

Minutes of March 2019 APSA Council Meeting

Saturday, March 9, 2019
Washington, DC
Kimpton Palomar Hotel

MEMBERS PRESENT

President: Rogers Smith; **Past President:** Kathleen Thelen; **President-Elect:** Paula D. McClain; **Vice President:** Cathy J. Cohen; **Vice President:** Lisa L. Martin; **Vice President:** Dvora Yanow; **and Treasurer:** Thomas Pepinsky
Council Members: Adam Berinsky, Ann Bowman, Joseph Carens, Mark Crescenzi, Omar Encarnación, Lisa Garcia-Bedolla, Kristian Gleditsch, Lilly J. Goren, Juliet Hooker, Julia Jordan-Zachery, Matthew Kocher, Lori Marso, Erin Richards, Colleen Shogan, Alberto Simpser, Valeria Sinclair-Chapman, Laura Sjoberg, Charles Smith, Rocio Titiunik, Renée Van Vechten, Lisa Wedeen, and Christina Wolbrecht
Guests: Melani Cammett, Robert Lieberman, Nadia Brown
APSA Staff: Steven Rathgeb Smith, Betsy Super, Janna Dietz, Dan Gibson, Kimberley Mealy, Larry Burner, Amanda Grigg, Jon Gurstelle, Casey Harrigan, Meghan McConaughy, Timothy Perkins, Jason Sapia, Tanya Schwarz, and Ashley Vande Bunte.
Not in Attendance: Matt Barreto and Simon Jackman

INTRODUCTION

APSA President Rogers Smith calls the APSA spring council meeting to order. On March 9, 2019 at 8:30 a.m. R. Smith acknowledges the passing of Sidney Verba.

CONSENT AGENDA

R. Smith introduces the minutes of the August 2018 council meeting for council approval. R. Smith moves to approve the minutes, the motion is seconded, and it passes unanimously.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Treasurer Thomas Pepinsky introduces the treasurer's report to update the council on the association's financial position. Pepinsky reports that APSA continues to be in

sound financial shape for current and future operations, and that the market value of the association's assets has increased from \$41.3 million to \$46.6 million. Pepinsky notes that operating revenue was under budgeted revenue, but expenses were under budget as well. The net bottom line was consistent with expectations. The annual meeting in Boston was also very successful and came in over budgeted revenue and under budgeted expenses. The association's journals and publications are on budget, and membership revenue is down slightly. Pepinsky summarizes that the association is in sound financial health due to its growth-producing programs, minimal long-term liabilities, professional accounting practices, and diversified investments. Carens asks about the ethical investment plans. Pepinsky reports that the Investment Committee is working on ethical investing plans, as well as revising the investment policy more generally. APSA Executive Director Steven Rathgeb Smith discusses the draft investment policy and plans for including socially responsible investing.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

S. Smith introduces discussion of strategic planning, the Human Subjects Review Committee report, advocacy and government relations, and international workshops to provide updates to the council. S. Smith provides background on the association's previous strategic planning processes and a timeline for development of the new strategic plan. S. Smith informs the council that the Human Subjects Review Committee has completed its report. The report will be reviewed by the Ethics Committee and then the Executive Committee in June. Following that, the report will be posted for comment and will perhaps be up for review and approval by the council at the August meeting. Yanow expresses concern that the membership and council will not have sufficient time to review the report, depending on when the report is posted for comment. S. Smith notes that he will work with R. Smith to determine the appropriate timeline for approval of the report and ensure that there is sufficient time for comment and revisions. S. Smith discusses APSA efforts in advocacy and government relations,

specifically the recent increase in advocacy and public statements. Yanow asks about trends in public statements issued by APSA and whether more statements are being issued. S. Smith agrees that there has been an increase in statements issued by APSA. Cohen asks about the decision-making process for issuing statements, and whether the membership is engaged in advocacy issues. S. Smith notes that decisions regarding public statements are largely guided by the APSA bylaws, though there are some issues that are in a gray area. R. Smith, Richards, and Cohen discuss criteria for issuing public statements, including the importance of academic freedom and cases where political scientists in particular are in jeopardy, the importance of civic education and advocacy, and the importance of more general public engagement and advocacy. S. Smith updates council on the APSA international workshops including new grants and partnerships.

FISCAL YEAR 2018 BUDGET SURPLUS

S. Smith introduces discussion of the FY18 budget surplus for council discussion and action. S. Smith discusses the background of APSA budget surpluses and the decision that any budget surpluses should be spent, with council consultation. S. Smith discusses the proposal for use of the surplus, described in a memo shared with council. This proposal included dedicating some of the surplus to travel grants, a special projects fund in FY20, and strategic planning priorities. S. Smith notes that the Executive Committee also proposed dedicating some of the surplus to backstop the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute, in case NSF does not provide funding. Sjoberg moves to endorse the plan to use the budget surplus to backstop the RBSI program, increase travel grant funding, support the special projects fund, and support strategic planning priorities. The motion is seconded and passes unanimously.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

R. Smith reports on recent Association activities and accomplishments to update the council on the state of the association. R. Smith discusses the new governance structure, particularly the importance of the policy committees and the increased council

engagement they require. R. Smith discusses the increase in public statements and letters that APSA has issued and encourages council members to draw attention to issues that they believe require a response from APSA. R. Smith notes the importance of coalition building with other political science associations, including in areas like public engagement and harassment and professional misconduct. R. Smith also notes the importance of ensuring that the association is valuable to a wide variety of political scientists and highlights the Presidential Task Force on New Partnerships, chaired by Robert Lieberman.

SMITH TASK FORCE ON NEW PARTNERSHIPS

Lieberman introduces discussion of the activities and initiatives of the Task Force on New Partnerships for council discussion and approval. Lieberman begins with updates about ongoing Task Force initiatives. Lieberman notes that the Peer to Peer Pedagogical Partnership (P4), which focuses on sharing teaching approaches and materials across faculty at different types of institutions, is moving forward with a pilot project in Houston in March. Lieberman updates council on plans for the Institute for Civically Engaged Research, which will be held at Tufts in June and will offer training and networking opportunities to early and mid-career political scientists interested in pursuing civically-engaged research. Lieberman notes that work on an award for civically-engaged research, which was approved by the council in the fall, is also moving forward. In addition, Lieberman updates council on two programs that originated outside the task force that the task force has decided to support: a program at Kent State University aimed at supporting democracy and encouraging civic engagement; as well as the APSA Public Scholarship Program, which works to make research more accessible to the public. Shogan asks if the task force has considered pursuing outside funding, and Lieberman responds that there are several possible opportunities they are pursuing.

Lieberman then discusses the three proposals that council is being asked to approve. Lieberman first describes the research partnership on critical issues, which would convene researchers in collaboration with think tanks and other organizations that span the ideological spectrum to develop high-quality research that could bring clarity to specific debates. Lieberman notes that because of an unexpected opportunity, a pilot for this project is currently underway developing

research to share with the Select Committee on Congressional Reform. Sjoberg and Goren encourage the task force to think broadly and carefully about both how to understand policy relevance and how to ensure ideological diversity. Lieberman then describes the second proposal, to develop an online teaching library to share political science teaching and pedagogical materials. This proposal involves the addition of a managing editor to curate the materials that will be included. Van Vechten indicates amendments to the online library proposal that are being proposed by Teaching and Learning Council Policy Committee, including suggested experience for the managing editor, such as an advanced degree and experience with teaching, as well as the requirement that the library not be launched until it is appropriately populated. Goren notes that it would also be helpful for the managing editor to have social media experience. Lieberman then describes the last proposal for council approval, a Distinguished Award for Civic and Community Engagement. This award would honor significant civic or community engagement activity by a political scientist. Sinclair-Chapman notes that the Public Engagement Council Policy Committee is enthusiastic about the creation of the award, but suggests that eligibility for the award be limited to once every ten years. Richards moves to support these initiatives as amended. Lieberman indicates support for the suggested changes. The motion is seconded and passes unanimously.

APSR EDITOR SEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT

R. Smith introduces Melani Cammett, chair of the APSR Editor Search Committee to present the committee's report for council deliberation and discussion. Cammett describes the process of reviewing proposals and developing the committee report. This included wide dissemination of the call for proposals, encouragement of proposals from a wide array of institutions, and emphasis of diversity in the editorial team. The committee had a multi-stage process, which included an opportunity for potential teams to submit a letter of interest and receive feedback from the committee before submitting the final proposal. The committee used an evaluation tool to help ensure the evaluation occurred in as unbiased a way as possible. Both teams were interviewed by the committee, which then circulated a draft report. The entire committee approved the report that was submitted to the Publications Committee. Cammett

also emphasized that all committee members agreed that either team would be qualified to edit the *APSR*. The proposals were both very high quality, but proposed different directions for the journal.

Wolbrecht, as chair of the Publications Policy Committee, notes that the committee was delighted to see two strong proposals which also included innovation in structure and approach. Wolbrecht explains that the committee was instructed not to endorse or rank the choices, but the committee recognized positive contributions as well as concerns in both proposals.

APSR EDITOR SELECTION DISCUSSION

The council discusses appointment of a new APSR editorial team in executive session. When council reconvenes in regular session, R. Smith notes that the Novkov team has been approved as the incoming editors of the *APSR* and congratulates the team on taking on this important responsibility.

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND THREATS (SWOT) ANALYSIS

S. Smith introduces the purpose and procedure of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis. S. Smith provides background on the current strategic plan and the process for developing a new strategic plan for the coming years. This will include feedback from the council, including incorporating the SWOT analysis conducted here.

The council begins discussion of opportunities currently facing the association. Pepinsky, Smith, Cohen, and Shogan note that the current political climate introduces opportunities including: increased undergraduate enrollment; increased student diversity; and increased demand for expertise. Council, including Richards, Yanow, Pepinsky, and Van Vechten suggest demographics that are currently underserved by APSA that could represent opportunities, including: community college faculty; underrepresented minorities; detained populations; international political scientists; and lapsed members. R. Smith and Sinclair-Chapman note that increased demand for civics courses could represent an opportunity, while Jordan-Zachery, Cohen, and Wedeen note opportunities for increased collaboration with other departments and organizations. Titunik notes that increased interest in data science and big data could provide an opportunity for APSA, while Wedeen suggests that

technological innovation, including the availability of video and podcasting technology, could be an opportunity. Simpser and Goren discuss the opportunity for APSA to play a role in providing information about graduate education for a broader array of students, including international students and liberal arts students.

The council then begins discussion of threats. Richards, Garcia-Bedolla, Pepinsky, Kocher, and Smith discuss changes in the profession and higher education that could pose threats to the association, including: financial cuts; declining enrollments; declines in tenure-track faculty and “adjunctification”; and oversupply of PhDs contributing to increases in non-tenure track faculty. McClain notes that the continued belief that a political science graduate degree is only valuable for a tenure-track job contributes to this threat. Richards, Marso, and Sinclair-Chapman suggest that the perception that a political science degree is not a practical or valuable degree constitutes a threat. Simpser indicates that increases in online learning could be both an opportunity and a threat. Sjoberg and R. Smith note that the potential for internal conflicts and fragmentation within political science, or a move toward a narrowing of political science, could pose a threat. Van Vechten and Goren discuss the extent to which polarization, along with a distrust of expertise and the democratization of information, is a threat. Jordan-Zachery, Pepinsky, and Yanow note that increasing pressure against academic freedom and freedom of speech threatens the practice of political science both in the US and abroad. Smith, Kocher, and Yanow discuss the perceived high cost of membership and the perceived value of being an APSA member as a possible threat.

Council then shifts to discussing APSA’s strengths. Jordan-Zachery suggests that APSA’s ability to bring together large numbers of political scientists is a strength in helping people marshal resources and deal with bullying or other issues within departments. Marso agrees and notes that the APSA Annual Meeting is an important strength of the association. Pepinsky notes APSA’s strong financial position, including its diversified income sources, and also indicates the staff as an area of strength. Hooker suggests that recent governance reforms and the creation of new APSA policies, including the harassment policy, are a strength, and Sinclair-Chapman brings attention to the increased survey data generated by the APSA. Yanow points to increased diversity

within the organization and leadership as a strength. Super points out the strong commitment of volunteers, including committee members and council. S. Smith and Harrigan discuss the APSA sections, including increased section membership, as a strength.

Last, the council discusses weaknesses. Marso notes that because of the annual meeting’s size and format, it may seem overburdened, which inhibits intellectual exchange, and Sinclair-Chapman agrees that the meeting can be large and overwhelming and there is a lack of small settings or intimate spaces for exchange. Richards and Goren discuss the culture within political science, which can be closed to different types of people who could be considered political scientists, and to different career paths for graduate students. Wedeen also notes that the association is relatively American-centric, which could be a weakness. Van Vechten, Jordan-Zachery and Yanow discuss the exclusion of some people from groups and programming, including the potential for sections and other groups to become insular and the lack of mentoring for people throughout faculty ranks who may still be on the margins. Simpser notes that the reliance on volunteers can overburden people, and Titiunik suggests that this is particularly the case in the journal referee process. Yanow suggests that demographic changes, particularly a large number of retiring political scientists, could be a weakness, especially if services for particular groups or categories are not developed.

S. Smith explains the strategic planning process moving forward, indicating that the council policy committees would be asked to contribute and the strategic plan will be reviewed by council in August.

HARASSMENT AND SANCTIONING POLICIES

R. Smith introduces the proposed Section Sanctioning Policy for council discussion. Encarnación discusses the deliberations of the Membership and Professional Development Policy Committee, noting points of agreement and continuing questions.

Garcia-Bedolla and Sjoberg emphasize the importance of climate as well as policy, and suggest that any policy needs to be combined with efforts to change the climate and set expectations. R. Smith asks for particular feedback on the authority sections should have in this area, as well as whether proceedings dealing with harassment and bullying should remain private or be publicized. Pepinsky notes that the proposed principles regarding section sanctioning seem appro-

priate, but there are some tensions that need to be addressed in the policy regarding privacy. Yanow notes lack of clarity in some of the language, including who or what is specifically meant by section, whether a policy like this should apply to other groups like related groups or caucuses, what the proposed timeline would be, and who would hear any appeals. C. Smith emphasized the importance of seeking appropriate legal counsel. Van Vechten notes that there could be a fairness issue if sections react differently to similar situations. Titiunik indicates that there should also be a policy addressing how to deal with accusations against individuals in leadership positions. Yanow suggests that a specific bullying policy would be helpful, and Carens notes that clarity in any policy would be useful to avoid subjectivity. R. Smith notes that it seems clear that the council is not ready to vote on this policy so he would like to move on to discussion of next steps.

R. Smith shifts discussion to broader questions of harassment, bullying, and sanctions. R. Smith specifically introduces discussion of a professional misconduct case that was investigated by the Ethics Committee and adjudicated by the Executive Committee, and issues this case raised about sharing information about misconduct in different venues and among associations. R. Smith indicates that there has been discussion within the Executive Committee and among political science associations about appointment of two ad hoc committees: one addressing policy issues surrounding who sanctions, under what circumstances, and what available sanctions are, and another to coordinate among associations regarding policy and the possibility of sharing information. Titiunik and Pepinsky express support for creating a policy to share information among organizations, but Pepinsky and Sinclair-Chapman suggest that this policy should be framed as a more general policy about how APSA can release information without a specific agreement with a particular organization. Council discusses potential tensions between releasing information about people who have been found to have engaged in harassment or professional misconduct and privacy for people who were the target of these acts. Sjoberg clarifies that conference behavior must include behavior outside of panels. Mealy reminds the council of the new APSA RESPECT campaign that was introduced at the 2018 annual meeting, to establish expectations about climate at the annual meeting. Council discusses whether the results of the recently adjudicated claim

should be shared or publicized. Yanow suggests that legal counsel should be consulted again before releasing identifiable information about the recently adjudicated claim, and C. Smith suggests that if a name is released details should be included to ensure that the nature of the behavior is clearly understood. R. Smith also shared concerns about the investigation and sanctioning process conveyed by the individual who had been sanctioned. These concerns included the possibility of double jeopardy and appropriate rules for evidence and recusal. The Ethics Committee and Executive Committee reviewed these concerns and did not identify any problems with the process that was used.

RBSI ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mealy introduces Nadia Brown, the chair of the RBSI Advisory Committee, to present the committee's report for the purpose of updating council.

Brown discusses her experience as an RBSI alumna and the overall importance of the program. Brown introduces the goals of the committee: to foster a mid- and long-term future for the RBSI program focused on sustainability and growth, to provide recommendations for the future format and funding strategies, and to provide leadership and governance on the use of the endowment fund. Brown describes the committee's process, which included interviews with staff and alumni, a visit to the RBSI recruitment fair, and an interview with the director of RBSI. The committee recommends moving forward with a hybrid model for RBSI, which would increase support for the existing RBSI institute at Duke and create satellite institutes to serve additional students and diversify the model. The committee also provides recommendations for cultivating partnerships, exploring training workshops and certification opportunities, increasing RBSI alumni engagement and support, continuing fundraising, and creating a call for proposals for future RBSI sites. The committee recommends that the next steps include the creation of a new advisory committee to move forward with this process, and recommends rolling over some members of the current committee into the new committee. The new committee would be charged with assessing the stability of the hybrid model, offering advice on the financial outlook of the program, conducting informational conversations with institutions, and drafting the call for proposals.

Jordan-Zachery and Thelen express their enthusiasm for the recommendations.

Sinclair-Chapman and Brown ask about potential satellite sites, the logistics of the call for proposals, and whether APSA would support universities that don't have the required faculty, department, or institutional commitment components. Garcia-Bedolla expresses support for the hybrid model, which could leverage additional funding and provide more options for students. The council thanks McClain for her service to the RBSI program and expresses support for the recommendations.

MEETING SAFETY POLICY

R. Smith introduces discussion of the proposed protest policy for the purpose of council discussion and approval. Hooker, chair of the Meetings and Conferences Committee, discusses background on the policy and expresses appreciation for the Membership Committee's approach in focusing on the safety issues and attempting to facilitate safe protest. Yanow expresses concern about whether this policy would effectively protect staff safety in the case of protests. Hooker notes that the policy would clarify what behaviors are acceptable, which would make staff involvement clearer and prevent the need for staff to referee potential conflicts. Sinclair-Chapman suggests clarifying who is indicated when the document mentions the event host. Carens, C. Smith, and others note that protests are often intended to be disruptive and could be mistaken for bullying. Carens suggests specifying acceptable and unacceptable behavior. Hooker and others note that the code of conduct covers acceptable and unacceptable behavior. Jordan-Zachery asks whether the policy would protect unplanned protests. Hooker and Super note that the policy would still cover unplanned protests, but without prior notice it will be more difficult for APSA to effectively facilitate the protest. Pepinsky, R. Smith, and others discuss who is eligible to protest, and Hooker and R. Smith note that registered attendees are covered by the policy but individuals who are not registered for the conference are not allowed in the panel rooms and could be removed. Kocher notes that the default for hotel and site security would be to stop any protest or disturbance, and part of the goal of this policy is to prevent that. Yanow and Encarnacion discuss the possibility that the policies of other organizations could provide a model. Richards notes that, while the policy is not perfect, she is in favor of approving the policy so that it is in place for the upcoming annual meeting, even if work on the policy

continues. Sinclair-Chapman moves to adopt the proposed meeting safety policy. Yanow offers a friendly amendment specifying that the meeting safety policy will be adopted as a temporary measure and deliberations by the appropriate committees will continue. The amendment is accepted. The motion to approve the policy as amended is seconded and approved unanimously.

AWARD PROPOSAL POLICY

R. Smith introduces discussion of the proposed Award for Civic Engagement, in honor of Theda Skocpol. This award would honor efforts to bring political science research to the broader public. If the council approves this proposal it would create an ad hoc committee to create criteria and pursue funding for the award, and develop the proposal more fully. Sinclair-Chapman discusses the deliberations of the Public Engagement Committee, including the role of naming in APSA awards. The committee endorses the proposal but encourages the council to carefully consider issues of equity in the naming of awards going forward, including race, gender and their intersection. The committee notes that of APSA awards, only four are named after women and only one after a woman of color. Hooker asks about the differences among this award, the proposed award for civically engaged research, and the Humphrey Award. R. Smith explains the distinctions, as discussed by the task force and the Public Engagement Committee. Cohen expresses concern about the proposal and the general approach to naming awards, and suggests that a committee which could issue an open call for suggestions in naming the award would be more equitable. Council discusses the pros and cons of approaches to naming the award, including the extent to which the proposed name exemplifies the work intended to be honored, and the fact that it is unusual for an association-wide award to be named after a political scientist who is still living. R. Smith reminds the council that the proposal under consideration is for the council to create an ad hoc committee to develop an award for civic engagement, and proposes that the committee could also be charged with developing a process for naming the award. The committee would then recommend criteria for the award as well as a process for naming the award. This recommendation would then be reviewed again by the Public Engagement Committee. Richards moves to approve this proposal. The motion is seconded and passes unanimously.

POLICY COMMITTEE UPDATES

Gurstelle presents updates from the Publications Policy Committee and draws attention to the initial report presented on the data-gathering initiative for submissions to APSA journals. Moving forward, the committee is considering the future of the *JPSE* editorial team, which has requested a two year renewal to their term. An ad hoc committee will be formed to make a recommendation to the APSA council regarding the editorial team's renewal. The committee is also monitoring APSA preprints service and continuing to gather and track data on submissions over a longer timeframe.

Crescenzi presents updates from the Teaching and Learning Policy Committee. The committee has discussed the future of

the stand-alone TLC conference. The stand-alone conference was not held in winter of 2019 for the first time, and the first TLC at APSA event was held in the fall of 2018. The committee plans to collect two years of data, to encompass a year with just the TLC at APSA event and a year with both a TLC at APSA and a stand-alone TLC conference and assess the future of the conference at that time.

Hooker provides updates on the Meetings and Conferences Policy Committee, including plans to revisit the meeting safety policy in light of the comments that were received, plans to monitor trends in manels at the annual meeting, and efforts on proposed changes to the related groups policy, which the committee hopes to bring to council in August.

Encarnación provides updates from the Membership and Professional Development Policy Committee, noting that the committee has focused primarily on the sanctions and safety policies, which it will continue to revisit and develop. The committee is also considering the question of print journals and membership and hopes to turn to issues of diversity in the membership.

Sinclair-Chapman discusses updates from the Public Engagement Committee, including work on a report to better incorporate public engagement criteria into promotion and tenure guidelines. The committee is developing data and working with several groups to gather information on how members are practicing public engagement.

R. Smith asks for any new business. Hearing none, R. Smith adjourns the meeting. ■