

To the Editor:

In the Fall 1972 issue of *PS*, I reported my tabulation of the sex participation balance at our annual meetings. Our largest minority group, women, were beginning to play roles proportionate to their "strength" in the profession (5.7% of the chairpersons, 11.4% of the paper givers and workshop participants, 12.1% of the discussants) though there were still conspicuous oversights (eleven of the 12 section heads were male as were virtually all of the participants in roundtables and plenary sessions).

The female participation rate continued to improve at our 1973 conclave. Women were 11.8% of the chairpersons (13 out of 110), 11.2% of the paper givers and workshop participants (53 out of 475), and 13.6% of the discussants (24 out of 176). Moreover, their contributions were integrated into the research concerns of the profession to a greater extent than was true a year ago (when a disproportionate number of the female participants were on panels dealing with the role of women).

Though women have "come a long way," they still have a distance to go to achieve full acceptance. One chairman, with a panel of five males and a female, continually addressed the panel as "gentlemen." It still does make a difference with regard to sex composition of the panels whether or not a woman is the chairperson; in the latter event in 1973 32.1% of the paper givers and workshop participants were female (17 of 53) and 20.8% of the discussants were distaff (5 of 24). Yet, there were panels chaired by women that lacked another female contributor as well as a few male-selected panels with more than the token lone lady.

This year one of the 14 section heads was a woman. (It has been announced for 1974 that two of the 17 section organizers will be female.) The best showing of women as chairpersons came in the section (headed by a male) on Urban and Community Processes; three of the nine panels were headed by a woman. Not a single female headed panels in the sections on Law and Judicial Processes, Political Theory and Methodology and Analytical Theory.

In the light of their 1973 showing we can conclude that women are at last being represented on our program to the extent of their attendance at the national meetings. There are some discrepant spheres as well as some areas of high concentration. Hopefully greater visibility of female scholars in our discipline will encourage more women to attainments in Political

Science as well as accustom males to regard their sister scholars as co-equal professionals.

Martin Gruberg
University of Wisconsin—Oshkosh

To the Editor:

The exchange of correspondence between Professors Truman and Polsby in the last issue of *PS* provides us with a quick glimpse of the frustrations and problems confronting would-be authors and most managing editors. I would venture to say that both have their problems and that neither position is without its own merits.

Professor Polsby reveals one aspect of the review process that does, I think, do potential injustice to manuscript authors. I am referring to the policy of assigning new reviewers to manuscripts that have been revised and returned to the managing editor. It seems to me that this procedure almost mitigates any rationale for revising the manuscript in accordance with the suggestion of the original referees. Isn't it conceivable that the second group of referees might have liked the manuscript, and recommend its publication, in its original form? Isn't it also possible that the very changes made in the revised manuscript cause the second group of referees to recommend against publication? Furthermore, if there is a problem in securing referees and getting manuscripts reviewed expeditiously, why not use the original referees who are familiar with the weaknesses of the earlier version of the manuscript and might be able to arrive at a publication recommendation with less travail?

Peter R. Gluck
University of Michigan—Flint

To the Editor:

It should surprise no one that there is dissatisfaction among our colleagues regarding the problems of publishing the results of scholarly efforts. Rejection rates are very high; I understand they approach 90% in the case of the *Review*. Moreover, long delays are normal between submission and acceptance, or rejection, and acceptance and publication.

Yet friends on the psychology faculty inform me that their acceptance rates run about 60% and from submission to *publication* the average wait is but two or three months. I should like to recommend that the Association commission a study of publication patterns in our

related disciplines; sociology, economics, psychology, history, etc. The findings would form a prescriptive outline for reform within our profession and would also be of value to administrators debating the tenure and promotion of specific individuals.

Peter A. Goudinoff
University of Arizona

To the Editor:

The full membership of the American Political Science Association should be apprised at the earliest moment of the unanimous adoption, upon recommendation of its Executive Council, by the Business Meeting in New Orleans on September 5th, of the Resolution opposing state-mandated enforcement of "competency/performance-based teacher education (C/PBTE)" in the colleges and universities of Texas and in other states.

The matter is of *national* concern because Texas is but one of at least 13 states in which this one approach to the preparation of public school teachers in certification programs of higher educational institutions has been ordered by the government. The other states presently affected are Alabama, California, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee (administrators only), Vermont, Florida and Washington. The State Board of Education in Arizona has ordered this approach to begin on July 1, 1974. Other states known to be contemplating such a requirement include Nebraska, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Nevada, New Mexico, Wisconsin, and Georgia. Impetus for this latest educationist fad derives both from the U.S. Office of Education and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE). Data summarized in this paragraph are drawn from Alan Schmieder, *Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene* (Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1973), pp. 32-48, and A. P. Wilson and W. W. Curtis, "The States Mandate Performance-Based Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 55, no. 1 (Sept. 1973), p. 64. (The entire January, 1974, issue of the latter publication will be devoted to C/PBTE.)

The extent of the problem will be evident. But it is less easy to describe just what all this means, particularly since the doctrine itself is couched in arcane jargon, and there are many local variations. Just *what* is being imposed by governmental fiat can best be learned from an earlier AACTE publication by Stanley Elam, *Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art* (1971).

Why ought political scientists be alarmed by this phenomenon? The Texas situation is instructive. In brief, under terms of

new Teacher Certification Standards issued by the state Board of Education in mid-1972, every college and university presuming to prepare public school teachers must "commit" itself to this sole approach not later than September, 1977, or lose approval to conduct programs leading to state certificates to teach for its students. What does this commitment entail? That every course in either an undergraduate or graduate program to be taken by a prospective teacher be taught on the basis of C/PBTE — including courses in political science, history, English, physics, and all the rest, *not* merely the so-called "professional education" courses. To this end, these *Standards* require the preparation of syllabi for each such course which identify specific "competences" and "performances" (behaviors), which are organized into modules, and which provide clear measurement ("assessment") devices. Moreover, an entire curriculum must reflect a high degree of integration so as to demonstrate that every increment palpably contributes to the production of the paradigmatic True Teacher envisaged as the "outcome" of the particular preparation program. Such outside agencies as the Dean of Education, an extra-university body composed of teachers in public schools, educationists, and others and called the "Local Cooperative Teacher Center," and the Central Education Agency itself must give prior approval to any such proposed program before it is acceptable. As said, this set of requirements applies no less to master's and doctoral students than to the undergraduates.

The bottom line, then, is this. The mandating of C/PBTE means a state agency is compelling college and university professors to abdicate the most basic principles of academic freedom and integrity and is dictating what and how they will teach. The threat is both real and sinister. It deserves the most vigorous and resourceful opposition of every academician and learned society. It is good that the American Political Science Association now has joined this Association, the Southwestern Social Science Association, the American Historical Association, and the American Association of University Professors in voicing protest against a new and incredibly arrogant tyranny. Now, how do things stand in *your* state?

Ellis Sandoz
East Texas State University

RESOLUTION ADOPTED
by The

American Political Science Association
at its Annual Meeting in
New Orleans, September 5, 1973

WHEREAS: The Texas Education Agency adopted, in June, 1972, a set of Teachers Certification Standards which require *all* Teacher Education courses to

be cast in a "Competency/Performance Based Teacher Education" (C/PBTE) format, including all courses in political science and other disciplines which are part of any Teacher Education program at the undergraduate or graduate level, and;

WHEREAS: These standards also require approval of outside agencies for substantive, discipline-oriented courses, and;

WHEREAS: Agencies in other states are giving serious consideration to C/PBTE as the single approach to teacher education, now, be it

RESOLVED, that the American Political Science Association at its Annual Meeting views with deep concern any effort to impose a single approach or a single doctrine on those involved with teacher education; be it further

RESOLVED, that the APSA express its long standing commitment to the right of professional competent instructors to determine the substance of their individual

courses and the most appropriate format in which to present the material for these courses; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the APSA urgently requests the Texas Education Agency to reconsider the standards adopted for Teacher Education programs in June, 1972 and, be it finally

RESOLVED, that the President of APSA be directed to communicate the sense of the Association to the appropriate officials in Texas and in other states contemplating the adoption of Competency/Performance Based standards as a single approach to teacher education.

(Editor's Note: Since this matter was brought to our attention by Professor Sandoz and following passage of the Resolution he refers to in his letter, the Association has been contacted by political scientists from several other states facing similar problems with Competency/Performance Based Standards. The APSA Division of Educational Affairs has been given primary responsibility in this area and we urge anyone concerned about the matter to contact Mark Ferber, Director of DEA, c/o APSA.)

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

PERSONNEL SERVICE

The American Political Science Association's Personnel Service operates as a clearinghouse, bringing together political scientists seeking positions and prospective employers. Registration in the service is open to members of the Association and to Political Science Departments. Membership in the Service, which includes a subscription to the monthly Newsletter, is \$6.00 per year. Membership in the Credential Referral Service of the Personnel Service is an additional \$8.00.

NEWSLETTER

A Newsletter, listing openings for political scientists including teaching, administrative and research openings, is mailed monthly to all Personnel Service members. Positions are listed by institution with a brief description of each opening.

CREDENTIAL REFERRAL SERVICE

A file will be maintained at the Association office for all members of the Credential Referral Service. This file will include a resume, a dissertation abstract and/or a list of publications, and up to three letters of reference for each member. Referrals are made upon the request of a member or of an institution.

EMPLOYERS USING THE SERVICE

The Association's Council has adopted a policy that it is a professional obligation of all political science departments to list publicly all vacancies in the APSA Personnel Service Newsletter for which they are recruiting at the Instructor, Assistant and Associate Professor levels. In addition, the listing of vacancies at the Full Professor level is strongly encouraged. There is no cost to the institution listing its vacancies with the Service. Forms for listing openings in the Newsletter are available from the Personnel Service.

For further information concerning the Personnel Service write to:

Director, Personnel Service
The American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036