

The Commitment of the American Political Science Association to the Principle of Affirmative Action

A Report of the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms to the Council of APSA

February 1, 1983

Members of the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms: Chair, Nancy Zingale, College of Saint Thomas; Louise Comfort, San Jose State University; Marian Lief Palley, University of Delaware; Allen P. Sindler, University of California, Berkeley; John Wahlke, University of Arizona.

The following report was received and approved, as amended, by the Council at its March 10-11, 1983, meeting.

INTRODUCTION

At its May 7, 1982, meeting, the Council charged the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms with the task of formulating "a statement outlining exactly what constitutes affirmative action" in the Association (Council minutes, *PS*, Summer 1982, p. 555). The Professional Ethics Committee met on June 25, reviewed the activities and statements of policy pertaining to affirmative action in APSA, and subsequently drafted this report. An earlier draft of this report was submitted to the Committees on the Status of Women, Blacks and Chicanos, as well as the Women's Caucus for Political Science, for comment. All of these groups approved the report, as the appended materials indicate.

This report divides the affirmative action policy of APSA into two parts: the policies and activities of APSA itself and the work of the Committee on Professional Ethics. Although this division is somewhat artificial, it does recognize that APSA has direct control over the activities of its national office and its own activities but has a different relationship with departments of political science. For example, in its own practices APSA can make sure that the national office follows equal opportunity employment practices. In the case of political science departments of colleges and universities, however, such direct control is neither possible nor warranted. Through its Professional Ethics Committee APSA has developed a set of procedures to help ensure that hiring and promotions in departments of political science are made on the basis of relevant profes-

sional criteria and that due process is followed. The adequacy of these procedures and some options to strengthen them are discussed later in this report.

APSA ACTIVITIES AND POLICIES PERTAINING TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Over the past decade and a half, APSA has actively worked to encourage and promote the interests of women and minorities in the Association in three specific areas: (A) the recognition of minorities and women within the Association; (B) the development of employment policies consistent with the principles of affirmative action; and (C) the provision of specific services for these groups.

(A) The Recognition of Minorities and Women within the Association

The unique problems of women and minorities in the profession have been gradually recognized in a variety of ways often due to the efforts of women and minorities themselves at the Annual Business Meetings and Council meetings. This recognition has been manifested in the following ways:

(1) The Committee on the Status of Blacks, the Committee on the Status of Chicanos and the Committee on the Status of Women have been established as official APSA committees whose activities are funded through general membership dues and outside grants and are supported by designated staff at the national office.

(2) APSA presidents and Council members have made a conscious effort to appoint women and minorities to official APSA committees, including award committees. However, the past president of the Women's Caucus for Political Science has maintained in a recent Caucus newsletter that appointments and nominations have been inadequate (*Quarterly*, July 1982, pp. 3-4).

(3) APSA presidents and Council members have made a conscious effort to make sure that women and minorities are placed in leadership positions within the Association, as committee chairs, Council members and Association officers. Both the current editor of *APSR*, one of the most prestigious and significant positions in the profession, and the Program Chairs of the 1982 and 1984 Annual Meetings are women. It should be noted, however, that only one black has ever been president of APSA (in 1954), and no women or other minorities have ever served as president. In addition, there has been at various times a concern that inadequate numbers of women and minorities have been placed in leadership positions in the Association.

(4) The rule for participation on panels at the Annual Meeting has been altered to permit any individual only one opportunity to participate on the official Program at the Annual Meeting. This change has enabled more people to participate on panels, especially those people outside the traditional scholarly networks. It is argued that minorities and women are less likely to be a part of those networks and consequently are the likely beneficiaries of the new rule.

In addition, in recent years Program Chairs and section heads have made a conscious effort to recruit women and minorities for participation in the Annual Meeting. For example, Herbert Weisberg, 1983 Program Chair, has assembled a Program Committee with seven out of 23 sections headed by women. This composition is significant in that, as Martin Gruber has pointed out, participation by women on panels increases significantly when women are section heads and panel chairs. According to Gruber, "50 percent of the 1981 convention's women chairs came from the three women-headed sections as did 31.6 percent of the convention's female panelists and 28.6 percent of the female discussants" (PS, Fall 1981, p. 725). Presumably, this same pattern holds for minorities, although similar studies have not been undertaken for them.

Finally, with regard to the Annual Meeting, the APSA participated in the national boycott of states which had not ratified the Equal Rights Amendment. This step was taken at the behest of a vote of members at the annual Business Meeting in 1978 and at the risk of considerable financial loss to the Association.*

(5) In addition to tangible recognition of minorities and women in the Association, the Council and the members at the annual Business Meeting have specifically encouraged participation by Chicanos in the Association (PS, Winter 1971, p. 63). It should be noted that the small number of minorities in the profession is a problem which needs to be addressed for Chicanos in particular. Out of 679 Ph.D.s awarded in 1981, in the U.S., only nine were granted to Hispanics who are U.S. citizens or have permanent visas. This statistic suggests the importance of fellowship programs in political science to bring Chicanos and other minorities into the profession.

*The Hilton Corporation subsequently filed suit against APSA which resulted in an out-of-court settlement obligating APSA to hold meetings at Hilton hotels at jointly agreed-upon sites for the five years after the deadline for ratification of the ERA had expired.

(B) The Development of Employment Policies Consistent with the Principles of Affirmative Action

APSA has demonstrated a strong commitment to affirmative action hiring and promotion policies at the national office, through the *Personnel Service Newsletter*, and in reports in PS which provide data on placement, hiring and new Ph.D.s, categorized by sex and race. These reports provide data against which to measure progress within the profession in employment.

There are currently four full-time professional political scientists at the national office. Two of the four, including the assistant director, are women. A fifth professional political scientist, who is part-time, is black. The head of the membership office is a black woman, the head of the business office is a woman, and the convention coordinator is a woman. Of the 13 full-time non-political scientists at the national office, all but one are women and six are black. There are no Chicanos at the national office.

Affirmative action principles are also followed in the *Personnel Service Newsletter*, as the attached (see Appendix) "Guidelines in Employment Opportunities" indicate. These guidelines, developed between 1970 and 1975 by the Council and at the annual Business Meeting, include:

- (1) an open listing policy which requires all political science departments to list all openings at the temporary, visiting, instructor, assistant and associate levels and strongly encourages listing at the full professor level;
- (2) a statement on nepotism rules which reads that "Employment and advancement should be based solely on professional qualifications without regard for family relationships";
- (3) an encouragement that departments should make more use of part-time positions which should "carry full academic status"; and
- (4) three policies of equal employment opportunity:
 - (a) "The Association will not indicate in job listings a preference, limitation or specification based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin unless such a specification is a bona fide occupational qualification for the particular position involved."
 - (b) "It shall be Association policy to urge that educational institutions not discriminate against employees or applicants because of sexual orientation, marital status, or physical handicap."

(c) "It shall be Association policy to support the principles of affirmative action and to urge political science departments to aggressively pursue affirmative action programs and policies with regard to blacks, chicanos, women and other minorities."

It should be noted that the Association's policies on equal opportunities pertain not only to women and minorities. Sexual orientation, marital status and physical handicap are irrelevant and inappropriate employment criteria in political science, as well.

Reports regularly printed in *PS* provide the essential data against which to judge the success of affirmative action efforts in hiring and promotion of women and minorities. In particular, each year the summer issue of *PS* reports on "Political Science Degrees Awarded and Graduate Students Enrolled," with data classified by sex, race and national origin. Similarly, the winter issue of *PS* includes an annual article on the placement of political scientists in the previous academic year with data classified by sex.

Related to these reports is an extensive departmental survey conducted by the national office each year and published for distribution to members. There is no better source of basic data on the profession, again classified by race, sex and nationality, than this annual Survey of Departments undertaken by the APSA Departmental Services Program. Few other national scholarly associations collect and make available such detailed information relevant to measuring the entrance and success of minorities and women in their professions. Many of these data, however, are not analyzed in narrative form.

(C) The Provision of Specific Services for These Groups

Directly related to implementing the statements of policy concerning equal employment and affirmative action are the services provided by the Association to enable minorities and women to overcome barriers which can prevent full participation in the discipline. Such services provided by the Association include the following:

(1) For several years child care services have been provided at the Annual Meeting. At the behest of the Committee on the Status of Women, child care service, which runs from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. (or noon on the last day of the meeting) each day of the meeting, has been provided free of charge since the 1982 meeting. For some women child care service is a *sine qua non* for participation at the Annual Meeting.

(2) Again at the request of the Committee on the Status of Women, the Association has instituted a roommate matching service to enable more people, especially women, to afford to come to the Annual Meeting.

(3) To assist institutions attempting to widen the diversity of applicants for available positions, APSA sells, at cost, mailing labels of women and minorities in political science. This service enables employers to link directly with women and minorities.

(4) The Association has developed an extensive placement service at the Annual Meeting. While this service is available to all political scientists, it can be particularly helpful for those outside traditional networks. As mentioned above, women and minorities, it has been argued, are frequently outside such networks and are direct beneficiaries of widened opportunities of this sort.

(5) The Association provides Black Graduate Fellowships. For the 1982-83 academic year, three Black Graduate Fellows have been selected and will receive \$4,700 each to attend the institution of their choice. This program is particularly significant for the future of the profession, as the program attracts blacks into political science.

(6) The Committee on the Status of Chicanos is working on a program to identify talented undergraduate Chicano students who are interested in pursuing graduate study in political science and to send the names of selected students to all graduate departments of political science for recruitment purposes. It is hoped that departments will offer fellowships and research assistantships to these students. Again, this program is particularly important in shaping the profession in future years.

(7) APSA has published the following materials related to women and minorities:

(a) *Directory of Black Americans in Political Science* (1977).

(b) *Roster of Black Women Political Scientists* (1980).

(c) *Roster of Chicanos in Political Science* (1976).

(d) *Roster of Women in Political Science*, fourth edition (1976).

(e) *Career Alternatives for Political Scientists: A Guide for Faculty and Graduate Students*, by Thomas E. Mann (1976). (This kind of information is particularly important for two-career couples, especially if they are both political scientists.)

(f) *Personnel Service Newsletter* (monthly).

(g) *Research Support for Political Scientists*, second edition (1981). (This kind of publication is important for those not part of traditional scholarly networks.)

(h) *Annual APSA Survey of Departments*.

(i) *Blacks and Political Science*, edited by Maurice C. Woodard (1977).

(j) *Guide to Publication in Political Science*, co-sponsored by the APSA Committee on the Status of Women and the Women's Caucus for Political Science (1975).

(k) *Women in Political Science: Studies and Reports, 1969-71, of the APSA Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession*.

Although this list is extensive, a number of the publications, especially the directories, are out-of-date and probably of limited use currently. However, mailing lists of women and minorities which APSA culls from up-to-date membership records are distributed, at cost, by APSA to qualified buyers.

(8) The Committee on the Status of Women and the Education Committee have jointly received a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education to prepare and distribute a series of instructional units that can supplement the textbooks used in introductory American government courses. The project, "Citizenship and Change: Women and American Politics," is to help correct misconceptions about women in politics as well as to fill in the gap caused by omitting feminism from much of mainstream political science.

(9) The APSA has widened the participation of women and minorities in all of its activities and programs. Probably the most visible example of this policy is in the Congressional Fellowship program. APSA now actively seeks women and minority applicants for this program, and the program is now directed by a woman.

In summary, APSA has a solid and developing record of affirmative action with regard to its own policies and activities. In recognizing minorities and women and in developing employment policies responsive to the needs of minorities and women, the Association has made tangible progress in eliminating discrimination on the grounds of race, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, physical handicap or marital status.

The proportion of women and minorities in the profession and in the Association is well below that present in the college population. To resolve the problem in the long run, the proportion of these groups entering the pro-

fession must increase substantially. Last year 20 percent of Ph.D.s granted were awarded to women, five percent to blacks and one percent to hispanics. These figures will have to increase if the Association is to move beyond token participation by blacks and hispanics, in particular, in APSA activities.

THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS, RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

The responsibility of protecting the rights of political scientists and of ensuring that the ethical policies of the Association are followed has been delegated to the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms. Originally established in 1968 at the Annual Business Meeting, this committee subsequently has had its responsibilities enlarged, as reflected in several changes in its name. At the outset, it was the Standing Committee on Professional Ethics, which was not authorized to take on individual cases. Its purpose was to "protect the rights of political scientists" (*PS*, Summer 1968, p. 24) by issuing Advisory Opinions and acting as an appeal body for any "member of the Association who has been accused of unethical conduct" (p. 25). The committee was also authorized to receive charges of unethical behavior made against any officer of the Association. The committee was to approach its work as an "educational, exploratory and hortatory" body and was to remind the profession that "political scientists have responsibilities as well as rights" (p. 26).

The initial work of the Professional Ethics Committee was to provide Advisory Opinions to guide the professional behavior of political scientists. Over the years the committee has issued 18 Advisory Opinions on subjects ranging from multiple submission of manuscripts to the rights of graduate students. None of the Advisory Opinions has a direct bearing on affirmative action.

In 1970 it was decided at the Annual Business Meeting that the committee would take up individual cases related to academic freedom. This directive represented an entirely new direction for the committee. Since that time the committee, renamed the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and then the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms, has taken up a variety of individual grievances, some of which pertain to equal employment opportunity. During these years the committee has developed a set of procedures which it follows in dealing with individual cases. An aggrieved party, usually a political scientist, submits in writing a grievance. If the committee

agrees that the case raises a significant ethical, procedural or professional question within its concerns, a Special Representative (a respected political scientist solicited by the committee) will be assigned by the committee to gather facts about the case, to mediate among the parties in disagreement and to issue a confidential report to the committee.

The Special Representative's first duty is to try to resolve the situation. If, however, the case has not been mediated successfully, the committee will make a determination as to the facts and as to what should be done by relevant parties to rectify the situation. Cases which raise a more general question of professional ethics, rights or freedoms lead to the writing of an Advisory Opinion which does not identify or refer to parties in a particular case but which sets general standards for the profession.

Political scientists and departments of political science are under an obligation to respond to the needs of Special Representatives for information (Advisory Opinion No. 17, *PS*, Summer 1975, p. 319). The information collected is "treated with complete discretion." Individual cases are not publicized nor does the committee censure individuals, departments or institutions.

In essence, the committee has no power to enforce its decisions or to sanction departments which have violated policies such as the affirmative action policy (see Appendix A) of the Association. Moreover, the committee has no way to force departments to cooperate. The best opportunity to see that justice is served under the committee's current procedures is through mediation among the parties involved. The committee has in a good number of cases been able to be of substantial assistance to aggrieved individuals and departments.

The Council has indicated its unwillingness to support committee action in censuring an institution (correspondence from APSA Assistant Director Walter Beach to former committee chairman Guenter Lewy, May 9, 1975). In addition, the committee has imposed limitations on its own participation in cases, such as not publicizing cases and not normally participating in cases if the dispute has been referred to litigation and the courts.

The committee does cooperate with the American Association of University Professors and has referred cases to the AAUP which can censure institutions. Also, institutions which have been censured by AAUP are annually listed in the summer issue of *PS*. It should be mentioned, however, that very few cases involving equal employment opportunity or affirmative action have ever come

before the committee. Academic freedom cases are much more prevalent.

How can the Professional Ethics Committee better serve the purposes of affirmative action in the future? Thus far, the committee has taken steps to encourage political scientists to make use of the existing grievance procedures by publicizing those procedures in *PS* (*PS*, Winter 1982, pp. 140-148; Summer 1982, pp. 481-482, 534-535). Also the committee has agreed to meet twice a year rather than its past practice of meeting only once a year in order to facilitate the timely consideration of complaints.

The committee can do little else without additional authority from the Council. It might be noted, however, that the committee has not always been entirely responsive to requests by the Council to investigate the adequacy of the Association's affirmative action policies. Specifically, at its August 28, 1974, meeting, the Council voted to ask the Committee on Professional Ethics to undertake a "special study on the problem of academic discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, marital status and physical handicap" (*PS*, Winter 1975, p. 43). The committee was to "report back to the Council within one year with proposals for possible action." The committee met on May 17, 1975, and, according to the committee's minutes, "the Committee discussed at length the current status and possible roles and jurisdiction of the Committee and the Association in the matter of affirmative action. It was concluded that at this time the Committee would not recommend specific actions."

In reviewing a number of options before the committee and the Council to ensure that affirmative action is "aggressively" pursued and not simply passively supported, the committee arrived at the following possibilities.

(1) On the positive side, APSA could publicize success stories on affirmative action in *PS*. Institutions which have developed innovative affirmative action programs might be sought out and their programs publicized in articles in *PS*.

(2) Also positively, departments which have been found by the Committee on Professional Ethics (through its normal procedures described above) to have violated equal opportunity principles could enter into a written agreement with the committee to rectify the situation and to alter hiring and promotion practices within the department. This agreement would then be monitored by the committee.

(3) As a sanction for wrongful discrimination, the findings of the committee, citing the

PS Appendix

specific offending parties, could be published in *PS*.

Several problems arise with any additional activity of this sort, especially the sanctioning of departments. First, the committee, in contrast to the AAUP, has inadequate resources either to undertake full reviews or to ensure due process. Special Representatives (who are the fact-finders for the committee) are voluntary and are difficult to enlist into service, especially for complex cases, as affirmative action cases inevitably are. If sanctions and consequently reputations were involved, in most cases it would take considerably more time on the part of Special Representatives, and they would have to follow more formal procedures. Finding volunteers for such a time-consuming and conflict-ridden activity (which conceivably could lead to court action against the Special Representative) would be exceedingly difficult.

Second, the standards of evidence and of due process necessary if cases are to be publicized have not been developed explicitly by the committee. Nor are there in place any procedures to appeal the committee's findings. The current practice of not publicizing the findings of the committee in part allows the committee to operate on a voluntary basis and with very few resources. For example, the current cost of meeting twice a year will exceed the committee's budget.

The matter, however, is not merely one of immediate budgetary considerations, but of developing procedures and of committing considerably more of the total resources of the Association to this activity. If option three above is undertaken, in other words, a series of other Council decisions will also have to be made.

Alternatively, the Professional Ethics Committee could continue to work with AAUP in publicizing their cases and censure of institutions and could focus on the first two options. If that course is taken, however, some procedure will have to be developed to create incentives for departments to enter into written agreements to rectify past discriminatory practices and to create sanctions if agreements are not followed.

There are two key questions before the Council. First, is the Association "aggressively" pursuing affirmative action? Within the Association the answer is generally "yes," as described in the earlier sections of this report. With regard to the Committee on Professional Ethics, the work of the committee has gradually expanded over the years; the committee supports affirmative action and considers discrimination on non-professional grounds wholly illegitimate. However, the committee

has no sanctioning power and its primary tool is one of bargaining with an offending institution and of trying to mediate.

A second question for the Council is how to ensure that individuals against whom wrongful discrimination has occurred can seek protection or relief within the Association, and specifically through the Committee on Professional Ethics. In the hypothetical case of an individual submitting a grievance to the committee, what can the committee do if the department refuses to cooperate with the committee's Special Representative, as can be the case when litigation is anticipated or underway? In the past the committee typically has not taken up cases when court action is likely. This practice means that the aggrieved party has no remedy through APSA.

In the hypothetical case of the committee's finding a department in violation of equal opportunity principles, how can the individual who has been harmed get relief? Past committee practice has been to try to mediate the situation. When that fails, the committee may issue an Advisory Opinion, with names omitted, to help guide members of the profession in the future. The aggrieved individual may be morally vindicated, but frequently his or her specific situation is not rectified. It may be that the procedures developed over the last decade and a half are the best the Association can do, with a few modifications, and that the Association can more realistically put its efforts in working more closely with the AAUP, encouraging aggrieved individuals to go to the AAUP and to court for specific relief and issuing Advisory Opinions to guide the profession in the future.

Specific Recommendations

1. The Executive Director should annually report to the Council on the extent of involvement of women and minorities in every aspect of the organization's activities, including employment at the national office, annual meeting participation, committee assignments, Council nominees, programs and selection of officers of the Association. This report should be published in *PS* in an annual feature and should help guide decisions about numbers of appointments within the Association.
2. The policies associated with the *Personnel Services Newsletter* should be continued. In Departmental Service mailings, departments should be reminded periodically of the policies listed in the appendix of the newsletter.
3. a. Data gathering on the progress of minorities and women in the profession should be continued. The Association

should continue to publish analyses of these data periodically in *PS* with affirmative action goals in mind.

b. In collecting data for its annual survey of departments, the Departmental Services Committee should ask a full range of questions bearing on APSA's affirmative action policy, including such items as whether departments have developed part-time positions as described in the appendix of the *Personnel Services Newsletter*. Such data collected in the survey should be fully analyzed in narrative form and published as an article on affirmative action and equal employment opportunity in *PS*.

c. Future surveys of members should include questions on discrimination in order to provide a better empirical picture of the degree of the problem. It should be noted that the Association's anti-discrimination policy includes not only race and sex, but also national origin, sexual preference, physical handicap and marital status.

4. To encourage more blacks and hispanics to enter the profession, the APSA should not only continue to provide Black Fellowships but should initiate such support for other minorities.*

5. The Council should instruct the editor of *PS* to publicize issues concerning affirmative action in *PS*. In particular, success stories on affirmative action matters should be published. Institutions which have developed innovative affirmative action programs should be sought out and publicized in *PS*.

6. The Committee on Professional Ethics should continue to engage in case work and to issue Advisory Opinions. The committee should work more closely with AAUP and should continue to refer cases to AAUP which can sanction institutions.

7. The Committee on Professional Ethics should continue its approach of first trying to mediate among parties in a case before making final judgments. Procedures of the committee should continue to be the same in affirmative action related complaints as in other cases involving professional ethics. (See pages 13-14 of this report for a detailed description of the Committee on Professional Ethics proceedings.)

8. Departments which have been found by the Committee on Professional Ethics to have

violated equal opportunity principles should be invited to enter into a written agreement with the committee to rectify the situation and to alter hiring and promotion practices within the committee. This agreement should not require such departments to admit guilt. The committee should monitor compliance of departments with the agreements. The Council should provide guidance to the committee as to adequate inducements necessary to encourage institutions to enter into and follow such agreements.**

9. In its annual report to the Council, the Professional Ethics Committee should have a specific section on affirmative action that includes the number and types of cases which have been brought before the committee.

10. The Association should not let the issue of affirmative action fade as an Association priority even though the salience of this issue in society as a whole may be declining.

APPENDIX A

IV. Guidelines on Employment Opportunities

Open Listing Policy. It is a professional obligation of all political science departments to list in the APSA Personnel Service Newsletter all positions for which they are recruiting at the Instructor, Assistant, and Associate Professor levels. In addition, the listing of openings at the Full Professor level are strongly encouraged (*PS*, Vol. VII, No. 1, Winter 1974, p. 22). It is also a professional obligation for departments to list temporary and visiting appointments (*PS*, Winter 1976).

Nepotism Rules. Institutions employing political scientists should abolish nepotism rules, whether they apply departmentally or to an institution as a whole. Employment and advancement should be based solely on professional qualifications without regard for family relationships (*PS*, Vol. IV, No. 1, Winter 1971, pp. 63, 76).

Part-Time Positions. Institutions employing political scientists should make more flexible use of part-time positions for fully qualified professional women and men, just as is now done for those professionals with joint appointments or part-time research positions.

**The Council added the following sentence to this recommendation: "If the Committee feels the department resists their suggestion, the case will be taken to the American Association of University Professors."

*This language was amended by the Council to read: "but should authorize funding for one fellowship for chicanos and other hispanics beginning in 1984."

PS Appendix

Part-time positions should carry full academic status, equivalent rank, promotion opportunities, equal rates of pay, commensurate departmental participation and commensurate fringe benefits, including access to research resources. The policy of flexible part-time positions is not intended to condone any practice such as moonlighting or any use of employers to circumvent normal career ladder appointments (*PS*, Vol. IV, No. 1, Winter 1971, pp. 64, 76).

Equal Employment Opportunities. Consistent with Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the guidelines interpreting the Act as published in the *Federal Register*, April 5, 1972 (Vol. 37, No. 66, p. 6837, sec. 1604.5), the Association will not indicate in job listings a preference, limitation or specification based on sex—unless sex is a bona fide occupational qualification for the particular position involved.

Under the provisions of public law 92-261 of March 1972, educational institutions may not discriminate against employees or applicants because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin except in the case of religious educational institutions where hiring an individual of a particular religion would not be deemed discriminatory. The Association will not indicate in job listings a preference, limitation or specification based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin unless such a specification is a bona fide occupational qualification for the particular position involved.

It shall be Association policy to urge that educational institutions not discriminate against employees or applicants because of sexual orientation, marital status, or physical handicap (*PS*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, Winter 1975, pp. 44-45).

It shall be Association policy to support the principles of affirmative action and to urge political science departments to aggressively pursue affirmative action programs and policies with regard to blacks, chicanos, women and other minorities (*PS*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, Winter 1975, pp. 44-45).

AAUP and CAUT Censure Lists. The Association wishes to bring to the attention of members of the Personnel Service the censure lists of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). The censure lists are printed regularly in *PS*.

APPENDIX B

As directed by the Administrative Committee, the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms sent a draft of this report to the

chairs of the Committees on the Status of Chicanos, Blacks and Women in the Profession, as well as the chair of the Women's Caucus for Political Science. In addition, the Committee on the Status of Women discussed the report at length at its November 5, 1982, meeting. The results of that discussion follow, including the relevant portion of the minutes and a memorandum of suggestions to the Association concerning the role of women in APSA. It might be noted that several of the suggestions are directed to matters within the purview of the Council.

Herman Lujan, chair of the Committee on the Status of Chicanos, responded to the report in the attached letter. He also raises questions concerning the Association's activities, particularly the necessarily "reactive posture" of the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms in responding to grievances. In addition, he notes the "absence of hispanic presence on the Council."

E. Wally Miles, chair of the Committee on the Status of Blacks, called Maurice Woodard of the national office to say he "is pleased with the report." While the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms has received no official response from the Women's Caucus, the affirmative action report is apparently acceptable to that group's leaders.

In sum, the four groups to which this report was sent seem to have no objections to it. However, two groups (or their leaders) do raise additional questions and make concrete suggestions which might be considered in conjunction with the recommendations of the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms herein.

* * *

To: Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms

From: Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession

Re: Response to Report, "The Commitment of the APSA to the Principle of Affirmative Action" (September 1, 1982).

The CSWP met in October and reviewed the report of your committee. After considerable discussion we decided on the following.

1. The CSWP reviewed and endorsed the twelve specific recommendations included in the September report, and commends the APSA for its progress in affirmative action.
2. The CSWP's fundamental concern is that the association continue and, in so far as possible, institutionalize the progress that has been made regarding the provision of oppor-

tunities for women and minorities in the profession.

3. The CSWP recommends that the APSA Council solicit information from standing APSA minority and women committees and other organizations (e.g., Women's Caucus) for APSA committee appointments and nominations.

4. The CSWP recommends that APSA provide an information brochure or paper about possible forums for the hearing and resolution of an affirmative action grievance for distribution to members of the association. Such information would include those services offered by the APSA's Committee on Professional Ethics, as well as non-APSA forums (e.g., AAUP).

5. The CSWP recommends that the Ethics Committee hold an open meeting on its jurisdiction and work at the Annual Meeting.

6. The CSWP endorsed the Association's plan to send a booklet on professional ethics to all new Ph.D.s and to reproduce the Affirmative Action Report in *PS* once it is completed. The CSWP suggested that *PS* have a symposium on professional ethics and responsibilities and that *PS* feature a new and permanent section on the discipline and the profession.

7. The CSWP recommends that the APSA issue a statement about its active commitment to affirmative action in all phases of the association and discipline. In such a statement, the CSWP recommends that affirmative action be defined as part of professional ethics. In conjunction with this, the CSWP recommends that the Association in general and the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms in particular consider the issues of professional ethics that are related to or associated with sexual harassment. More specifically, the CSWP encourages the Committee on Professional Ethics to consider sexual harassment and other issues with a view to the development of a code of professional ethics and/or a set of guidelines for distribution in the profession.

* * *

Minutes—Meeting of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession

Friday, November 5, 1982, 10 a.m.-4 p.m. APSA Conference Room

IV. A Review of the Affirmative Action Report Prepared by the APSA's

Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms

Catherine Rudder joined the Task Force for this discussion. She described the report and its components and explained that the APSA Council requested responses to the report from the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, the Committee on the Status of Blacks and the Committee on the Status of Chicanos.

Committee Discussion: Talarico pointed out the importance of assuring the continuation and institutionalization of progress regarding the provision of opportunities for women and minorities and the problem of how to do so when appointments are regarded as the prerogative of the APSA President.

Committee Decision: The Committee responded to the Affirmative Action report by:

A. Reviewing and accepting the 12 specific recommendations in the report.

B. Recommended the following:

1. It is appropriate for APSA to provide an affirmative action approach to the profession as an ethical position (since APSA does not have resources for formal litigation procedures). In this regard, the Committee will ask the Council for a resolution that the President will solicit nominations of women and minorities for committee appointments in a timely fashion.

2. APSA should provide an information brochure or paper about where a person might seek assistance for an affirmative action grievance.

3. The Ethics Committee should hold an open meeting about its jurisdiction and work at the Annual Meeting.

Additionally, the Committee endorsed the Association's plan to send a booklet on professional ethics to all new Ph.D.s, and to reproduce the Affirmative Action Report in *PS* once it is finished. Nechemias suggested that *PS* have a symposium on professional ethics and responsibilities. Rudder said it might be a possible feature for a new section in *PS* that will serve as a forum on the discipline and profession.

Talarico will draft a resolution containing these recommendations on behalf of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, circulate it among Committee members and submit it to Rudder for the Ethics Committee's December 3 meeting.

* * *

PS Appendix

Dr. Maurice Woodard
Staff Associate
American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Maurice:

I have received and reviewed the Affirmative Action Report of the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms of the APSA. My thoughts follow.

The report does an adequate job of substantiating its current efforts and its reasoned posture on affirmative action issues. The nub, of course, is that the APSA has no power to sanction departments in any meaningful way. Thus, the process of responding to issues raised and attempting to mediate, not becoming involved in cases where litigation is underway, and not publicizing results seems reasonable. I might note that the nonpublication policy depends upon a strategy of mediation for its appropriateness. By keeping things contained, mediation is enhanced.

The concept of affirmative action, however, does call for assertiveness, when there is due cause, in order to remedy the situation. And, while the Association cannot effectively sanction, it can create a climate of opinion within the profession which can serve as a motivational factor to institutions since respect, status, and prestige are important aspects of institutional reputations. For that reason, publishing findings reflecting the view of the profession is an appropriate policy on matters of affirmative action and should be considered by the APSA.

In addition, dependence on mediation as the primary strategy requires some complaint or grievance. This places the Association in a reactive posture. If the primary value in ethics-related activities is facilitating a resolution over differences, can some mechanism be derived for insertion prior to the hard and fast crystallization of issues and positions which characterize a complaint or grievance? Could ad hoc committee(s) of respected colleagues be used to function in an *amicus curiae* role at the request of an individual faculty member or a department at some point where impasse appears likely but where there remains a willingness to work something out? Use of such ad hoc committees by the Ethics Committee would make this feasible and could help keep costs down by using colleagues in nearby areas. Obviously, some volunteer effort is also required for this to work. In my view, such a process would benefit the proactive posture required by affirmative action.

With regard to Association leadership, the report speaks for itself on the absence of his-

panic presence on the Council. The Committee on the Status of Chicanos in the Profession has sent names forward any number of times. Recent top leadership has been comparably less sensitive to suggestions on this regard. Only leadership behavior, especially in the Nominating Committee, can change that.

I hope these thoughts are helpful. Warm personal regards.

Sincerely,
Herman D. Lujan
Vice President for Minority Affairs
University of Washington

Status of Chicanos in the Profession: APSA Committee Report

From the beginning of 1982 to the present, the Committee on the Status of Chicanos in the Profession has continued to carry out the task assigned to it by the APSA at the time of its creation. Its efforts to fulfill its mission have led it to pursue several new projects that will garner much of the Committee's energies during the remainder of 1983 and most of 1984.

During 1982 the Committee continued its efforts to assess the representation and progress of Chicanos in the discipline. Its major documentary effort in this area was the development of a comprehensive roster of Chicano political scientists that encompasses both members and non-members of the American Political Science Association (APSA). The Committee has devoted much energy on this project because it believes that a comprehensive listing is necessary if the progress and status of Chicanos is to be accurately assessed in the discipline and if the APSA is to succeed in its efforts to develop accurate listings of its component sectors from its membership listings.

In gathering data for its roster the Committee also initiated a study to identify the progress toward tenure of Chicano political scientists in institutions of higher education since the late sixties. This study is to be concluded in late 1983. When completed the study will provide the first set of findings regarding the number of Chicano political scientists that have achieved tenure and the departments and institutions where these achievements have occurred since the late sixties. By providing data on these issues the study, the Committee expects, will provide insights into the validity of several current notions regarding the progress toward tenure made by political scientists of