

Draft Minutes APSA Council Meeting

American Political Science Association
Annual Meeting
Wednesday, August 28, 2002
Boston, Massachusetts

Present: Robert Putnam (President), Theda Skocpol (President-Elect), Robert Holmes, Susan Clarke, Nancy Burns, Lawrence Dodd, Richard Brody, Kirstie McClure, Desiree Pedescleaux, Robert Kaufman, David Collier, John Jackson, James Scott, John Garcia, Doris Marie Provine, Kristen Monroe, Katherine Tate, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Valerie Martinez-Ebers, Ronald Schmidt, Sr., Margaret Weir, Mary Segers, W. Phillips Shively, Kathryn Sikkink, Lee Sigelman, Jennifer Hochschild, Michael Brintnall.

Nominees: Susanne Rudolph, Steve Macedo, Marsha Posusney, Gary Segura, Fran Hagopian, Martha Crenshaw, Margaret Levi, Wilbur Rich.

Not attending: L. Sandy Maisel.

Staff: Rob Hauck, Jeff Biggs, Linda Lopez, Rebecca Odum.

Introduction of the Council and Welcome from President Robert Putnam

President Robert Putnam began the meeting by asking Council officers, members, guests, and national office staff to introduce themselves. He then talked briefly about the Administrative Committee meeting and the agenda set forward by that meeting. Putnam mentioned the letter sent by the Association to the Egyptian President on behalf of Dr. Ibrahim and stressed the importance of APSA's timely initiative as the U.S. Government was discussing its stance on the issue at that time. He also urged the Council to take more action on Family-Friendly employment practices. He recognized the issue was addressed by several committees, but stated he had hoped to make more progress on it during his tenure.

Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Michael Brintnall introduced the new staff at the meeting and mentioned the steps being taken to hire a new Program Associate. Brintnall also brought to the Council's attention several items on the Association's agenda. These items included

an overhaul of the data collection process, membership marketing and teaching initiatives, the preprint paper server archive, extending the reach of the Association's personnel service, and the new phase of the Centennial Center. Brintnall asked for the Council's direction and feedback on these issues as the Association moves forward. In regard to membership, Theda Skocpol asked how APSA compared to other member association trends. Brintnall responded that the office would research the question and report back. Brintnall also highlighted a section in the council briefing book regarding Council roles and encouraged members to review the document to ensure it reflects their own perceptions. Brintnall then turned the floor over to Rob Hauck to discuss the Centennial Center.

Report on Centennial Center, Rob Hauck, Deputy Director

In light of the phase change from fundraising to development of the Centennial Center, Deputy Director Rob Hauck reported on the background of the Centennial Center and its current status. The Centennial Committee determined that \$3 million was needed to fund the center. So far \$3.5 million has been raised and of that total \$1.1 million has been donated by individuals. Part of the money will go to the creation of a study center where scholars can carry out their own research in DC. The Center will be mainly for scholars from institutions in the U.S. and abroad who do not have access to affiliated centers in the DC area. Along with the Center, there will be opportunities for grant support in the form of stipends and money for travel. The Center is scheduled to open September 2003. In addition to the Center, there will be endowed programs sponsored by the centennial center in conjunction with a few standing committees of the Association. One such program may be a triennial lecture series at the Annual Meeting on the broad issue of inequality from an interdisciplinary and global perspective. The Committee is seeking funding for programs that will examine immigration from a global perspective in conjunction with other scholarly societies of the U.S. and abroad, and a program on European integration in collaboration with the European Commission. Also, the Center is looking to work with the Congressional Fellows Program to possibly expand it to include an exchange program with the European Parliament. It is hoped that the

research done through these programs is shared broadly, so that presentations are made available not only to public media, but also decision makers in Washington, DC. Hauck mentioned the Centennial Committee's meeting on Friday, August 30 to discuss more initiatives and told the Council he would pass along any ideas the Council had for the Center.

Report of the Treasurer

Robert Kaufman reported that the operating budget is in good shape with a small surplus. However, due to recent stock market performance, endowments are down. Two policy items mentioned were the agreement with Cambridge University Press and dues. Under the agreement, Cambridge has taken over both the production expenses and revenue from advertising and sales in exchange for a royalty payment to APSA. Kaufman stated APSA should net \$100K from this agreement which should help cover the additional expenses from the new journal. Dues will continue to be increased annually by small percentages. Last April they were increased 3%. Susanne Rudolph asked if there was data on how income levels and dues obligations compare with other member organizations. Brintnall responded by saying that information was gathered by Strategic Planning and would be updated and distributed.

Discussion on Civic Education

President Robert Putnam proposed nominees for the standing committee on Civic Education and Engagement that had been authorized earlier by the Council. Putnam stated that the committee initially will be unlike other standing committees because a large number of members are being appointed for a two-year term at the outset. This will allow the committee to develop a research agenda quickly. Future appointments will be staggered to move toward a steady state of nine members beginning with Theda Skocpol asking some members to continue for a third year, and subsequent presidents adding three members each for three-year terms. The nominees include:

Stephen Macedo (chair), Harvard Center for Ethics and the Professions
Yvette Alex-Assensoh, Indiana University-Bloomington
Jeffrey Berry, Tufts University
David Campbell, University of Notre Dame

Pamela Conover, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Luis Ricardo Fraga, Stanford University
William Galston, University of Maryland-College Park
Margaret Levi, University of Washington
Meira Levinson, McCormack Middle School
Richard Niemi, University of Rochester
Wendy Rahn, University of Minnesota
Rob Riech, Stanford University
Katherine Cramer Walsh, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Susanne Rudolph asked what would be the committee's approach—would the committee lay out objectives for staff to research or would position papers result based on own research? Putnam responded that the committee would do its own research and collaborate with other associations. Kristen Monroe followed-up on Rudolph's question and asked for clarification on the real purpose of the standing committee. She also urged the Council to be careful when saying this set of people will be doing research on this topic because a lot of other research is being done on the same topic. Putnam responded by saying this is not to be thought of as the only group working on civic engagement in America and this group would collaborate with other sources. Theda Skocpol added the committee represented to her a new venture and not all the answers are clear at this point. Working group participant and standing group nominee, Margaret Levi, responded that the committee would facilitate the gathering of resources, not necessarily do all the work, but link with each other on existing research.

Marsha Posusney expressed concern about the diversity of the proposed committee stating that the members should represent institutions with a variety of student populations, such as regional, community, or state universities/colleges. Katherine Tate worried that the committee is too "intellectual," and maybe it should be integrated with the Council. She proposed the roster be leaner and include Council members. Kristen Monroe stated she approved of the list if during the discussion on governance the issue of having more input from Council members on nominees was broached. Theda Skocpol stated that the main issue before the Council at this time was to get the committee started.

Council Action: Richard Brody seconded the motion and Council unanimously approved both the proposal and the nominees for the Civic Education and Engagement Committee.

[Note: In light of Theda Skocpol's later request asking for Council's approval of her authority to make substitutions to the committee nominations if the nominees decline, the fol-

lowing action regarding the Civic Education and Engagement Committee took place.]

Council Action: Robert Putnam asked the Council to reconsider the previous action on Civic Education, which they approved. He then asked for Council's approval of the slate of nominations plus two additional nominees pending their acceptance. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved by the Council. Subsequent to this action, the two remaining nominees [E.J. Dionne, The Brookings Institution and Keith Reeves, Swarthmore College] accepted their positions on the committee.

Discussion on Public Presence Advisory Proposal

President Robert Putnam put forth a proposal on public presence which would establish working groups to analyze major issues. He stated that the goal of the public presence initiative is for the Association to become more focused on major issues without taking a particular stance. Initially, there would be two working groups on different topics, the first focused on inequality. Their progress/success would be reviewed after two years. A steady state would be for each president-elect to appoint a new working group focused on a new issue. Putnam assured Council members there is room in the budget for such working groups.

Richard Brody asked how working groups could avoid taking on controversial issues? Putnam responded that though the Association as a whole is barred by its constitution from taking partisan stances, it is not unconstitutional for APSA to appoint a committee to do research that comes to particular conclusions on an issue. Jennifer Hochschild mentioned she was leery about the stances that are taken and nervous about association-sponsored reports. Kirstie McClure stated that the point of the working groups should be to raise questions, not necessarily answer them and that public presence would play a role as a voice to focus attention on the topic.

Phil Shively stated that over the period, the working group should encourage and recruit other reports, and the result would not be just a task force report, but a collection of several reports. Margaret Weir agreed with the idea of no single report, approving of research briefs instead. Bruce Bueno de Mesquita said the model exists from the National Academy of a stand-alone document which would not be included in any APSA journals. John Jackson felt the topic should be more specific, so the research group would be educating the debate and not necessarily coming down on one side or the other. Kristen Monroe responded to the

National Academy model by saying it would still mean taking a position and it would come from APSA. David Collier said he assumes the reports did not have to be approved by Council; they could simply be aware of them. James Scott believed the issue of APSA taking a stand is not a problem because the bigger issue of inequality is important and deserving of attention. Doris Marie Provine asked the Council about its vision for publication of the research—would it be linked to internet or paper? Theda Skocpol stated the purpose of the field trials would be to think through all these issues.

Valerie Martinez-Ebbers asked specifically about the budget. Putnam responded it would amount to \$10K per year/per committee from the general operating budget.

Katherine Tate agreed with the framework of the proposal but was concerned about representation and hoped there was a way to put the spotlight on APSA members who are already doing this research. Lawrence Dodd wondered to what extent the working groups would tackle politically charged issues?

Council Action: The proposal for a pilot initiative to advance the public presence of political science was moved. Under this initiative, two new task forces will be formed to bring political science research to bear on important areas of public concern. Each task force will create a work plan for approval by the Council. The first task force will be named by President Theda Skocpol and will address the issue of inequality in the U.S. President-elect Susanne Rudolph will name a second task force on a topic she proposes. After two years, the Council will evaluate the success of this pilot program and decide whether to continue to sponsor future task forces. The motion was seconded and approved by a vote of 20 in favor, 3 opposed.

Discussion of a Mentoring Program for Women

Robert Putnam expressed the Administrative Committee's enthusiasm for the idea of a mentoring program. At this point in the process, the committee felt the program was not ready for a standing committee, but a task force which would report back after 2–3 years. Bob Holmes expressed the need for more data on the issue to be sure the proposed approach is the best method. Nancy Burns also worried about doing the mentoring strictly over email and that face-to-face contact would be more effective. Theda Skocpol felt the task force should look into the program's effectiveness.

Robert Putnam reiterated the Administrative Committee's position supporting the idea

behind a mentoring program and stressed that several approaches should be explored in detail. Kristen Monroe responded to the Administrative Committee's comments by saying she had no objections to a task force and an evaluation after three years that would include other caucuses (Blacks, Latinos), and assured the Council that it is not just eMentoring, but that the proposal included face-to-face contacts. Valerie Martinez-Ebbers asked to be a part of the program and endorsed the proposal.

John Garcia stated that mentoring is not just about two people, but about multiple individuals and particular attention should be paid to the fit and that people are well-matched. He felt the synergy of the proposal was good because there was multiplicity in terms of forums.

Council Action: The motion was made for a task force on mentoring to report back after three years, after implementing and evaluating an array of mentoring initiatives that would be open to a number of constituencies in the discipline. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved by the Council.

Graduate Curriculum Study Discussion

David Collier gave an overview of the task force and its members. A number of issues they are beginning to focus on include skills of faculty members, identifying best practices, and data collecting. One overarching theme is gathering practical advice. Kristen Monroe suggested graduate training models. Other suggestions included a list of criteria for Ph.D. programs, and a discussion on the changing format of the GREs (and SATs). In addition, a suggestion was made for the task force to provide students with a reasonable portfolio of a graduate department that offers the full set of political science skills. Theda Skocpol thanked David Collier and the Graduate Student Task Force for their accomplishments over such a short period of time.

Report of APSR Editor, Lee Sigelman

Lee Sigelman reported on his first year as editor. During his year, the number of papers submitted increased 18% over last year and 30% in original submissions. However, he stated the mix of manuscripts has not changed dramatically over the past year. The turn around time for manuscripts to reach reviewers was within one day of having received them. Reviewers were given short target dates and on average were able to meet and even beat them. Decisions were made immediately following receipt of the review and the average time for the entire

process was 39 business days. Sigelman expressed the possibility that this could be sped up through more emphasis on technology, however, it may not be wise to speed the process too much. Authors may not feel their manuscript was reviewed properly if they perceive the review time was too short.

A major priority has been to cut down on the number of revise and resubmits. Currently, the number is under half of recent years. As a general rule, what is accepted and what is rejected is resolved within two rounds. Lastly, Sigelman pointed to the listing in the report of the papers to be included in the September and December issues.

Robert Putnam asked if Sigelman has used his own judgment to override a negative review. Sigelman responded positively that there were several instances. Putnam said this was an important procedural change that will have positive substantive effects. Sigelman also noted that he is turning down papers with two negative reviews and not waiting for the third. Jim Scott stated that the articles in the September issue were inspiring and Lee's work has been a real achievement.

Report of *Perspectives on Politics* Editor, Jennifer Hochschild

Jennifer Hochschild started by saying the main item to report is that the journal is up and running with a full-time managing editor, five associate editors, and two book-review editors. Hochschild noted the office is functioning as acquisition editors, mainly looking for articles that are broadly integrative across subfields. Articles of interest that have gone through initial editing are sent for a blind review. The team is also looking to expand the book review section to include reviews of different kinds of media. As for the solicitation process, Hochschild has gone to several convention programs and written to people on the basis of their paper titles alone. This has generated 3–4 pieces that will appear in the first edition of *Perspectives*. To date, since the Call for Papers went out, the number of solicitation/submission transactions totals 90–92. Of that number, one-third of these articles were turned down. Hochschild mentioned the meeting on Thursday, August 29, 2002 which will determine if there is enough variety of pieces to publish the first issue in March 2003. Two holes to make note of for the first issue: the lack of large broad integrative pieces across subfields, which are difficult to get people to write and take long lead times, and the lack of "small-N" qualitative case studies.

Richard Brody suggested basic textbook reviews for inclusion in the journal. Hochschild

agreed that textbook reviews were within their portfolio. Susanne Rudolph asked for a review of the breakdown on the number of submission/solicitations which Hochschild provided. Council noted they did not add up to the total and Hochschild agreed to submit the correct numbers at a later date. Michael Brintnall mentioned the change in the mailing schedule to one journal a month and Robert Putnam announced that the presidential address will appear now in *Perspectives* instead of the *APSR*.

Discussion of Minority Fellowships Program

Michael Brintnall provided Council with background information on the program. The program was intended to provide fellowship support for minority students entering a doctoral study targeting African American, Latino/Latinas, and Native American students. The design of the program called for an award of \$6,000 to a student. However, if the student's university provided \$6,000 or more in funding, that money replaced the APSA funds. Because awardees usually received at least \$6,000 from their institutions, the \$12,000 that was budgeted for the program was rarely expended.

The Council, at its last meeting, asked a working group to discern a way to award funds to this year's class of fellows and recommend a new approach. The group found a way to award the funds, the proposal included in the Council Book is their recommendation for a new way to conduct the program. One highlight of the proposal is the removal of the stipulation that the student receive less than \$6,000 from other sources. The intent is for the designated fellows to receive the funding independent of the resources they receive elsewhere. Another provision of the proposal is funding the students during the summer after their first year to aid in the retention of these students (exact timing dependent on individual student needs). The proposal calls for a \$2,000 award per student at the end of their first year and again after their second year. Six students are chosen for the award, so this translates to a \$12,000 increase in the budget. Also, within the proposal is a provision that states if a student drops out of their program, then the unused award would not go back to the general fund, but be allocated to another minority award program.

Robert Putnam noted the Administrative Committee supported the proposal to double the amount budgeted for the program, but would like to see more research on whether spending money in the second summer is the most cost-effective way to encourage retention. The Administrative Committee proposed that the Council accept all the recom-

mendations from the working group with the qualification that the use of the additional \$12,000 be dependent upon a report back from the group with alternative ways of reaching the end goal.

Katherine Tate noted retention as a huge issue and perhaps anchoring the second year of the award to students in good standing defined by their own departments is the best way to go. Robert Putnam restated that the Administrative Committee urges the same working group to look at whatever systematic data there is to discern where the money would be used most effectively. The issue is not over the amount of funding, but only the effectiveness of the allocation.

Gary Segura suggested front-loading the award would be advantageous because many students currently enrolled in classes do not have other sources of income. Fran Hagopian noted because of APSA's awards, aid from the institutions sometimes are reduced and asked if there was any mechanism for ensuring this would not happen. Brintnall responded that we would get commitment from the institutions on a case by case basis.

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita asked why the committee should regulate the rate at which the money is paid out; why not let the students make the determination? Theda Skocpol noted the point, and wondered if the second installment would not be better used as a dissertation grant instead of a summer grant. Katherine Tate responded by saying the first two years are the critical years in terms of getting funding. Skocpol asked if there was data on that point. John Jackson asked if the working group could get data on past minority fellows. Valerie Martinez-Ebbers responded that it would be difficult to get the data because APSA does not always know where a lot of fellows are.

Dick Brody stated that the Departmental Survey has a calendar of financial aid which would be useful in collecting data for the ad hoc group. John Garcia stated that non-completion does not necessarily mean failure if it is thought in terms of public presence. Katherine Tate urged the Council to keep in mind that many of the minority fellows for this program are not admitted to the top ten schools where summer funding is more readily available. Jim Scott felt that the decision should be left to the discretion of the committee, and a big study is not necessary. Skocpol and Putnam noted that because there is no standing committee for this program and because they are giving out money it is important to be transparent about the process.

Council Action: Robert Putnam called for a vote on the report of the task force and the

increase in the budget pending further investigation to be reported in April. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved by the Council.

Report on Events on the 2002 and 2003 Annual Meeting

Kathryn Sikkink began by thanking Rob Hauck, Jennifer Richards, and the entire APSA staff for their hard work and dedication in support of the Annual Meeting. One substantive comment she had on the program was to support a discussion on changing the date of the program for not only family-friendly reasons, but also public presence to attract more people outside the realm of academia. Putnam agreed that changing the date is an issue worth looking into though not at this particular time because it would be years before a change would occur. Phil Shively commented on the change in format for poster sessions into a colloquium, which is good practice for presenters and urges new program chairs to institutionalize these changes.

Margaret Weir spoke on behalf of the new program committee and stated they were in the process of gathering a variety of thematic panels in honor of the 100th year anniversary. She welcomed suggestions from the Council and noted the meeting will also have a variety of celebratory events.

Approval of the Committee Nominations of President-Elect

Theda Skocpol asked the Council's approval of her committee nominations of those who have already expressed a willingness to serve and the authority to make future substitutions if necessary. There was a question about the Elections Committee and what this approval would mean for them. Michael Brintnall responded the Elections Committee is a subcommittee of the Council and not a standing or an awards committee. The Elections Committee would be nominated some time after the business meeting when it is known for sure which members are on the Council.

Council Action: Robert Putnam called for a vote on the nominations. Council unanimously approved the nominations of the President-Elect.

Discussion of Governance Issues

President Robert Putnam began by encouraging the Council to center the discussion on governance as a whole due to the fact that

no further actions were to take place concerning elections until after the Forum on Elections and the Business Meeting.

Kristen Monroe began the discussion by urging members to attend the Forum and that comments are welcome regarding the plenary on elections. Richard Brody asked for clarification on what is governance beyond the election issue. Putnam responded by saying a discussion on governance could include such items as whether or not more responsibilities should be given to vice presidents, or if the Council should be more representative of non-degree granting institutions, etc. Theda Skocpol added by saying that the discussion could focus on continuity of leadership and the terms of the council—whether or not they should increase terms to three years.

Susanne Rudolph stated that she agreed with the length of Council terms, but noted that the committees and the Council should be more interlocked. Rudolph also thought it important to discuss elections at this time. Kathryn Sikkink agreed and stated that competitive elections play a role because they would make longer terms more legitimate.

In terms of representation, Bob Holmes felt the APSA should poll former members at the state association level and see why they are not currently members of the APSA and ask them specific questions about their reasons for leaving to get a sense of how APSA can increase involvement by smaller institutions. Kirstie McClure stated that the Council should not forget the other regional associations because they are quite diverse. Also, she stated that the Council needs to take advantage of precedents set by other associations and what they are doing with elections. Richard Brody stated that the Departmental Services does a lot to reach out to other organizations in terms of dues structure and it is a mistake to say that the Association does not address these issues.

On elections, Ronald Schmidt stated that governance and elections are intertwined and on that note worried that elections could become a popularity contest that would weaken the legitimacy of the Association's leadership. Bruce Bueno de Mesquita said that research within his own scholarship shows that elections alone do not grant legitimacy, especially if elections are small and there is a small winning coalition.

Theda Skocpol stated that the Association's current Constitution and nominating process, which includes the nominating committee, have done a great job creating a highly representative governing body. Marsha Posusney asked for clarification on the process of elect-

ing. Skocpol responded by saying that ten members can put forward a nominee to contest the slate. Fifty members have to sign a petition to change the system as a whole several months in advance of the business meeting. Susanne Rudolph brought up the suggestion of using Organized Sections as part of the electoral process. They would function as a pre-nominating committee where the nomination of candidates would take place, and the final voting of the Nominating Committee would be made by the entire profession. Posusney also stated the *Perestroika* committee did not agree on how to get minorities on

the Council. The option she proposed was to leave seats open for appointments.

Jim Scott hypothesized the reason the Association has been diligent about making sure the Council is more representative of its members is due to the emergence of *Perestroika*. Katherine Tate stated she would like to consider competitive elections, but worried about turn out and having to do elections at the Annual Meeting. Margaret Levi responded that competitive elections have been done in the Association's past, so there is precedent. Susanne Rudolph said the re-

quirement that ten people are needed to nominate a candidate is a fall back procedure and not part of proper electoral process.

Meeting Adjournment

At the close of the discussion on governance, Robert Putnam asked if there was any further business to discuss. Theda Skocpol presented a gift on behalf of the Association to Robert Putnam for his service as President. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.