and they create puzzles for their team to solve.

A third leadership practice would be to create tough and fierce but really healthy and civil debate. Leaders typically in business and in other settings tend to rush to debate where they have fire for the deed, when opinions are high. They tend to debate opinions or issues and topics, but the very best leaders treat debate a little bit like surgery. They do it very selectively and very carefully, and everyone prepares. And they debate well-framed questions with clearly defined options.

One of my favorite examples of this comes out of Microsoft, an executive named Lutz Ziob. In running his business, when there becomes a vital issue—not every issue. Delegates a lot of those. But, when there is a vital issue, he pulls the team together. He says: This is an issue we need to debate. Here is why it is important. He frames it. He poses the question. And then he says: I want you to come back in 2 weeks, ready to debate this. And everyone is asked to come with two things: one, evidence; and, two, a point of view.

When he starts the debate, he lays the ground rules. I want this to be fierce. I want people to push hard on these issues. But I want it to be civil. He defines that, and then people start to go. He asks people to come with a position already established. They argue for their point of view. And then, when thing are starting to settle into kind of a pattern, a decision is becoming clear, he mixes it up. And he says: I want you to switch points of view. You know, Marcus, you have been arguing for this. You know, Amanda, you have been arguing against it. Amanda, you are arguing for it. Marcus, you are arguing against it. Go. Or, Marcus, you have been looking at this from marketing point of view. And, Sunir, you have been looking at this from a sales point of view. Sunir, you are about marketing. You know, Marcus, you are all about sales.

And it is very unsettling, but the team gets very used to it. And, in the end, the team comes to a decision that the team agrees to. And it is unclear who was the winner of that debate because he has mixed it up.

My very favorite debate practice is the simplest one. It comes from third graders arguing, debating the merits of great literature in the Junior Great Books program. It is three questions. I will add a fourth question. It is that the leader of the debate should ask the question and not give an answer. Two, they should ask for evidence. No one gets an opinion without bringing evidence for it. Three, they should ask every person to weigh in on it. And, fourth, the one I would add to this is to ask people to switch. The switch creates amazing things.

Lutz also opened up his debates. He has the members of the debate around the team, but he opens up the debate to other people in the organization so that they can observe the debate.

The best leaders don't tend to assign work based on people's skill sets or job responsibilities. The best leaders tend to look for what each member of the team is naturally and natively good at. I call it someone's native genius. It is just like what our minds are built to do. It is what we can't help but do. And they find a way to tap into that.

I see so many leaders who do this as an entire team at the onset of a project, which is, like, let's first see what kind of capability we

are working with. And everyone understands people's genius. At first I thought this was sort of a little bit of a hippy practice. I come from California. We are prone to hippy thinking. I thought this was a bit strange. Every group, every single group I have seen do this, where they identify the native genius of each member of a team or a committee, has said, "It is the best thing we have ever done."

The last one that I would like to just sort of end on is this idea of creating transparency. I think and what I have seen is the best way to create civil debate and collaborative practices is to create transparency and put good leadership on display. When Alan Mulally had taken over Ford and they were hemorrhaging losses in the billions, he would tell you that the secret to that success was he stopped one-on-one meetings with his executive team members. He established a joint meeting where they dealt with issues as a team. They had a simple color coding system to deal with the severity. And then he opened up those meetings to members of Ford. Everyone was to bring a guest. And it was remarkable how the behavior of the executives changed instantly.

I think there is a number of ways that congressional committees can take—can put their leadership behavior on display because people tend to lead at their very best when they know that people are watching, particularly young people.

There are several other practices in the testimony I am happy to answer questions about. Thank you.

[The statement of Ms. Wiseman follows:]

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION OF CONGRESS

Leadership Strategies for Congressional Leaders

Testimony from Liz Wiseman, researcher, author and executive advisor

September 23, 2021

OBJECTIVE

Introduce leadership practices that will empower rank-and-file members of Congress and enable them to do the work they were elected to do, feel greater productivity and fulfillment. Members can employ these practices in committee, in caucuses, in "Dear Colleague" efforts, and in task forces or informal member groups. In taking the lead on issues, members empower themselves to do the work they were elected to do.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Leadership: The best leaders optimize the intelligence and capability of their teams. They use their intelligence in a way that provokes intelligence and capability in others. They don't lead with formal authority or threat of repercussions; they lead through influence and create an environment where people voluntarily contribute their best thinking and hold themselves accountable for doing their best work.

Contributorship: People want to contribute their full capability and do work that makes a meaningful impact. People want to be difference makers not position holders.

High-contribution environments: People tend to do their best work in a climate that is both comfortable and intense. A leader's job is to create equal measures of safety and stretch. Safety, both psychological and intellectual, invites people to do their best thinking, while stretch pulls people out of their comfort zone and normal patterns of thinking and behavior and demands people's best efforts.

PART ONE: BEST PRACTICES FOR PEER-BASED LEADERSHIP

The following are proven best practices from the corporate world that are used in complex organizations where managers and professionals must lead and achieve desired outcomes without formal authority. Members who seek to take the lead on a particular issue or cause can incorporate these practices into their game plan for action.

1. Delegate leadership and ownership

Often leaders encourage team members to "take ownership" for the group's success; however, when ownership is fuzzy, team members tend to over-rely on the team leader for decisions and action and momentum stalls and/or participants disengage. People perform best when they are given ownership for and held accountable for their work.

The best leaders do more than just let the team know what is expected of them; they give team members clearly defined portions of the work and full accountability for their domain. It is generally

more effective to give majority vote in a smaller domain of responsibility than vague ownership in a larger domain.

A best practice for building ownership in a committee setting is for a chair to put committee members in charge of a particular portion of the work by giving that person the majority vote. Instead of delegating tasks, a leader can let the committee member know that they (not the leader) are in charge and accountable, and that, in that particular domain, they have 51% of the vote but 100% of the accountability. Be sure they understand what 51% (or more) means: You are in charge (hence, I am not). If we disagree, you make the call. I expect you to be the one to move things forward (I will participate but will follow your lead).

To maximize ownership and accountability, leaders should encourage individuals to volunteer to lead the portions of the work they are most interested in. This is especially important when committee members have become disengaged, dispirited and disempowered.

When building a team, look for individuals who are willing to take ownership and who can articulate the portion of the work they volunteer to lead. In addition to looking for people willing to step up and lead, look for individuals who are just as capable and willing to follow their colleagues as those colleagues take the lead on other aspects of the committee's work.

2. Encourage members to set and achieve stretch challenges

Often leaders encourage team members to tackle challenges by giving them directives or assigning work within their current capabilities. However, when leaders provide directives, people tend to fall into usual patterns of thinking and behavior that limits collaboration and vision and produces average work. People are most deeply engaged when they are given a challenge that requires them to learn, find answers, and extend their current capability.

The best leaders ask hard questions and lay out bold challenges that push people not only to think but to rethink. To answer these questions, the organization must learn. Enabled by these big questions, a vacuum is created in the space between what people know and what they need to know, and also between what they can currently do and what they need to be able to do. This vacuum creates tension and raises a need to reduce that tension.

A best practice is for leaders to shift their role from giving directives to asking questions. Leaders who want others to take ownership and tackle stretch challenges should listen more than they talk in team or committee meetings and should use their talk time to ask questions that get people thinking about possibilities and looking for solutions.

A best practice for establishing stretch challenges is to create a "mission impossible" challenge—a hard, concrete challenge with multiple variables. The best challenges are intriguing puzzles that need creative solutions. These types of puzzles have constraints such as, "How do we accomplish X by Y date, with only Z resources available to us?" In the business world such a challenge might be: How can we change an Electric Vehicle battery in five minutes and also ensure the process is user friendly, location independent, car independent and low cost? When applied to members who are taking the lead on a policy issue within a committee or caucus, an example challenge might be: *How do we get this issue on*

the agenda within the next 12 months? Or, what would we need to do to get leadership to consider this initiative during the current session? How can we get a floor vote on this issue by the end of this session?

When leaders offer a challenge and then create a culture of belief, people step up and contribute beyond what they thought possible.

3. Create a tough but healthy debate

Rigorous debate can speed collective action and unify a team. However, leaders and teams typically rush to debate when they have strong opinions on heated topics or attempt to debate topics or philosophies rather than well-framed questions or options. This type of debate engenders divisiveness, drives further entrenchment, and avoids the real issues. People will do their best thinking during debate if the issues are framed well and defined, the questions of the debate are clear, and participants have time to gather the right information.

The best leaders use debate selectively, for the highest stakes issues that require diverse perspectives. It is conducted like surgery: used for very specific problems, has clear objectives, isolates issues, entails specific prep and post-op work, and is time bound.

Leaders can use these practices to help a team prepare for a healthy debate:

1. *Frame the boundaries of the issue*. This includes: A) The Question: What is the decision to be made? What are we choosing between? B) The Why: Why is this an important question to answer? Why does the decision warrant collective input and debate? What happens if it is not addressed? C) The Who: Who will be involved in making the decision? Who will give input? D) The How: How will the final decision be made? Will it be made by majority rule? Consensus? Or will you (or someone else) make the final decision after others provide input and recommendations?
2. *Set expectations*. Establish the rules of engagement so people feel equal parts safety (to speak up) and stretch (to ensure a rigorous debate). Give participants time to prepare and ask them to come ready with A) a point of view and B) evidence.
3. *Invite observers*. This encourages those involved in the debate to work collaboratively and transparently. Further, it teaches good debate practice to the observers.

Leaders should use simple and light procedures to ensure the debate is rigorous but not divisive, informative, and fun. Instead of following complicated and formal debate practices, a leader can lead debate with these "four asks":

1. *Ask the Hard Question.* Ask the question that will get at the core of the issue and confront underlying assumptions. Pose the question to your team and then stop. Instead of following up with your views, ask for theirs.
2. *Ask for Evidence.* When someone offers an opinion, don't let it rest on anecdote. Ask for the evidence. Look for more than one data point. Ask them to identify a cluster of data or a trend. Make it a norm, so people come into debates armed with data.

3. *Ask Everyone.* Reach beyond the dominant voices to gather and hear all views and all data. You might find that the softer voices belong to the analytical minds who are often most familiar with and objective about the data. You may not need to literally ask everyone, but be sure to ask enough people to invite diverse thinking.
4. *Ask People to Switch Positions*. When consensus or camps begin to form, ask participants to argue the issue from another point of view or from the opposite position. This switch of perspectives reduces personal attachment and increases collective ownership.

While more formal procedures might be used on the floor, this form of debate could be utilized by teams of colleagues who are trying to move an issue forward or within a committee or caucus. I understand that the Modernization Committee has also recommended Oxford Style Debates on the House floor. These practices can be used by the debate leaders and teams as they prepare to take their debate to the floor.

4. Utilize each colleague's unique strength

While it's natural to assign work based on someone's official job responsibilities, past experience, or skill, the best leaders engage people's strengths because they understand that people operate at their best when their unique talents and skills are seen, utilized and genuinely appreciated by their leaders and colleagues. Specifically, the best leaders see and engage the native genius of others.

A native genius is something that people do, not only exceptionally well, but absolutely naturally. It is something people typically do easily and freely. What people do easily, they do better than anything else they do, but they don't need to apply extraordinary effort to the task. They get results that are head-and-shoulders above others', but they do it without exhaustion. What people do freely, they do without condition. They don't need to be paid or rewarded to do it and often don't need to be asked. It is something that gives them inherent satisfaction, and they offer their capability voluntarily, even ardently.

Leaders can use the following practices to find and utilize the native genius of team members.

1. Find someone's native genius by carefully observing the person in action, looking for spikes of authentic enthusiasm and a natural flow of energy. Ask: What does this person do...better than anything else they do? ... better than people around them? ... without effort? ...without being asked? ...readily without pay? ...in all aspects of their life, including both work and home?
2. Talk with the individual and agree on a short name that describes their native genius (e.g., "synthesizing complex ideas" or "building bridges" or "identifying root causes").
3. Identify roles or tasks that will utilize and extend this person's genius. In conversation with the individual, allow them to identify the best ways to utilize their genius.
4. Meet as a team or committee to discuss each person's native genius. Focus on one person at a time, inviting everyone to share their observation of that individual's native genius. Agree on a name that describes their gift (these names can be fun!) Discuss ways the team can utilize (and further develop) each person's native genius.

5. Build swift trust among unlikely allies

A number of innovative organizations use a vision exercise to establish shared purpose at the outset of a cross-functional collaboration. In this exercise, the team writes a mock press release (or newspaper or magazine article). The mock press release announces the outcome of the collaboration, including a statement of the problem, the work the team did to solve the problem, and the transformative effect of the solution. The mock press release typically includes aspirational (and at this point fictitious) quotes from key constituents. The group then uses the statement as both an aspiration and check point for their joint work.

Additionally, having a new team begin their work by identifying the native genius of each team member helps build an environment of respect and trust.

This is an exercise that members could engage in as a team, with staff assigned the task of capturing the discussion and memorializing it into a mock press release or statement.

PART TWO: IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES

The following are several methods commonly used in the private sector that can be utilized to introduce and reinforce new leadership practices among rank-and-file members of Congress.

Training/Orientation: Introduce a leadership training module into the freshman orientation. The program could focus on "Leading Among Equals: Principles of Effective Peer-Based Leadership" and include a number of the leadership practices mentioned above.

Case Studies: Identify Representatives who have demonstrated effective bi-partisan and peer-based leadership and then create video-based case studies to share with existing members and use during the orientation process. Continue to create additional case studies to help others aspire to lead in similar ways. Allow members to share these videos with their constituents on their websites. An example might be Reps. Upton and DeGette discussing their joint bipartisan leadership on the 21st Century Cures Act, which the committee highlighted at its July 20, 2021 hearing.

Mentors and Reverse Mentors: Establish a mentoring program that matches incoming representatives with current (or former) representatives who have demonstrated the right leadership practices. In addition to having senior representatives offer insights to incoming representatives, introduce reverse mentoring in which the less experienced members mentor the more experienced members. Newer representatives can teach new approaches and technologies and provide insights that reflect latest trends.

Awards: Encourage committee leaders or members to spotlight desired partnering and leadership behavior by creating awards that can be given out "on-the-spot" without seeking prior approval. Awards could be purely symbolic (a lapel pin or sign on the door). For example, awards could include themes such as:

Full House Award: Peer recognition given across party to those members who display bi-partisan collaboration

The Assist: Recognition from a committee leader for individuals who help other committee members and set up others for success.

Transparency: Encourage students to attend open committee meetings (e.g., middle school field trips). Incorporate teaching moments in which the representatives share the challenges and opportunities of leading among peers. Enable students to become active observers of civic and congressional leadership in action by providing students the criteria for good leadership. For example, provide students with a list (or bingo card) of the desired leadership and collaborative behavior to note the presence or absence of behavior and then discuss as a class.

Seating Configuration: Create greater collaboration opportunities (and send strong symbolic messages) by establishing an alphabetical seating arrangement rather than the current seating configuration in which each party sits across the aisle from the other.

The CHAIRMAN. Thanks very much.

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 to either me or Vice Chair Timmons. Or for those who are joining virtually, if you want to use "raise hand" or just tug the ear, or as you wish. Exactly, there you go.

One, I really appreciate the testimony from each of you. It seems like we sort of covered three different themes all around how to make the place function a little bit better: civility, collaboration, and leadership. And I thought maybe the committee could start by just pulling on the threads related to civility.

I presume that Vice Chair Timmons will ask a little bit about incentives since in his opening remarks he spoke about that. I think one of the things that this institution struggles with is this notion of sort of what we owe each other in terms of standards of conduct. As part of this effort, I reached out to a sports coach who had taken over a team that had a pretty dysfunctional culture. And he said the rules are what governs us when we are at our worst, and the norms and culture are what keeps us at our best.

And so, Mr. Richards, your suggestion of establishing some sort of standards I think is really important.

Now here is what is tricky in this place. One person's violation of standard and norm is another person's only avenue for exercising the rights of the minority. You know, and we have seen that in this place. We have seen it recently with, you know, every suspension bill now there is a roll call vote on. And, you know, and we saw that when the Democrats were in the minority and literally took to the floor and did a sit-in on the issue of gun rights or gun safety.

So you see at times things that, probably, if there were those sort of codes of conduct, you know, this is—I think it is worth recognizing this is different than rules. Right? You are talking about how do we engage one another in a way that might lend itself to a more collaborative approach.

So I am just looking for any guidance you have to the committee as we think about this and as we think about making recommendations, how to thread that needle, recognizing that it—that, as an institution, we want to be respectful of the rights of the minority and we also want to make sure that the place isn't just dealing with persistent obstruction.

Mr. RICHARDS. Thank you for that question, Chairman Kilmer.

You know, since you brought out sports first—and I am hoping I will be the first of many sports metaphors throughout the day hopefully. When I look at a sports team, I think of a football team. And if I remember correctly, Mr. Cleaver also formerly played football. So I—when I think of football or any sport, really, what happens are rules that govern the sport. But there is also unwritten rules around respect, not just for the teammates but respect for the game. So, when you see someone who violates an unspoken norm or a team norm, so to speak, not only are the people on the other team upset at that person, but people within the team are upset with that particular player. You notice that people can fight hard

and play hard. At the end, they are trading jerseys because they can still respect the game.

So, when we come to the House of Representatives and we think about the work that is being done here, the reason why norms are important is that it is conflict with guardrails. So, when you see people who are engaging in disruptive behavior, things that make this institution dysfunctional in some way, there should be some sort of guardrail in terms of, "Hey, this is how we are going to be working here," and more than just a Code of Conduct but really specific to each committee and subcommittee to see whether or not this is something that would actually work.

So, in my experience, I have found, like I said in my opening testimony, people are more willing to adhere to norms when they play a role in creating them, regardless if you are in the majority or in the minority. This is part of—because, as we all know, this is cyclical. Sometimes you will be in the majority; sometimes you will be in the minority. But the idea is these norms should be constant. They make a difference when people actually adhere to them. And, most importantly, more people are willing to hold others accountable to these norms because they played a role in creating them.

So, while it is hard to do this—and I know we can't legislate people being nice and kind to each other. I just want to be very clear. That is not what I am saying, unfortunately. But what would be nice is that if people could at the very least have some sort of norms, some process that they can remind themselves of when they show up.

I think Phoenix Suns Coach Monty Williams said, and I want to make sure I get this quote right: Everything that we want is the on the other side of hard.

And this is hard. This is not easy. If it was easy, this would already be done. So it is going to require some sort of process and, quite frankly, some new suggestions that I am so happy to get into during our question and answer. But I want to cede my time and share with the two fabulous ladies on either side of me.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't know if anybody else wants to speak to that question. Otherwise, I will invite Vice Chair Timmons. Go ahead. And then others who want to pull on any of these threads related to civility, and then we will shift gears and talk about collaboration.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Craig, I want to talk about incentive structures, particularly at the committee level. We have talked a lot about Congress as a whole. Just—there is a lot there: 435 Members is very challenging. But, when you kind of go down to the committee level and say, what can we do to really change the incentive structures within committees, which is where most Members of Congress do the most of their work, it becomes maybe a little bit more manageable.

We had Congressman Upton come and talk about how, when he was the chairman of E&C, they had—you know, they gave priority to bipartisan amendments. That seems like a pretty easy thing for us to recommend. Sitting interspersed throughout the dais, I really think that that is something that is a no-brainer, just creating, forcing people to sit amongst their colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I really think that has potential. Modifying the ques-

tions—the questioning structure is something that we talked about, actually exchanging ideas as opposed to just using talking points and not really defending your ideas. Honestly, that is one of the biggest things that I think is missing in really our country today. You don't defend your ideas. You can say things that may be incredibly intelligent or may not make much sense, and nobody actually says: Let's really get into the weeds on that. What is the effect of that policy you are proposing? And what about this?

Nobody does that. You go on Fox News or CNN, and you get praised. There is no—there is no back and forth.

One of the things that we talked about, discharge petition. I mean, you know, 218 is what you got to get. But what if there was another one? What if it was like a bipartisan discharge petition with a lower threshold? You get 100 Rs and 100 Ds, you are guaranteed a vote. And, you know, taking that same thought process to committees, you are guaranteed a hearing if you get X percent of committee equal Rs and Ds.

So that causes me to say: All right. I have this thing I am passionate about. I got to go and sell it to people on both sides of the aisle because that is the only way that I can guarantee my outcome, things like that. I mean, throw out some new ideas, talk about those. I am open to really anything.

Ms. CRAIG. No, I appreciate that. Thank you, Vice Chair Timmons.

You know, I think that you are right that committees are I think an excellent avenue for a lot of collaboration to occur because it is, first and foremost, a smaller group and it is easier to get a smaller group of people working together. You know, I think that having, you know, actually tying into the idea of kind of setting committee norms, having one of the norms and—would work better again in some committees understand others—be, like, some level of prioritization of bipartisan legislation, you know, the committee chair agrees that they are going to—you know, if you get X level of support, yes, they are going to put it on the agenda or at least have a hearing. Similarly with amendments, it could happen that way.

You know, I think that, in terms of kind of tying, I guess, the committees into, like, the relationship building, like, one of the things I like—well, we will see how it goes. But I think I like how you are doing because it is the questioning here in terms of it keeps people in the room more. And that then also, I think, facilitates relationships and more of a conversations and builds connections between members if you have that sort of structure within the committee hearings.

In terms of kind of then when you move on to the floor side of things, you know, I think—toying around with the idea but the idea of, like, the suspension calendar, obviously, is where a lot of bipartisan—the main benefit of, I think, of a lot of bipartisanship is that it becomes much easier to get through on suspension. But a lot of Members don't really know how that works, especially, like, in the first couple of years. And it is not really clear.

And so, even if you weren't to say—so all—I mean, you could go all the way to saying, like, yes, there is a guarantee. Like you can show me that you are going to get two-thirds, that this bill will get

two-thirds support, we will put it on the agenda. But at the very least allow Members to, like, submit their legislation and say: Hey, I have enough—maybe I don't have two-thirds cosponsors, but I have enough bipartisan support here that I am confident we will get past that two-thirds vote. And allow them to kind of raise the legislation to the attention of the leadership to hopefully get it on the schedule would be another one of my suggestions.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you.

Anybody else have any thoughts on incentive structures?

Mr. RICHARDS. I will jump in.

You know, I have two young daughters. And I have learned that the best way to get any type of behavior to change is to focus on the behavior that you want versus the behavior that you don't want.

And there has been some talk and some ideas around in terms of collaboration. But also, too, with civility is having, like, a civility score or something that you can actually see in real time who is playing an active role in getting Congress to work again? And this hopefully would disincentivize the folks who want to be difficult and be obstructionists and make things difficult for the institution. But, more importantly, it shows what this institution actually values, which is collaboration, which is civility, people working together, and, most importantly, doing this in a way that is public so that people can actually see what is going on, on social media or on the website.

It helps to get people to think: Okay, this is important. Clearly this is something that is being measured. I don't want to be a person who is staying out of this. I want to be a part of this. And hopefully really engage people's better angels in doing the right thing.

Ms. WISEMAN. There is something I would like to add to that. When I look at what is done in the business world to incent collaborative behavior, civil behavior, you know, collaborating in the business world, you know, in many cases, is as hard as in really complex organizations where people have interests and very different interests. And what the organizations tend to do is, first, they create case studies, like: Here is what it looks like when it is done well.

And they create heroes out of these people, and there are probably video-based case studies.

I think there could be a lot of power in saying: Where has it been done well? Where are the positive examples? And let's put that on display and maybe continue to build this library of case studies of successful, bipartisan, collaborative, good leadership, and civil discourse. That is one thing that businesses tend to do. I think it could work here.

Another is not just the kind of formal incentives but spot incentives. A lot of organizations use these peer-based spot incentives where anyone without prior approval can see good leadership, collaborative behavior, bipartisan legislation, civil behavior, and give somebody a spot award. Maybe it is a lapel pin. Maybe it is a sign on their door that says this is what—this is what the desired behavior looked like. And it is not only fun to receive one of these,

people love giving these kinds of awards. It is incredibly gratifying. I think there is power in doing something that simple.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you.

I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay. We have a flurry of hands that just went up. So I have got Mr. Latta, then Perlmutter, then Joyce, then Phillips, then Cleaver.

So, Mr. Latta.

Mr. LATTA. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks for today's hearing. I think it is very instructive.

You know, I think that you have heard me say that, in my 25 years of almost in the legislature, either in Congress or back in the General Assembly, I have always pushed for what I always call the five Cs. The top of it was civility. And you got cooperation and then collaboration and then camaraderie but, you know, working together.

But, you know, it is a tough world out there. And I think that is what you had mentioned in your opening statement. Or maybe it was Mr. Timmons that, you know, time is one of our biggest enemies out there. It is getting to know one anymore is very, very difficult.

And, for our panelists, maybe I could hear from each of you because just to get your thoughts on how—where we are today because, again, you know, we live in an instant world. You know, people are reading the scroll on the bottom of their TV or something like that or something off their handheld device, and get their information in less than 30 seconds and not delving into it.

But when—you know, when you take away the thoughts of where we are with the internet, with Instagram, with Twitter, with Facebook, you know, how do we get out there to make sure that, you know, we are working with each other? Because, again, it is difficult, you know. And I objected when, you know, the cameras were right outside the House floor. You know, it seems like Members would run right out and—from the floor after they said something and get right in front of the TV cameras.

And, you know, it is the way we address each other on the floor. I am a big stickler for that. One of the things in Ohio that we had as a rule is that you never addressed anybody by their name. It was always by where they were from and, you know, to keep things on a nonpersonal basis just on that.

But I am just kind of curious. You know, in this instant world that we are in today, how do you all see that we can get this civility? Because, again, with time being a problem, getting to know people, having that ability, how do we address that in today's world? Thank you.

Mr. RICHARDS. I will take that.

Ms. WISEMAN. I will follow.

Mr. RICHARDS. Perfect. It is so interesting when we talk about time. And, you know, I think we have to get creative when we think about time, how we use it, how we use it within this institution and maybe, quite frankly, maybe outside of it.

So, creatively speaking, what would be cool—and I am using that word intentionally because I don't think this is happening now—is an idea where folks from either side of the aisle could invite a

person from the opposite side of the aisle out to dinner. Now, I want to be very specific about this, because this is not just some idea of, like: Hey, let's go have dinner with someone from a different party. This is very intentional, and I want to be clear when I say this.

So the idea behind this to make this work because then it is hard to find time when you have multiple committee meetings and different competing priorities, I get that. But what would be great is you could have a dinner once a month that is actually expensed by this institution. Now, not the $7,000 dinner that Vice Chair Timmons was talking about in his opening remarks, but it could be something like $50 or $100, whatever makes the most sense.

But what is important about this particular dinner is you are offsite. You have an opportunity to connect with someone that is not really based on, "Hey, will you sign off on this bill," and things of that nature, but leaving work aside and having an opportunity to get to know someone based on the relationship-building that Vice Chair Timmons was mentioning in his open.

It should be branded, though. And this is really important. It is not like: Hey, we are going have dinner. You could call it something like, just naming a President, a Jefferson Dinner. Hey, I am going take someone out on a Jefferson Dinner. Now the idea behind this is that, when you brand something, you give it a name, there is an expectation behind it. So it is, like, when we have this dinner, the expectation is I am going to take someone out from a different party, and we are going have dinner expensed on this institution where we can get to know each other and finally build that trust away from the cameras that you see after a hearing where people run out to their favorite cable news station and get in front of a camera and say: Look how I did. Look how I did.

This is more around getting people to understand each other, to start humanizing people, and taking the time to get to know people and build those relationships.

Maybe most importantly though, once you find that friend from the other side of the aisle, it is easy to say: I will just keep taking this person out to dinner every single time.

It should switch. So it should be a new person every month in order to be able to get this expensed.

This is a very simple, powerful way to do this. Businesses all over the world use this as an opportunity to get people to know each other. I am surprised that this is not built into this institution, knowing that it works. So once you get the opportunity to build this, it can create bonds that go far deeper. And it hopefully will alleviate the challenges of time that Mr. Latta was speaking about earlier.

I have more, but I just want to stop there for that.

The CHAIRMAN. Anyone else want to swing at that?

Ms. WISEMAN. I would like to add something to this. You know, it is no secret that we are—there is a lot of performance going on, performing for cameras, performing for social media, performing for constituents. You know, it is happening with our young people performing for social media. I think we know how damaging this is.

I think there is some interesting thinking that can be done about, how do you allow people to perform for a different audience,

and I know there is a practice of allowing school children field trips to come in and watch. And I just wondered what would happen if committee meetings were open not just to whatever classes happen to be by but there was active just reach to bring in middle school field trips and not just have them come and go but to look for teachable moments. And perhaps these norms of behavior, as they are codified or we say, "Here is what good leadership, civil, collaborative, productive leadership looks like," I would think, like, put that on a piece of paper and give that to each kid who sits down. And maybe make a bingo card out of that. Maybe you make a checklist and give them a pencil and say: Just circle every time you notice that behavior.

And then maybe the teacher has a conversation about that with the students. Behavior would change.

Maybe you structure in more teachable moments where there is a chance to talk to the school classes that come down about what it means to be a steward and not just a representative of geography or a constituency but what it means to be a steward of a democratic process and the obligations and the higher obligations that come with being a public servant.

And I think if you create an audience that people value, people will perform at their best. I think you could also bring peer observation in, or there is a slew of external executive coaches who I am sure would be happy to come in on a pro bono basis and observe and coach and help people lead at the very best. But I like bingo cards for school kids myself.

The CHAIRMAN. That is fun.

Ms. CRAIG. Well, I would like to add to that, just because I am really sad I did not give my students bingo cards for this hearing because I am making them watch.

But just to briefly chime in on the role of time, you know, I think that is one of the reasons. You know, there is a lot of conversations. You hear a lot of people talking about how, you know, part of the problem with Congress is that no one lives here anymore; no one plays—you know, the kids aren't playing on the same baseball time. Like this is a very common refrain.

We don't actually have a lot of evidence to say that that is what kind of caused the decline of civility. So I want to caution with that. But I feel like sometimes we get so hung up on these conversations of, like, well, no one living here, so we don't hang out, we are not friends, that no one thinks about, so how do we adapt to the new world in terms of finding new ways to make connections and finding, you know, new ways to have these conversations. I think, you know, going out to dinner, the dinner idea is fantastic. This is one of the reasons that I also emphasize staff because, again, the staff are here all the time. And so, if you can facilitate connections between your staff, the staff can then be a bridge to make connections between Members. And, yeah, I mean, I think just generally.

The other thing I would say is that, in terms of kind of the instant response, it is also why I think part of it is getting—part of what would increase civility is to have a lot of these conversations happen behind closed doors and then come out as a joint, united front and make that the announcement, rather than having, you

know, "Oh, here is an idea," and then, you know, go through some back and forth and place different, competing proposals on the table. Instead, just come out as a united front of, like, "Here is our idea," and really take joint ownership of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Perlmutter and then Mr. Joyce.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Is that on? Yeah.

I guess just in trying to put these in silos, I am not sure. You know, civility, collaboration, leadership, they are all part of the same thing.

So, going back to the sports analogy, you know, the Broncos, two of our fiercest competitors were the leaders of the team, Peyton Manning and John Elway. Okay? And I mean they wanted to win. Period. And made it a better team. What we have under this—in this room under the dome is we have two teams competing. It is different than Microsoft and everybody getting in the room and debating, you know, towards a thing. They are part of the same team.

So what has been difficult for all of us is the team element has become more and more pronounced over time.

So I just open it to the three of you because I think you are all talking, you know, from the leadership, you know, the more competitive the leader, you know, all of a sudden, you are going down one path. And I can pick a couple of my committees where I have just the fiercest competitive leader in one committee versus a more collaborative leader in another committee. And you get different results. There is no question about it.

So, in the setting that we have, which is difference than a corporate setting, you know, it is—we are sort of in the game the whole time. How do you manage that? How do you bring out civility? How do you bring out the collaboration? I guess that is my question.

Ms. CRAIG. Sure. So I can jump in on this.

You know, I think—I do think there is a perception issue more so than—I mean, yes, there absolutely are competing teams. Don't get me wrong. I am not going to come in here and be, like, no, no, everyone really gets along. But the—I actually do have a fair amount of research showing that the majority of Members are mostly just focused on, you know, creating policy solutions and/or district advocacy, you know, like the majority—a bare majority—but the majority are focused on that end.

And so that is where I see the role of collaboration I think being really impactful is actually getting those, like, rank-and-file Members who are less concerned about the partisan fighting that is going on over here and more concerned about working together and making these connections and because, like I said, you know, kind of collaboration facilitates more collaboration.

So, if you have these two Members that are really concerned about policy working together and then, oh, they are successful, like, other people will hopefully try to imitate that behavior and expand the, you know, value, the norm of collaboration within the Congress by just demonstrating good behavior or collaborative behavior anyway.

Mr. RICHARDS. Can I jump in, too?

Thank you for that Dr. Craig. I am—I just love sports metaphors because, I mean, using Peyton Manning and John Elway is a great

example for this. And I know your district is obviously in Colorado. And the idea—right? The idea is when you talk about John Elway and Peyton Manning, the two things about them, besides being Super Bowl-winning quarterbacks for the Denver Broncos, they also are not just fierce competitors, but they did something that could also be duplicated within this institution.

You mentioned before that there is fierce teams that are separated, and they are fighting for their cause. So the one thing that could help interrupt that is intraparty policing where there is someone within the party who is willing to say: Hey, listen, you can fight for your cause and fight hard, but still let's remain within these guardrails.

It is more—far more powerful hearing it from someone within your own party who is willing to say: Hey, this is not okay. Like I understand that you are fierce. But to get on social media, to run to said news network, and just start to disrespect or humiliate someone is not advancing this cause.

And this is going to take courage. Quite frankly, and I know courage is a relative term, but the idea is this is going to require people to put their necks out a little bit. I think if you are in a, politically speaking, a safe district where you are most likely to be reelected over and over and over again and because, for whatever reason, there is more people in your party there, it is either deep blue or deep red, there is less of a willingness to engage for sure, if we are going to be honest. But the idea is, if someone from the party within the party chooses to hold someone accountable, this is beginning the process of turning the ship around that has been so off track for so long.

And that is what Peyton Manning did. That is what John Elway did. They went to the situation. And even Tom Brady who—sorry—but he went to the Tampa Bay Buccaneers after they were a horrible team and in one year turned them around. And I think it is because the inside of the team, there is a spirit of accountability, which I think is sometimes absent in this partisan bickering that we see so often.

The CHAIRMAN. It is interesting. I mentioned I have talked to a sports coach, and he talked about they have a players council, where it is that type of holding each other accountable. It is not getting sent to the coach's office because you violated a rule. It is, you know, it is a peer basically pulling you aside and saying: Hey, you know, we don't really do that here.

You know, I keep wondering if there is a way to structure something like that in Congress. I don't know that there is. But I can tell you, like, if Emanuel Cleaver came up to me and say, "Hey, you know, that is—you were outside of the lines here," like, that would probably change my behavior. Right? I mean, he would be the chair of the players council.

Mr. Joyce.

Mr. JOYCE. Unmute. They we go.

The CHAIRMAN. There we go. I knew you could do it.

Mr. JOYCE. You would think, after 16 months, I would know how to work this thing.

When I—you know, you touched on a good point, as always, Derek. But I thought that maybe I would have those conversations

with some knuckleheads, who aren't here, when they said stupid things that reflected poorly on all of us. And, on top of them, you know, giving me grief, then they turned around and said crazier things.

So you would like to think that, you know, peer-to-peer discussions would work. Maybe with some they do. But certainly, in this instance, I see it as more—and I think—I am sorry. But the last speaker touched on it, the idea that the, you know, that Tom Brady or the coaches, in other words, the leadership has to bring and be incentivized to bring that to the team. And I was wondering if any of the panel had an idea on how that might be accomplished or how the team could search for the leadership to actually make that happen.

Ms. WISEMAN. I will comment on that.

I don't—I think I first want to acknowledge that I understand that the business world has a different model. I don't think the leadership dynamics are any different, that people are people. However, the organization's structure creates a very different dynamic because, in the business world, as well as the nonprofit world or our school systems, there tends to be a unifying leader.

And, in this setting, there is an absence of a single unifying leader. There is competing teams and which means that the unifying force has to come from within the organization for there to be a functional process.

And I want to share just an observation and then maybe a resource. The observation would be, you know, so much of my work is studying power inside of organizations. And I have been thinking a lot about this question over the last months, and the conclusion I come to is probably a conclusion that everyone in this room has already come to. But I want to share it anyway, which is, in absence of a unifying force and if the peer-based leadership dissolves, people need clear leadership. And I think what is happening is we will, as a country, trend toward authoritarian leadership. Like we will see that this vacuum is filled. If it is not filled in Congress, it is going to be filled more and more with leaders who take very authoritative position. And I think more and more, as our citizens, the electorate, people like me see a lack of peer-based unifying leadership in these buildings, the voters are going to want leaders who are authoritative and dictator-like, and I think this is a disturbing trend. I don't think we want to see that on any party. And so we have to find a structure where this comes from the middle of the organization or from the top of the House, so to speak.

That is probably an obvious conclusion. But I feel like shared—like that is the only conclusion I can come to is we will move more and more to an authoritative society. And that troubles all of us, I believe.

The resource I would point you to is there an organization, I think you are familiar with, the Partnership for Public Service. And I am a member of their advisory board. I have been serving with them for the last, I don't know, 2 or 3 years. And, as part of that work, they have and we have built a leadership model that takes some of the best thinking out of the business world, that looks at what are some of the peculiarities and challenges of being a leader in the public service space. And it is centered in the idea

of stewardship and public service, and I think it is a tremendous resource to say this is what good leadership looks like in this context.

And I think you will be talking to some members of that group next week, but I would encourage you to look at that leadership model in particular.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Craig.

Ms. CRAIG. I just wanted to jump on here real quickly because the answer is that that is a really hard thing to do, frankly. I mean, you elect party leaders whose job is to keep your party or get your party into the majority. I mean, that really—that is who you elect to be your party leaders are the ones that you think are going to be, you know, keeping your party in the majority. And that requires distinguishing yourself from the other party, and it rewards conflict, and so on and so forth.

So I am, with respect to Liz, I am not sure it is the right idea to try to change kind of how the leaders are. But maybe—I am really into this, like, council of—now I don't want to call it council of elders, but that is because I am—like, you know, kind of another sort of—create a new leadership position that is a little bit more bipartisan, that is elected—I really—in a majoritarian institution, this is so hard to do. But find a way to create it so that it was absolutely a bipartisan position and have them be someone who is, like, providing, setting this norm of collaboration and voice that isn't necessarily the partisan—the party leaders. Or hire a staff member or hire, like, a parliament—the parliamentarian version of the civility director.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I add one small thing to that too and just to add on to kind of what Dr. Craig was saying? I also think there has to be a reimagining of our leaders around, who is their audience? You know, we have to think about this more deeply. We have an idea that your base are the people who are on Twitter, who make up, what, like 20—I think only 20 percent of Americans, according to Pew Research, are actually on Twitter. So that is not your audience. That is maybe the most vocal minority who is speaking up, and there is a need to placate those people, and there is way that that kind of moves the conversation towards the fringes to satiate that base.

But what would make more sense is to reimagine the audience of the remaining 80-plus percent of people who may consider voting for you, may consider working with you, maybe consider pushing your agenda if you were to behave in way that was maybe more civil, more thoughtful, and can engage more people. It just may be time to reinvent that and think about it differently.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Phillips.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Perlmutter and I were just reflecting on the proposition to have children, you know, attend everything and how beautiful that would be even in our caucus meetings because it would change. Then, again, we have plenty of children already, I would argue.

There is so much to unpack. This is my favorite conversation in Congress because I was reading Chairman Kilmer's tweet this morning. And he wrote, quote: Research shows that leaders who

practice civility and who take a collaborative approach to their work are able to produce and achieve at higher levels.

And having come from the private sector myself, that is exactly how things worked until I got Congress.

And I thought a lot about this. You know, there are 435 of us. You know, if we were in a private enterprise or a business, surely each one of us would have been fired already for insubordination at one time or another. But only—and a handful, clearly, if there was accountability, would probably be terminated for poor behavior. Growing up in a household, you know, we had a parent who provided accountability. In schools, we had a teacher or principal. In business, we have a boss. And, here, as I reflect on rewards systems and the incentive structure to all of your respective points, it is actually antithetical. It is the opposite rewards, which is so terribly confounding to me.

You know, so a couple of questions. You know, voters are electing dividers to Congress. And then those elected to Congress are electing dividers to leadership positions. That is just pretty clear. It is true on both sides of the aisle. A couple of questions and one reflection.

You know, I think we have this vice happening in America. We have got angertainment on one end of the vice that is thriving, using us as pawns to divide. And then we have gerrymandered districts, as you, I think, reflected on, Mr. Richards, that reward deeply blue or deeply red behavior. And then all the rest of the country is in the middle of this vice.

I want to better understand the psychology behind why both Americans might be electing dividers, why we in Congress seem to be elevating the wrong people. And then, secondly, what if hypothetically there was a third caucus? How would that change the behavior, do you think, in the institution, a more moderate, a combination of thoughtful Democrats and Republicans perhaps that would be a triangulation, if you will, of power? Would that change anything in the U.S. Congress?

So, two questions: the psychology behind why and how some internal dynamics might change with a third entity instead of just two teams.

Ms. WISEMAN. I can speak to a little bit on the psychology of why. One of the things that I study is, I mean, leaders I call multipliers who bring out the best in others versus leaders who are very smart and capable but have a diminishing effect on others.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Uh-huh.

Ms. WISEMAN. They tend to be very divisive leaders. And often they have staying power in organizations, and they have success. And I have spent a lot of time trying to understand why people keep working for them and why people follow them, and I think it addresses a couple of your concerns. And what happens is, when people feel voiceless and they feel like their voice is not being heard: Nobody is listening to me; I am going to get behind someone who people are listening to. And, even if I in some ways abhor this person, this is my only avenue for voice.

And it is what happens in the business world is people tend to follow them.

The other dynamic that we see out in the private sector is that these leaders tend to have a diminishing effect on others, and others get intellectually weakened around them. We become lazy. We will—I will just defer thinking to them. I will let them do the hard stuff. I will just sort of be hands and legs. And people actually become less capable around these leaders. So they are less capable of standing on their own. So they become places where people degrade around, and then they become dependent on them for any kind of influence.

And so I think it is a very—it is a very disturbing cycle of degeneration. And I think it is—I see it happening all the time in the workplace. And I think it is also happening in our political system.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And just—and to my second question about just this notion of these two teams, you know, what happens if there is a third team in a construct like this? What do you think?

Ms. WISEMAN. Probably changes everything.

Mr. PHILLIPS. How so?

Ms. WISEMAN. Well, it gives more options. And, you know, you don't have a mortal enemy. And you have to form—I don't know. I don't want to purport that I understand anything about the political process, but I think it creates more options and more like a market system perhaps. But I don't know. This is not my expertise.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I appreciate it.

Ms. WISEMAN. So we are over the edge of my expertise.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I appreciate it.

Ms. CRAIG. I think I am, like, obligated to jump in here as the political scientist at the table.

So I am sitting here, trying to imagine a third party. And I just can't get to the point where it exists. Just in terms of thinking about the House, the way, because of the Members that are elected right now, you have—you know, if you imagine everyone on kind of on a left-right continuum, obviously, there are issues that go on other dimensions. But right now there is actually such a gap between the two that filling in the middle, like, Members who are even at the more, you know—like conservative Democrats and moderate Republicans are probably better off with still, like, their own party preferences than going all the way to the other party. The further apart the parties move, the less incentive there is——

Mr. PHILLIPS. Of course.

Ms. CRAIG [continuing]. To cross the aisle, obviously.

So, yeah, so I get really stuck on the where does the third party come from because ideally you would have, like, a middle component. And we don't really anymore. I mean, that is really true that the—for a number of different reasons actually, you know. A lot of moderate Members are losing their seats. And then that also, I think, leads to a more polarized Congress.

In theory, though, you know, and it is a theoretical version of having three parties, I mean, it definitely changes thing because all you have to do is, you know, look at parliaments where you have to start, look ahead to these coalitions. So, okay, we are going to try to forge weird groups to try to get a governing majority. And, I mean, you know, I like a good parliamentarian, just a parliamentary system. But that is kind of the dynamic that you would get

where you would have—force—it would force people to kind of break outside of their group in order to get a majority.

And the only other thing I would add on that is that, while we do not have a third group, you know, it is important to remember that, right now, for the time being, you do have—I mean, I know it is bad to talk about them on the—or Hill, but you have the Senate on the other side, which actually does serve as, to some degree, as—it does force a degree of bipartisanship. If you want to get something actually through the Senate, there are ways around it, obviously. But you need to get past that 60-vote threshold. And that is going to require, you know, Members of both parties.

And so that is, you know, I think, certainly an element that can also kind of help people break out of their coalitions if you emphasize that a little bit more and focus on that a little bit more.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And before we move on, any thoughts on if rank choice voting, as an example, might change the rewards system for candidates to broaden their base of support perhaps or to not just pander to the base?

Ms. CRAIG. So that is really outside my area of expertise in fairness.

Mr. PHILLIPS. All right.

Ms. CRAIG. So I am really kind of hesitant to jump in on what—because it really varies. You know, I think it depends a lot on the State. It depends a lot on the districts that they are running in.

I will say on the subject of thinking about the incentives in districts that, you know, there definitely is a line between the really what we call safe districts but really the strong partisan districts where there is, if not a disincentive, certainly no real incentive to be bipartisan there.

But one of the things that I find in my research is that for Members who represent districts where it is not even just the marginal ones, they went up to about 60 percent of the vote, kind of that 50 to 60 percent, 48 to 60 percent range, the Members who collaborate more, who have larger and more robust networks, actually do a little bit better in their elections.

So, if you have those sorts of districts that are a little bit more swingy, a little bit more moderate, then that actually—the voters end up incentivizing collaboration. But, when your district is 80 percent Democratic or 80 percent Republican, they want—they are with their team, and they want their team's positions, and nothing else will do.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yeah, I do see a correlation between good behavior in more competitive districts——

Ms. CRAIG. Uh-huh.

Mr. PHILLIPS [continuing]. You know, no question, yeah.

Mr. RICHARDS. Can I take a quick stab at those two questions, Mr. Phillips, really quickly?

I—kind of on—adding onto Liz's point earlier around leadership, why people follow leaders who may be divisive in some sense, I think the easiest way to look at this is, when you see bad behavior, bad behavior is an unskilled expression of an unmet need. I will say it again: All bad behavior is, is an unskilled expression of an unmet need. So there are needs that are not being met, and the skill to meet those are not developed.

So, oftentimes, you will find a figure who is able to engage the lesser angels of a person, so to speak, and, without the skills to manage those needs that are not being met, it is easy to follow someone like that.

Secondly—and this is outside of my expertise, but I will take a stab at it anyway—is the idea of adding a third potential party to the table, so to speak. My initial response was I don't see how that would truly fix anything. It is like having a dysfunctional couple, and they are married. And it is like: Hey, we should add a child; that is going to fix everything. And I don't know if that would.

I mean, like, the reason why I think about that is I think about how adding something to a situation that is already dysfunctional without really finding some tools that are going to repair the current dysfunction will be aided by adding something additional to it, if that makes any sense.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yeah, and the reason I asked that, of course, is in, you know, when there is triangulation of leadership, it forces you, to get anything done, you need two of the three.

Mr. RICHARDS. True.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And that is—anyway, thank you all very much. I appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Cleaver and then Ms. Van Duyne.

Mr. CLEAVER. And thank you. This has been very, very interesting. I almost ran over to make sure I was here in person. We have so many problems. And you have been very articulate in giving us some reason to, you know, contemplate ways in which things can function better.

We have multiple influences, and one of them is the media. And I understand the media. I mean, but if you want to get attention and want to become a national personality, I mean, if I, you know, took off my pants and ran around, you know, this building, I mean, I would get significant coverage tonight.

Ms. CRAIG. Or lack thereof coverage.

Mr. CLEAVER. Yes. But if I did it, you know, to demonstrate that we have naked policies, you know, then I am heralded. And so that is a part of it that we—nobody wants to talk about because nobody wants the media to get mad at them.

However, the good news is that, 2 weeks ago, a major news outlet—I am not going to mention them because I don't—we have this lengthy meeting. And I don't want—they may not be ready to talk about it. But they are interested in something that you have talked about and I have talked about here in our committee. And that is they want to figure out a way that their particular news outlet can measure civility among Members and recognize Members, you know, like, we are measured, as I have said to the committee, by every group in the world. I mean, the, you know, laborer, and the Chamber, I mean, everybody, you know. You get a 98 or whatever.

And they are interested in doing it. We ran into a problem, and we talked about this. It was a lengthy meeting, and I was thrilled to see that that media outlet was actually wanting to do something to turn down the volume and or maybe more particularly to celebrate individuals who were not turning up the volume.

And the problem that we ran into is—was—and it is going to be difficult to solve—and that is, you know, by personality, by their

nature, there are a lot of Members whose voices are never heard because they just kind of, you know, do their work, get on the plane, and go home. Do their work at home. Come back. They are not going to be recognized by the media. And so, if you, you know, if you say, well, they are the ones who have the greatest level of civility, it is probably not a good way to, you know, to measure others.

And I said to them, using a sports analogy, I said: Yeah, we have got to create a way to do it because you can hit 450 in baseball, but if you did not come to bat a certain number of times, you can't win the championship. You know, you have to have—a certain number of at bats that you have to have in order to be a part of the statistics. And so we couldn't—we were not able to get past that in the conversation. And so I am just wanting to throw that out to you.

And then, to this, finally, said there are a lot of Members who on both sides of the aisle really want things to do better. I have been beaten up by a Republican friend who said: You know, you quit writing the letters.

And for the newer Members, for about 5 years, I wrote a letter each week to all of the Members, 435 Members.

And then I was in New York over the weekend, and another Member came up to me and said: You are the problem.

I said: What?

They said: Where are the letters?

So I thought I would start it again. I think the chairman was probably here when I was doing the letters every week to everybody. So I am going to—I did one yesterday—2 days ago that is going out.

So I know that there are a lot of people who want things to be better. And they don't celebrate, you know, people who are doing a nasty—making a nasty remark. But, on the other side, if you have any ideas on this system of measurement, I think this particular news outlet is really interested in doing this because they spent a lot of time with me twice and probably watching our meeting because that is where they first got the idea.

Ms. CRAIG. So I can jump in on this.

And I don't have an answer for you quite yet on how to measure civility. But I did make a little note for, like: Next project, consider finding a good measure of civility. So maybe, you know, a little bit, a couple of years.

You know, I think—but you have raised several, I think, really excellent points that, you know, first and foremost, the media is driven by conflict. It is not actually their fault. That is what—the views. You know, it is, you know, conflict draws attention.

But I will say that bipartisanship actually also gets coverage, like when—I mean, it is covered in a certain way where it is covered, it is, like, a rare show of bipartisanship on Capitol Hill. The number of headlines I have tracked of, like, The Washington Post, The New York Times that highlight the rare show of bipartisanship makes it kind of clear it is not actually all that rare. But if that is—if it gets them writing about it, cool. That is great.

So, when bipartisanship is successful, you know, I think it does get attention. And I think the—the idea I was proposing about hav-

ing Members have or having legislation that has, like, two sponsors, a Democrat and a Republican sponsor, I think would actually help in that it would make that bipartisanship much more visible. It would also make—we could get all sorts of scores to calculate for you if you do that on the political science side of things.

But the other thing I would just say is that, you know, so there is a couple of political scientists at the University of Illinois who have done work kind of classifying Members, classifying all of you by your behavior in terms of not civility but in terms of, like, your actions, in terms of, like, how much do you fund raise, how much due vote with your party, so on and so forth. And the vast majority of Members fall into categories that, as Mr. Cleaver was pointing out, don't get any attention. It is 16 percent of the Members end up falling into, like, the two high-profile categories of, like, the party—you know, party leaders and not just leadership but, you know, carrying party warriors, I think is what we are going to call them, and what we call the ambitious entrepreneurs, although I really like conflict entrepreneurs, too, for that.

But that is, you know, a small segment of Congress. The vast majority of them are policy—policy wonks, district advocates, you know, people who are focused on their policy. And so, you know, also doing internal work to promote more of that behavior, like, promote that activity more publicly could be part of it. Certainly passing their legislation obviously ends up getting more attention by making it more public that way, but it is a big challenge.

Ms. WISEMAN. I want to add one thought to that. I agree with you. You know, there is a reason why the media covers conflict. We are interested in conflict. It is part of our human nature. We are drawn to the salacious. It is interesting. It is compelling. And rather than trying to change that, maybe to play with it, double down on it, which is, you know, a great movie, something that we are fixated on is all about conflict. No one wants to watch a movie or read a story that lacks conflict, but what we love even more than conflict is conflict resolution.

And I wonder if there is a chance to tell stories about conflict and then say: Here is the conflict. Here is how we were warring, at odds. Here was the no-win situation. And here is how people came together to resolve that.

These are stories people want to read. These are case studies that would get media attention. So I would play up the conflict and add the resolution piece to it, and I think we could get a lot of attention for it.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to echo what you just said, Liz. That is—I am so grateful that you said that because—and I know that the media is set up in a way to kind of, you know, attract people to drama. I understand that. But I will be just be from my own personal experience, and I feel like I am pretty dialed into the civility stuff. I had never heard of this select committee prior to, like, a month ago. And the work that you all do is so meaningful and so powerful. And, quite frankly, when I tell people, when I told my friends, like, yeah, I am going to be testifying on Capitol Hill about civility, it is, like, there is an amazing Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress that is doing really powerful work to make Congress work better. There is?

So there is a responsibility. And I don't know on your websites if you have this front and center, if this is something that people can actually see, so people are aware of the work that you are doing. It could make a huge difference to know that there is hope on the horizon. There are people who understand this problem because I will tell you, on the ground, people are just, like: Yeah, this is the way Congress is broken. That is the way it is. It doesn't seem like anyone is taking the effort to fix it.

So this hearing, hearings like this and the work that you all are doing needs to be publicized even more than it currently is.

Mr. CLEAVER. The problem—I am sorry. I am from Kansas City. It is the home of Hallmark cards. And the Hall family—I am not doing a commercial, although they—the family, they are good friends of ours. But, Don Hall, Sr., reads every script for the Hallmark movies. The number one watched net—yeah, network during—from Thanksgiving to New Year's is the Hallmark Channel.

And one of the thing that—my son is an actor. So I have started paying attention to this stuff. But one of the things you have to, if you know Hallmark—I don't know if any of you know the culture. I don't—every movie ends beautifully. I mean, I mean, whatever it was that happened, it is—it ends beautifully. They have to end that way. And the millions of people who are watching, they know how that is going to end. And yet the overwhelming majority of Americans watch it from Thanksgiving to New Year's, and they already know how it is going to end.

And so people are—they are hungry for things to work out well. And, you know, and they enjoy it and celebrate it. And I think we are fighting against it here. I have a—I don't want to get him in trouble. I have a friend who is a Republican. We have traveled all over the world together. I have wiser—friends. And I said it to him the other day. We were someplace. And I said: You know, I am scared to say anything about this because I don't want you to end up getting death threats.

I mean, I—you know, death—I have two people in prison now. I don't have them. The FBI put them in two prisons. And, you know, we talked about it yesterday in Homeland Security. And so I am almost—I don't want one of my friends to end up getting, you know, threats. And that is where we are right now in the country. You know: You have violated the rules of the tribe, and, therefore, we are going to attack you and call you and tell you what we are going to do to your children and so forth.

So the—I think there is a hunger for it. But if we allow this thing to continue to get out of—to get further and further and further out of control, I am—I—you know, I have a little 6-year-old grandson who I love more than I love myself most of the time. He can do some other things. We won't talk about it here. But I actually fear right now for what my little 6-year-old is going to experience, I mean, in our country.

And so I—I think this committee is doing valuable business. I appreciate you being here. I think that we got to get out of this thing where we can't even acknowledge relationships because we are afraid to do it.

Thank you. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Ms. CRAIG. Can I—I just want to jump in really quickly, because an idea came to my mind while you were talking. It does not solve the problem of death threats, unfortunately. But in terms of we were talking about the Hallmark movies. And I think one of the reasons that, you know, the Hallmark movies are so popular is because everyone knows, for that one month, you can turn on that one channel, and you will get a feel-good movie.

But you could actually imitate that behavior in Congress where you have a sort of, like, this is the bipartisanship month or the week, you know, whatever it ends up being where you have, if you had a week that was focused on, you know, bipartisanship and collaboration and you kind of centralize all of your activities around that theme like as a House, then that is going to be an easier way for you to get attention from the media probably also in terms of these, like, small little bills that wouldn't get attention of themselves. But if you do an entire week of it, like, right now I think that would be so shocking that people would be, like: Well, we are definitely going to cover this. But, you know, you can kind of capitalize on that by consolidating things.

Ms. WISEMAN. Yeah, and you can play it right after Shark Week.

The CHAIRMAN. I feel like this is the time where I should thank C–SPAN for being here, but I also——

Mr. PHILLIPS. We need Hallmark to cover Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. They did a week, covering the week of this committee. They replayed all of our hearings. As you can imagine, it was ratings gold.

Ms. Van Duyne.

Ms. VAN DYNE. I had—hit the button. It is not——

The CHAIRMAN. There it is.

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Is it on? All right.

I appreciate the work of this committee. But I think it is also incumbent on each of us as leaders to take those responsibilities of reaching out and being everything that we talk about in being a leader, of being accountable, of being collaborative.

As a freshman, this has been an interesting time. I think, as anybody in this room will acknowledge, we are probably at our most divisive that we have been in decades. You know, my third day here, we had January 6th. The week after that we were talking about impeachment.

We have a lot of different characters on both sides of our aisle, but I don't want to give anybody death threats. But I am just looking across the table. And, yesterday, Representative Cleaver and I signed a deal inking a caucus that we are creating as former mayors, trying to work together. And, you know, when we were mayor, I didn't have a letter next to my name. People knew where I went to, you know, where my kids went to school, where we went to church, where I shopped. You know, we were very accessible. And so, as mayors, I think we look at it differently. We want to be productive.

I don't know anybody here who is just wanting to be on C–SPAN. I think a lot of us come here with ideas of what we want to do, and we are desperate to be productive, which means working and collaborating. And I am looking at, you know, Ed Perlmutter, at the bottom of the—you convinced me to join the Congressional Soft-

ball Game, the softball team. Thank you very much for the 7 a.m. practices.

But, I mean, those opportunities, we are creating. It is not, you know, having a month where we are doing it, and it is just kind of hokey, but we are creating those opportunities.

Last week, I was in Minnesota with, you know, with fellow colleague Dean Phillips. We were going around and talking to businesses that were in his district to find out the commonalities. What are businesses across the country facing? And I am in Texas. He is in Minnesota. I will tell you: They are facing the same things.

And I look forward to having you in Texas to do those, to do the same type of meetings.

I think it is incumbent on all of us to create opportunities to do that. Now, look, we may not be in agreement on a lot of our votes. But I am trying to find ways that we can work together. Now, as a freshman, I may be naive to be doing these things. I mean, time will tell if they actually are effective. But I think it is important that we all recognize that we are here to do a job, and we can't do a job if the only thing we are doing is just throwing axes. And I don't know if those are interesting ways that have been tried before and have failed. But what are your thoughts on some of those ideas?

Ms. WISEMAN. I think that is the essence of leadership. That is my thought.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have to jump in, too, because it is interesting, Ms. Van Duyne. I was in your district, Tarrant County, and had an opportunity to speak at the Fort Worth Convention Center. And there was a moment where I saw almost the epitome of civility in terms of what I would see from—there was a moment where something went wrong from an AV perspective. And the amount of people who came in and didn't place blame and didn't point fingers and just collaborated to get everything working again, it was hard to explain because there was no Republican, Democratic, Black, White, gay straight, born-again, atheist. It was just: Hey, let's work together to make sure this event goes off without a hitch.

And in my travels around the country, I have always found that the leadership that Liz was speaking of, you know, often comes up in moments of crisis. But I also want to see how this can continue in moments that are just a regular Thursday or, you know, just a normal way of operating. I think we can get there.

I did want to mention, too, to Mr. Cleaver—and I am really sorry about the fear that you shared about your grandson, about potential—I mean, it hasn't happened hopefully, but death threats that could be something that is a problem for even admitting that you are hanging out with someone who is across the aisle. Ms. Van Duyne was talking about going to Mr. Phillips' district in Minnesota outside of Saint Paul to have an opportunity to connect, and now it is on C–SPAN.

But the idea is we have to normalize this. And as hard as it is to feel like, well, you know, I would rather keep it private for fear of these things, if we normalize that there is nothing to be afraid of, of having people across the aisle have meaningful relationships, I think we can begin the process of making meaningful change.

Ms. CRAIG. And I would just jump in and say, I mean, I think that trips like the two of you are talking about are really fantastic for a few different reasons. But one of them is because a part of working together to solve problems starts with agreeing on what the problem is, and I think sometimes that is missing. You know, sometimes these conflicts can't be solved because you are not actually agreeing on what the problem is. And then, obviously, the solutions are going to vary. So, if you start by doing this sort of, you know, fact-finding and work together to actually come around on the problem, then I think that facilitates also collaborating on solutions.

And then the other thing I would say is, again, I think it is a lot of work could be done in terms of just making it easier for Members to find people to work with, especially Members in their first term who maybe don't have the robust connections that more senior Members have. And that is, you know, I think utilizing the infrastructure that currently exists in the House, like utilizing committee staff is obviously one place to facilitate that. But, even if it were just—I mean, Zoom makes things very challenging right now. But, you know, having these sorts of Jefferson Dinners, which I also am a big fan of, to get people to meet each other, like, you know, once you get more—once you get more, like, personal connections, they kind of have more—you know, they build upon themselves. And I think that helps a lot.

Mr. RICHARDS. One last thing, back to Ms. Van Duyne's point, orientation, and I know it was probably very odd for you being oriented during a pandemic and everything like that. But if we can also use orientation as an opportunity to set some norms around civility, knowing that being new to Congress, that could also be a great opportunity as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Indeed, one of the recommendations out of this committee was to do that.

Mr. RICHARDS. Oh, awesome.

The CHAIRMAN. So we are thinking alike.

I think we have covered a lot of good terrain. I want to give folks an opportunity to ask some kind of cleanup questions. I just want to quickly, and then I will ask—I know Vice Chair Timmons has a question to follow up on, too.

Dr. Craig, I think one of the—it is not just around incentives in terms of the challenge of collaboration. It is actually sometimes just hard to find, you know, who do I want to work with on this? I keep thinking that there are lessons to be learned from private industry. I worked for a management consulting firm that had thousands of people all around the world. And I could say who has got expert—you know, I could literally go onto an intranet and say, who has expertise on this subject?

Similarly, I don't think anything like this exists in Congress where I could come in and say: Hey, I am a new Member. I want to work on veterans' housing issues. Are there other Members who have self-identified as wanting to work on that—or rural broadband or reducing debt or whatever? It does seem like something like that might be useful and being able to identify the staff person on your team who would be the point of contact for something like that. Is that kind of along the lines of what you were

thinking about when you said, you know, like a craigslist or something like that, you know?

Ms. CRAIG. No, that is. That is really what I was thinking about. But another idea, similarly, along similar lines is, like, again, within kind of the House intranet if all of the Members set up profiles that were, like, here are my top three priorities, the things that I am really interested in working on, and here are my staff contacts for those, it is a different presentation than like what you put out on your public-facing web pages because this would only be for internal use.

But, you know, we do this in academia where it is, like: Okay, I am looking for someone to collaborate on a paper that studies X. And it turns out I can pull up their websites. And I can find, okay, you know, they—this is their priorities, the priorities in their research. And so I think that would also translate really well if you don't necessarily want to set up a dating site for legislating in Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Vice Chair Timmons.

Mr. TIMMONS. Chair, thank you.

When I got sworn in, I guess this was 2019. One of the coolest experiences I had was a dinner in Statuary Hall, and it was all the Republican freshmen. And the Marine Corps Band was there, and it was very formal. It was just a very cool experience. And I know the freshmen Republicans my year, freshmen Republicans, they are some of my closest friends in Congress, and I have a relationship with all of them.

I don't have that on my Committee on Financial Services. And I don't have it to the same degree even close with the freshmen Democrats from my—from my year.

So we are talking a lot about just opportunities. And we had previously discussed the idea of having committee dinners, annual committee dinners. And the Library of Congress has a lot of space. I don't think it is reasonable to open up Statuary Hall for that many dinners. But there is multiple spaces within the Library of Congress. And you could host a dinner, for example, Financial Services. You invite Republicans, the entire committee. And you have 10 seats per table. You do four Rs, four Ds. And you bring in people that you anticipate will be speaking in front of the committee and for hearings. You know, we can anticipate this pretty well with Financial Services. I imagine it is the same for most other committees. And you just have a get to know each other. There is no—there is no agenda. It is just, what are you working on?

So I think that is something that is an easy, low-hanging fruit that we can do. But there is also this opportunity of issues. I mean, there is 10, 20, 30 issues that are very important to everybody. Why not have a dinner just to get to know people? Hey, if you care about immigration, we are going to have this opportunity where it is going to be an incredible experience to go and have dinner in the Library of Congress—it is beautiful—and share a meal together. And, you know, make sure each table is divided, R and D.

And these are just layouts. I mean, I think everybody can agree that this is something that should be going on that is not. So I think that we will spend some time looking into that more.

And the other thing with civility, a civility officer, I don't know where they would go. But this is not going to be easy. What I am talking about is not something that you just say: All right, you do this.

Somebody is going to have to be in charge of making sure that all the committees are scheduled right. We don't even populate some of the committees until a certain time. So there is all this scheduling. And then you have to make sure that—you know, I know that Zoe Lofgren and Rodney Davis serve on four committees or five—I don't even know—five committees. It is crazy. So you got to make sure there is no conflict, but it is doable. It is very doable.

So I think that that is a really good direction that came out of everything that we just talked about. So, I mean, any thoughts on that idea? I mean, it seems like we are taking everything that we just talked about and putting it into an action item.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yeah, I would happily jump in on that.

I love the idea of the dinners and having an opportunity from people from different parties to have an opportunity to connect. There is something humanizing about breaking bread. There is something—this has been, gosh, since the—the beginning of time where people connect more deeply when they have an opportunity share a meal together.

I will also on that vein share something that could be a potential recommendation, as well, that could be useful from the business world is—and Liz kind of talked about this, but this is a little bit different—is Bring Your Child to Work Day.

Now let me explain. Not necessarily bringing your child into committee hearings but having an event once a year where—because I know the challenges—and Dr. Craig had talked about this before—where people don't live in the District anymore. They live away from D.C. So the idea of bringing your family here for a period of time where they could have an event, where it is bipartisan, and there is speakers, and there is teaching events. But, most importantly, lawmakers and their children get to interact with other lawmakers and their children. And the children are in age-appropriate events that are things that they can enjoy and have an opportunity connect.

It builds the trust that I think is so desperately lacking in this institution where people can feel like: Hey, my kids get along with their kids, and there is an opportunity to do this. One, it will also help to make people understand what their kids—what their parents do for a living, which is certainly nice. But maybe, more importantly, it will remind lawmakers to set positive examples to their children and have an opportunity connect to people who may ideologically think a little bit differently from them. And I think it is a powerful way to begin this process and gives people something to look forward to on a bipartisan basis.

Ms. CRAIG. And I would just say I think also the thing of the committee dinners idea is a great idea. I would suggest, instead of trying to make it so the entire committee gets together, because that is going to be really hard with some of your bigger committees and scheduling is a nightmare, obviously, but if you made it so that it was just like a small dinner, like eight members of Financial Services and the members had to sign up, it also creates some scar-

city, like I think that could also get people a little more excited if it is hard to get into the dinner. And so, you know, it becomes something that, you know, they want to do—they haven't had the chance to do it—and facilitate participation with the schedules.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Phillips.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Just one more quick question, and we have spoken about this pretty regularly. Just the physical construct of this hearing is remarkably unique in Congress. We are facing each other instead of backs towards one another. And maybe even more important, we are all on the same level, you know, you testifying with all of us, Democrats and Republicans. Do you think the physical construct perhaps of how we do our hearings and conduct our meetings might even change? In my experience, it is a little harder to be rude to someone who is just a few feet from you, not to mention physically on the same level. So any thoughts on that?

Mr. RICHARDS. I mean, 100 percent, 100 percent. I think, Mr. Phillips, just this idea of sitting—and I am a little bit of a political nerd. So I do—watched a few hearings in my day. But, to your point, it is having layers of higher ranking people with more tenure sitting higher than ones who are lower ranking, so to speak, and talking to the backs of people's heads is not—not only does it not increase collaboration, but it is just not really a civil way of doing it.

This is an opportunity for hopefully whoever has C–SPAN as part of their cable package to see how this actually works——

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yeah.

Mr. RICHARDS [continuing]. When people do look at each other in the eye and have an opportunity to communicate. It is not just the subject matter that is creating this civil conversation that we are engaging in, but I do believe, to your point, it is the format.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yeah.

Mr. RICHARDS. I think it makes a huge difference, and I don't want to overstate that. I think it does make a difference to be able to see people and look at them when they are speaking.

Ms. CRAIG. And I want to—oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Ms. WISEMAN. I just wanted to add to that. I do think it is hard to be divisive and dislike people when you are close to them. And it makes me think—I want to share just a small story because it is about sports, and I haven't been able to add to the sports metaphor. And it is something—a story I heard Steve Young tell, you know, former 49er quarterback.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yeah.

Ms. WISEMAN. And he talked about one of his opponents, Reggie White, who was this, like——

Mr. RICHARDS. Uh-huh.

Ms. WISEMAN [continuing] Fierce——

Mr. RICHARDS. SURE.

Ms. WISEMAN[continuing] Lineman and he talked about what it was like being the quarterback in the pocket, like, knowing that Reggie White, who was, I don't know, like, 6 foot 5, like, I don't know, 300 pounds of, like, massive offensive line coming at him. And he said: I could hear Reggie coming. He was loud, like, I knew he was coming to get me. And I lived in terror of this man.

He said: But when Reggie would come and tackle me—you know, I think he led the NFL in quarterback sacks. He would take Young, and he would grab him. And he would tackle him to take him down, and then he would use all of his own weight to flip Steve over and so that Steve landed on top of him so that he would take him down but not hurt him.

And then Steve said: And then, as soon as he tackled me, he would be like, "Hey, Steve how you doing?"

And Steve would be: Not so great right now, actually, but glad you asked.

He would be like: Hey, Steve, how is your dad?

And, you know, Steve is trying to shake it off. And I think it is this wonderful metaphor, which is you can be fiercely competitive.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Ms. WISEMAN. You can be on opposing sides. You know, Reggie came at him with everything he had and was ready to take him down, but he did it with civility.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yeah.

Ms. WISEMAN. And he didn't hurt Steve.

And I think that is a metaphor for how people can work. Yeah, you can be competitive. You can try to be vying for a point of view, but you can do it with dignity and civility and with good leadership. It is just like we need a few more Reggie Whites in Congress. So that is what I would offer around proximity, like they are close.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I love that.

Ms. CRAIG. And the only thing I would add is that I think that, you know, one of the strengths of this structure of a committee hearing is that it does turn into much more of a conversation. I mean, your average committee hearing, you know, you come in. You give your 5-minutes talk. And then you leave. You have no idea what anybody else said in that committee hear—not everyone but frequently you have no idea what anyone else said in that.

Ms. WISEMAN. No, always.

Ms. CRAIG. Yeah. So, you know, this encourages people to stay and have this conversation. But it also encourages more of an exchange of ideas. And, you know, I think that talking about—I don't have a good sports metaphor here, unfortunately. I am really sad about that. But, if you think about—thinking about, like, navigating the fact that there is this really intense conflict that isn't going to go away anytime soon, there are still a lot of areas where there is a lot of room for common ground. You know, if you think about going back to your—you are, like, people who go back to their districts, even if it is a really, you know, deep red, deep blue, they are afraid. They are, like, oh, well, I compromised, and so, therefore, it is bad. The district isn't going to care if it is something like "and we worked together to bring you all of these money" or "we worked together to bring you all of these roads."

You know, that is sort of like distributive politics, in particular, is, you know, everyone is very collaborative. But having the conversations I think reminds people of the areas where you can find common ground, and then that also then facilitates collaboration.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Terrific. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay.

With that, I would like to thank our witnesses for their testimony today.

And, Dr. Craig, I would like to thank your students for watching and boosting our C–SPAN ratings.

I would like to thank the committee members for their participation. You are right. The structure we are using is not cosmetic. I mean, it is with an eye towards trying to foster similar collaboration that we are talking about today.

As always, I want to thank the staff of the committee for pulling together such a great hearing with three such terrific experts.

And, again, thanks to our friends from C–SPAN for showing up.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Can I just make one point?

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah, go on, Ed, Mr. Perlmutter.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I am surprised that Mr. Cleaver didn't talk about Patrick Mahomes.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to thank the National Football League for the substance for the day.

So, 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 material to the chair for inclusion in the record.

And, with that, this hearing is adjourned.

Thanks, everybody.

[Whereupon, at 10:59 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○