

APSA Biographical Directory

Don't Be Left Out

The Association is preparing a *Biographical Directory* of members that will be published in early 1988. The last *Biographical Directory* was published in 1973. In addition to the information normally included in the membership directory (name, address, phone, educational level, current position, and fields of specialization), each member will have the opportunity to list honors, publications, employment history, and public offices.

If you have not received a copy of the questionnaire, mailed to all members, by the time you receive the spring issue of *PS*, please contact the national office at once, (202) 483-2512, and request a form. *The deadline for completed questionnaires has been extended to July 15, 1987.*

Advisory Opinions Issued by Ethics Committee

The Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms reviews grievances of political scientists who allege a violation of professional rights and standards, or wish an ethical matter reviewed. Members of the 1986 committee included Ada Finifter, Michigan State University; Susan Mezey, Loyola University; Lawrence Herson, Ohio State University; Paul Sniderman, Stanford University; and Morton Tenzer, University of Connecticut. Below are the advisory opinions added by the committee in 1986 to the 19 existing opinions that are published in "A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science," available from the national office for \$3.00.

Advisory Opinion #20 (Adopted May 9 and revised October 24, 1986)

Accepting Offers of Employment

Once an individual accepts an offer of employment from an institution, it is incumbent upon the hiree not to seek or accept further employment for the same initial contract year unless the hiree secures a prior release from the hiring institution.

Advisory Opinion #21 (May 9, 1986)

External Review on Tenure and Promotion Decisions

Principles

In formulating a policy on outside letters of

reference, the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms has tried to consider fairly the interests of all parties to the transaction: (1) the requesting institution, which sees a need for impartial reviews of a candidate's work; (2) the candidate, whose job or future professional status are at risk; (3) the reviewer, whose time and professional qualifications are being utilized by the requesting institution. Therefore, guidelines for external reviews are defined by a triad of rights and obligations: those of the department conducting the review; those of the candidate under review; and those of the external reviewers. All three share values in common—for instance, a commitment to fairness and dispatch. But obligations and rights are not the same for all parties; each may give these values a differing weight, even a conflicting interpretation. Hence the need for guidelines.

1. Where external reviews are used in tenure and promotion decisions and if they are used in reappointment decisions, it is the right of faculty members to receive, and the obligation of academic departments to provide, external reviews that are expert, disinterested and timely.

2. Guidelines, necessarily, must concern general principles. Guidelines for external review are not intended to be, and should not be read as, a uniform code, to be applied to all universities and colleges alike. Academic departments differ, for example, in educational mission, institutional resources, access to external reviewers and size. The proper procedure for one department or institution may not be the same for others.

3. As a matter of principle, a given department should use the same procedures and, insofar as possible, similar criteria for all candidates.