

**Women and Minorities**

Improving the Status of Women in Political Science: A Final Report with Recommendations  
 1992 Ralph Bunche Summer Institute  
 Committee on the Status of Blacks Honors Former APSA Graduate Fellows  
 APSA Bunche Students Attend Annual Meeting  
 Participation by Women in the 1992 APSA Meeting  
 APSA Minority Graduate Fellows Selected

September 1992	547
September 1992	607
December 1992	761
December 1992	762
March 1993	107
June 1993	277

**APSA Council Reviews the Credential Referral Service**

At its April 17, 1993 meeting, APSA's Council reviewed the Credential Referral Service, with the following three facts in mind:

- fewer than 2% of APSA's members use this service;
- the expense to APSA greatly exceeds the fees charged for this service; and
- many people who use the Credential Referral Service have alternatives, but not everyone does.

Balancing a concern for fiscal responsibility with a desire to help job applicants, the Council decided to retain the Credential Referral Service but to limit its scope and to require users to pay much more, but not all, of the cost of running this program.

Specifically, only those members earning \$40,000 or less are eligible for the service. The fee to enroll is now \$100 rather than \$25. This covers four referrals per month. Any referrals above four cost \$10 each. As in the past, participants must be current members of APSA and subscribers to the *Personnel Service Newsletter*.

Those members who are eligible and desire to enroll will need to submit \$100 rather than \$25. For current members of the service, the old rules apply until the subscription year is complete.

In a related matter the Council reaffirmed its policy of confidentiality for all letters of reference. Should APSA be notified by an institution that it cannot maintain such confidentiality—because of state open document laws or other reasons—our policy will be to withdraw the file and notify the applicant that this has occurred.

Questions about the new procedures should be directed to the

September 1993

Credential Referral Service at (202) 483-2512, or 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

**APSA Extends Family Memberships to Include Domestic Partners**

Domestic partners of Association members are now eligible to join APSA under family memberships. The Administrative Committee of the APSA Council has affirmed the principle that all APSA programs that are available to spouses of members be available to domestic partners of members, which has led to the extension of the family membership option. The Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession and APSA staff are now exploring other implications of this principle across all APSA activities. Any member with ideas, suggestions, or comments are invited to send comments to Mark Blasius, chair of the Committee, at APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

In principle, a domestic partnership, for purposes of APSA family membership, is defined as two individuals who live in a relationship similar to marriage, who are not married to anyone else, and who agree to be responsible for each other's welfare and to share financial obligations. Further reports on the implementation of this benefit and related policies will be made in subsequent issues of *PS*.

**Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms**

The following report provides an overview of the work of the Commit-

tee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms. The Committee is available to address individual complaints about violations of ethical standards of the discipline, as well as to work with political scientists, departments, and other institutions in advancing professional standards as articulated in the *APSA Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science*.

The *Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science* was reprinted in the June 1992 issue of *PS*. It is mailed to all departments participating in the APSA Departmental Services Program, and is sent free of charge to all senior doctoral students. Members can order a copy from APSA for \$4.00 plus \$1.00 shipping and handling for single copies.

Members of the Committee welcome hearing from political scientists about matters of practice and policy. All inquiries are handled in confidence. The Committee presently is chaired by John J. DiIulio, Jr., Princeton University. Other members are Seyom Brown, Brandeis University; Jean Elshain, Vanderbilt University; Armin Rosencranz, Pacific Energy and Resources Center; and Joseph Silver, University System of Georgia. Correspondence to the Committee should be sent to the Chair, care of APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036; and inquiries can be directed to Michael Brintnall at APSA by phone (202) 483-2512, Fax (202) 483-2657, and E-mail, incem024@sivm.

**The Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms Overview and Status Report**

Alys Brehio and Michael Brintnall, *American Political Science Association*

The APSA Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms has been in place since 1968, when it was formed following recommendations of a Council designated task force chaired by Marver Bernstein. This report provides a brief overview of the work of the committee and of the issues that it faces.

The work of the Committee is intertwined with the Association's *Guide to Professional Ethics in Polit-*

*ical Science*, which is the authoritative statement of ethical principles for political scientists. The ethics code, and subsequent advisory options of the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms and other Council resolutions have recently been revised and updated in a new edition of the *Guide* following work by a recent task force chaired by Lawrence J. R. Herson.

The Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms is concerned about any ethical problem or personal abuse experienced or caused by political scientists acting in their professional capacity. Committee responsibilities fall into three major areas: (1) handling individual grievances and complaints, (2) helping protect human rights of scholars in other countries, and (3) framing ethical guidelines for the Association. Each of these areas is discussed below.

### Individual Cases

Most of the work of the Committee is devoted to handling individual matters raised by political scientists and the institutions they work with. The Committee is charged foremost "to aim for mediation." It does not publicize cases, and asks that all parties to complaints before it not publicize its involvement, in order to increase its effectiveness as a mediator. Cooperation with the work of the Committee is itself considered an ethical obligation of political scientists and departments.

Cases which reach the Committee are hard to classify since they are often bound up in the peculiarities of individual professional or academic circumstances, but a rough coding of cases handled in the last ten years shows the following patterns:

academic freedom	5
sexual harassment	4
plagiarism	2
tenure-salary	6
recruitment-hiring	7
graduate students problems	2
research practices-funding	2
publications	7
other aspects of professional conduct	13

Some themes, such as hiring and promotion, provide a steady work-

load. Other issues fluctuate with the times—in the past, issues such as access to data under the freedom of information act, and affirmative action complaints, were prominent concerns before the committee, but now are uncommon.

### The Process

The committee does not render judicial opinions; its goal is to solve problems rather than to settle scores or declare winners. It does not assume an advocacy position in its deliberations or fact finding. However, should it find that an ethical violation has occurred, the Committee will take any actions it can to support those individuals who it concludes have been treated unfairly by other persons or institutions. These actions usually involve persistent contact and persuasion with the parties involved, and a reliance on pressure of peer commentary. The Committee does not have the power of censure. As a practical matter, the committee does not handle cases that have not exhausted existing internal grievance procedures or cases in litigation.

Typical practice when a complaint is received is to request detailed information in letters from both parties. The parties are advised that the process is confidential and that they should not publicize the involvement of CPERF. Should the initial inquiry show a need, a special representative is appointed to conduct a more thorough investigation of the case. A special representative is a political scientist appointed by the Committee to conduct fact finding and mediation. The Association's guidelines call for the special representative to have "the judgment and sensitivity necessary to win the confidence of those involved."

Service as a special representative is one of the more substantial contributions a member can make to the profession. It usually means throwing oneself in the midst of thorny and sometimes unpleasant personal and departmental situations, in which success is unpredictable, though personally rewarding when achieved. Further, such service is publicly unsung, since the situation remains confidential. Nine political scientists have served as special representatives in the past 10 years.

Some fact finding leads to an early conclusion that a complaint is unwarranted, or committee involvement is inappropriate (e.g., the matter is in litigation) and further action is not taken. In other instances, it has taken lengthy investigation, stretching over a year or more, to determine whether or not an ethical violation has occurred. In those matters reaching a definitive resolution, slightly over half are found to be justified complaints.

Most often, however, a definitive resolution is impossible, since the situation complained about is often highly fluid and involving many participants—e.g., a graduate student complaining that an opportunity to retake general examinations was unfairly denied by the department, but reaching a compromise solution through the university's own grievance process. In such a matter, the Committee will stay informed, and may communicate with the department about ways to review its decision making which led to the initial grievance, but would otherwise close the file without reaching any particular formal finding.

### Illustrative Cases

No case is typical, but composites can illustrate the Committee's work.

(1) A publishing company reprints a scholar's work without obtaining appropriate permission or providing for compensation. The scholar notifies the Committee of this violation. Requests for information from both parties are made. After review, and the tracking of a paper trail through several publishers and re-publishers, the Committee finds that a violation of ethical practice in publications has been committed and sends out letters urging the publishing company to provide compensation, apologize for their violation or carelessness, and take the appropriate steps to correct their procedures for the future. It takes repeated appeals to get a reply. Ultimately, the publisher responds and apologizes to the author who prefers to forego the modest compensation involved. The publisher also agrees to reform the practice which led to the abuse, and volunteers to engage in future discussion with the Association about designing new reprint policies to adapt to

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION  
Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession

The APSA is studying the relationship between sexual orientation and professional life. We urge all APSA members regardless of their sexual orientation to complete this questionnaire and mail or FAX it to the APSA Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession (CSLGP), c/o Michael Brintnall, 1527 New Hampshire Ave N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036. FAX: 202 483-2657. Anonymity and confidentiality will be completely protected.

Our goal is to hear from as many political scientists as possible. We recognize that this non-sampling methodology poses some limitations on analysis. If you know a political scientist who is unlikely to see this questionnaire, please make a copy and pass it on. We encourage you to respond in depth to any question on a separate page. The Committee will report on the results of this survey, and of a separate survey of department chairs, in *PS*.

1. Please check or complete all that apply to you:  
 graduate student;  non-tenure-track faculty;  part-time faculty;  untenured faculty;  tenured faculty;  
 government employee;  private for-profit sector employee;  non-profit sector employee;  unemployed;  
 female;  male;  bisexual;  gay;  heterosexual;  lesbian;  US citizen;  resident alien.

If you are in an academic institution, is it:  PhD granting (in political science);  MA granting (but not PhD) in political science;  4-year college;  2-year institution;  public;  private religious;  other private

What is your date of birth? \_\_\_\_\_. What is your race or ethnicity? \_\_\_\_\_  
 What is the highest degree you have received? \_\_\_\_\_; year awarded? 19\_\_\_\_.  
 What subfield of political science is your specialty? \_\_\_\_\_

2. What is your assessment of how appropriate the following are in political science:

	Very Appropriate	Appropriate	Not Appropriate	Not Familiar With This Topic
Research on topics of lesbian or gay politics in your subfield	—	—	—	—
Graduate seminars on lesbian or gay politics	—	—	—	—
Undergraduate courses on lesbian or gay politics	—	—	—	—
Integrating topics on lesbian or gay politics into undergraduate courses	—	—	—	—

In what courses would topics on lesbian or gay politics be most appropriate? \_\_\_\_\_.

In what courses would topics on lesbian or gay politics be less appropriate? \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Do you include lesbian or gay topics in your teaching?  regularly;  on occasion;  no;  NA.

If so, do any courses you teach have 10 percent or more lesbian or gay related content?  yes;  no;  
 25 percent or more?  yes  no. What percent of the lesbian or gay content is AIDS related? \_\_\_\_\_

If you do not include lesbian or gay related issues in your teaching, why not?

4. Do your research interests include lesbian or gay topics?  extensively;  somewhat;  a little;  no.  
 Have you ever been encouraged or discouraged from conducting research on gay or lesbian topics? Check all that apply:  no;  strongly encouraged;  encouraged;  discouraged;  strongly discouraged.

Have you ever avoided pursuing research on these topics: (a) out of concern that it would not be considered "serious political science?"  yes;  no; (b) for fear that others would label you as gay?  yes;  no.

5. Have you ever encouraged or discouraged anyone else, for whatever reason, from conducting research on these topics?  no;  strongly encouraged;  encouraged;  discouraged;  strongly discouraged.

6. If you wrote an article on gay or lesbian politics, to which professional journal(s) would you be likely to submit it?

Association News

7. Are you a mentor for lesbian and gay students?  yes, with grad students;  yes, with undergraduates;  no. Of the time you spend dealing with gay and lesbian undergraduates, what percent is on  personal matters;  academic matters? For gay and lesbian graduate students, what percent is  personal;  academic.

8. Have you experienced or witnessed a situation in which you believe a person's perceived homosexuality helped, hurt or was deemed irrelevant, in the following circumstances:

	Yes: helped	hurt	no impact	No: never
graduate school admission or aid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
course grade received	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
dissertation sponsorship	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
job recommendations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
hiring/job search	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
reappointment, promotion or tenure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
research funding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
publication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
teaching assignments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
actual teaching in classroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
teaching evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
collegial relations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
student advising	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Has any other political scientist you know experienced discrimination in such situations?  no;  yes.

9. If you are lesbian, gay, or bisexual:

a. In what situations or to whom are you "out"? (check all that apply)

In general:  to everyone;  to no one;  parents;  sibling(s);  most straight friends;  some straight friends; On campus or at work:  only to gays/lesbians;  most/all colleagues;  some colleagues;  most/all staff;  some staff;  most/all students;  some students;  dept chair;  senior administrators.

b. Do you feel your job would be endangered if your chair or supervisor knew you were gay or lesbian?  definitely yes;  probably yes;  probably not;  definitely not;  don't know;  NA.

c. Have you ever experienced discrimination as a political scientist because you were gay or lesbian?  yes;  probably yes;  probably no;  no;  don't know. If so, what did you do, or try to do, about it?

d. If you have a partner/spouse, how much is she or he integrated into your academic or professional social life?  not at all;  only with some colleagues;  at most dept or office events;  at most institutional events

e. Did a faculty member ever encourage or discourage you from coming out?  no;  encouraged;  discouraged;  both encouraged and discouraged. Elaborate on separate sheet if necessary.

f. Did you have a mentor in graduate school?  yes;  no. If so, did he or he know you were lesbian or gay?  yes;  no;  don't know;  NA. Was your relationship with your mentor affected by your being lesbian or gay?  enhanced;  unaffected;  hindered;  don't know;  NA.

g. In your current work, do you get asked to speak or advise on issues related to sexual orientation?  frequently;  occasionally;  no;  NA. If you have an academic position, do you experience extra workload as a result of being out?  yes;  no;  NA. If yes, in what way:  excessive committee assignments;  student advising;  more demanding expectations on your scholarship;  other (specify).

h. If you teach and your students know you are lesbian or gay, how have they reacted?

i. Was your career decision in any way related to your sexual orientation?  yes;  no; If yes, please explain.

10. Whatever your sexual orientation, what do you see as the most significant problems confronting gay and lesbian political scientists now? What kinds of changes in policies, practices, etc. would make life better for gay and lesbian political scientists on your campus? in the profession? Please elaborate on a separate page.



rapidly changing publishing technology.

(2) A faculty member at an institution with branch campuses receives contradictory performance reviews from the review committee at the branch and main institutions. The scholar feels she is being held to conflicting standards at the same time and thus brings her case before the committee. The committee reviews the basic information at the next meeting and decides that a special representative should be sent to more thoroughly investigate the motives of the institution and the circumstances surrounding the incident. The special representative finds a sprawling institution in transition, struggling to define generally the balance between roles of the center and the periphery.

The special representative meets with campus officials to discuss these issues, and the Committee follows up with letters to alert the chair and appropriate deans that failure to resolve competing definitions of the institution is harming faculty and their ability to perform. The chair and dean meet with the faculty member and promise a clear statement of which reviews are advisory and which are binding, and demonstrate to the Committee's satisfaction that the institution has procedures underway to establish and implement appropriate policy regarding relations between campuses.

### Human Rights

The Committee is also charged with becoming involved in cases involving the human rights and academic freedoms of scholars in other countries. The Committee relies primarily on requests for action and suggestions from individual APSA members and from international organizations such as the Committee to End the Chinese Gulag, the National Academy of Sciences, Amnesty International, and the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences. The APSA has become part of a "coalition" of scholarly associations working for this cause; the action taken to object to these violations extends well beyond what happens in our organization.

All requests for Committee action

are cross-checked first with the Science and Human Rights Program of the American Association for the Advancement of Science which maintains a clearinghouse of names of scholars whose rights and academic freedoms have been restricted.

The main activity of the Committee in this realm is letter writing—to embassies and to government officials. The format of these letters of inquiry generally follows three guidelines set by the AAAS:

1. to express concern over the arrest of the individual and ask for information about the charges against him/her, the place where he/she is being detained or imprisoned, and if the individual has access to legal counsel. If the charges are known, information about the circumstances which led to the person's arrest and if a trial date has been set is requested.
2. to urge the authorities to make public the charges against the individual and his/her place of detention, and to ensure that the individual is not being mistreated in detention, and
3. to urge the authorities to release all those detailed solely for the peaceful exercise of their fundamental human rights.

As is usually the case, the Committee rarely hears from the countries it writes, but the human rights community repeatedly reaffirms that such letters can have a positive influence on the case in question. Other methods available for human rights actions by the Committee are the possibility for APSA to "assist exiled political scientists by helping them find jobs and assisting in getting their work published" and to "develop contacts with national political science associations abroad to develop ethical standards and to cooperate in verifying violations as well as check with international non-governmental organizations on procedures which the Committee might adopt."

Over the past few years the Committee has written to the governments of Guatemala, Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, and China on human rights matters. The Sudanese matter, at least, showed positive results: the APSA was informed by the U.S.

Embassy that two of the political scientists who had been detained and for whom the APSA had written letters were released with no further restrictions on their behavior.

### Other Issues

Finally, the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms develops policy generally for the Association regarding ethical practice and professional responsibility. This occurs in several ways—the Committee may publish Advisory Opinions which present general statements of practice arising out of the handling of individual complaints. These are in turn periodically incorporated into the *Guide to Professional Ethics* upon review by the Council.

The Committee is also asked to review specific policy matters for the Association, and has been involved in such topics as policy regarding academic freedom in church-related institutions, sexual harassment, standards for employment, research on human subjects, and financial aid deadlines for graduate students.

In the last matter, by way of illustration, the Committee was asked by the Chairs of the Big Ten Institutions (plus Chicago) to review Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) policies which, at that time, had required students to commit to accepting or rejecting financial aid by April 15, but had not protected graduate students from institutions attempting to force an earlier decision. Committee recommendations to CGS contributed to new CGS policy which does protect students in this way. The APSA Council has subsequently endorsed the CGS policy statement for political science departments.

The Committee regularly participates in roundtable meetings of our counterpart scholarly societies to discuss issues of ethics and academic freedom common to us all and represents APSA on the Professional Society Ethics Group organized by the AAAS.