

# Open Letter to Members of the Association from Robert E. Lane, President

May 1971

## Dear Colleague:

Where does the money go? What do you get for your Association dues? What in the world do they *do* in the National Office?

I'll speak of the 1970-71 situation, since it is the one most relevant to your interests and one on which we have pretty good estimates.

The total expenditures in this year will be about \$786,000. The total income will be about \$598,000. Thus this year, when the new dues only came into effect in the third quarterly billing (except for some welcome voluntary dues payments), we will be running a deficit of about \$189,000. The new individual dues payments for a full year will increase income by about \$53,000. As you can see, we have had to cut back drastically our planned expenses for next year.

The REVIEW is the biggest single item, with direct costs of about \$162,000. But that figure doesn't include keeping the membership (circulation) lists, the cost of a bookkeeping department, the cost of the person in the national office who promotes advertising for the REVIEW, or any of the legal, auditing, or other national office expenses. They are hard to assign; I'll refer just to direct hard costs here and then take up the overhead costs later.

The REVIEW also produces income. The Institutional Memberships which includes the REVIEW and *PS* (libraries and government offices for the most part), bring in about \$94,000. Advertising in the REVIEW brings in \$60,000. Thus, one could say the REVIEW covers its direct costs, although not the overhead.

*PS* serves very useful functions in the Association; indeed, I believe it should be expanded so that it is as useful a publication as THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST or THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGIST. Readership studies in psychology show that of all their publications (and they have thirteen!) the AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST is the most frequently and most thoroughly read. Perhaps *PS* readership follows the same pattern in political science. In any event, its direct costs (almost all printing and mailing) will be about \$51,000 in 1970-71. This does not include the salary of the editor, a national office staff person. Unfortunately *PS* brings in no income so that this sum is totally a charge on dues and other sources of income.

*Annual Meeting.* The Annual Meeting (printing preliminary and final programs, hiring special registration personnel at the site, Program Committee expenses, national office staff—it takes about one half of the time of a staff member of the Association to handle this large administrative task—travel of the entire staff to the meeting site, hotel expenses, etc.) costs about \$79,000. On the other hand, there is some income from this enterprise: exhibits \$24,000; registration fees \$13,000; advertising in the programs \$28,000, or a total income of \$65,000. Although the Annual Meeting contributed \$15,000 to the deficit this year, when we raise the registration fees for the September 1971 meeting, we should just about break even.

*Personnel Service.* It costs us about \$27,000 to run the personnel service, including a small amount for the national manpower register (for which NSF pays). I think you will agree that this service has been greatly improved this year and we are moving toward a more rational scientific manpower marketplace. For example, this year over 400 different positions have been listed in the *Personnel Service Newsletter*. To help pay for this service, we receive about \$9,000 in subscriptions (fees for the newsletter, a few department fees, and special payments to handle dossiers for those who request it). We also get about \$4,000 from NSF for the manpower register—a project not to be continued next year. In fiscal 1971, then, the personnel service contributed about \$14,000 to our deficit.

*Directory.* The profession is now working with a Biographical Directory that contains information gathered in 1967. In that year we had about 11,000 individual members while today we have about 14,500 individual members. It is estimated that the average member of our profession changes his location about every three years. Since the Directory is used by the membership for recruiting, locating specialists, addressing colleagues, and every other manpower function, it is clear that we are grossly handicapped by our lack of a current directory, a situation that works its serious hardships on the younger members of the profession. Yet because of our deficit, we did not provide for work on a new directory in 1970-71 (although we have done so for next year). Sales of the directory help to cover the costs, but without subsidy the operation has always incurred a deficit. This year we received an income of about \$1,000 from the sales of our obsolete directory.

**Open Letter to Members of the  
Association from Robert E. Lane,  
President**

*Professional Equality.* As you know, we have been making special efforts to improve the status of Blacks, Chicanos, Women, and others in our profession. These efforts have three components: (a) a graduate fellowship program for Blacks, (b) meetings for the several groups to consider their problems and surveys of their memberships and circumstances in the profession, and (c) attempts to improve recruitment, the protection of legal rights, and research opportunities for these and other groups. Costs are hard to assign, since much of the cost is incurred by national office salaries, mailings, and overhead items. The direct costs are these: Black fellowships \$18,000; Meetings of Committees and studies for Blacks, Chicanos, and Women \$33,000; costs of recruitment, legal protection, and development of research funds are all overhead expenses and difficult to ascertain. Thus the total direct cost of this enterprise is about \$51,000. Our application to the Ford Foundation to help us with the Black fellowship and research funding enterprise was not successful, hence there is no program money to help us with these costs. We are currently seeking funds elsewhere.

*Education.* The Association has four kinds of educational programs currently operating. The first is a program of work to develop better pre-collegiate education, funded currently by the Office of Education. The headquarters for this program is at the University of Indiana (but there are allied projects at seven other universities) and, aside from a contribution of about \$3,000 for a general conference on education in political science, the Association itself receives no funds from this program, except support for the Committee. This is not a place for a review of the program, but it has already done much to improve curricula and teacher training in political science at the high school level.

The undergraduate education committee has devoted its energies this year to developing a proposal on curriculum improvement to be submitted to NSF. Since this is a large and important program, the energies of the committee and a special conference on undergraduate education have been devoted to thinking through what we should be doing, a matter in which department chairmen have cooperated extensively. This committee and conference cost us about \$6,000, but some of this was paid for from other sources. The net costs to the Association were about \$3,000, a figure that seems to me to

be low, given the vocation of most of our members and the expressed need for help in this area.

We have done almost nothing about graduate education this year, although you will recall that in 1969-70, a group of (primarily) graduate students conducted a study later published in *PS*, "Obstacles to Graduate Education in Political Science." If we had the staff resources further follow-up work in this area would have a high priority.

*Internships.* For many years the Association has conducted two internship programs: the Congressional Fellowship Program and the State and Local Government Internship Program. By all accounts these have provided valuable education of a special kind this year for about 59 persons (8 political science Congressional Fellows, 9 journalism Congressional Fellows, and about 40 State and Local Government interns). The total spent on these fellowships in 1970-71 is about \$261,000, but of course that is not part of the regular budget of the Association and comes entirely from foundation funds. What is important here, is that the provisions for salaries and overhead in these grants have helped the Association considerably; the sum amounts to about \$38,000. While it costs about this amount to administer the programs, the work load they require is uneven, and the larger staff these funds provide can, in relatively slack program periods, do other things. On the whole, the Association's many other functions benefit from these fiscal arrangements.

*Public or continuing education.* Newspapers, television and radio provide much, perhaps most, of the political education that non-students (and students) receive. As a consequence, it makes sense for the Association to continue its long-standing concern with this phase of education. We have a program of fellowships for journalists providing opportunities for them to take leaves of absence to return to universities for further training in the areas they cover in their reporting. These fellowships, funded entirely by foundation support, amount to about \$127,000. In addition, the Association operates week-long seminars twice a year for journalists, and awards prizes for political reporting—also paid entirely from foundation grants. Like the other fellowship grants, the Association receives funds to operate the programs; about \$23,000, enough to cover the costs and to provide the flexibility I mentioned above. In thinking about the budget it

is important to remember that these funds are expendable only for the designated programs.

*Ethics and Academic Freedom.* The Association has a Committee on Professional Ethics and a Committee on Academic Freedom to advise us on these matters and to handle cases as they arise. They have no staff and hence cannot undertake studies or negotiate with universities; this year we have had to reduce their meetings to one each. Their total direct costs this year will be about \$4,000. There is no compensating income from these activities.

*Public Affairs.* As most of you know, academic scholars and their associations have been under considerable pressure to take a greater interest in public policy or, more specifically, to use their special expertise to improve the workings and responsiveness of government and public policies and programs. The referendum on the environmental problem passed by the membership last October, urged us to address ourselves to policy questions in this area. My mail is filled with requests for better ways of using political science research in housing, education, poverty, and race programs. We have not done much in this area, but the Legislative Service Program, foundation financed, has done some effective work in helping state legislatures improve their functioning. This program provides Association guided help in running pre-session seminars for new state legislators and for developing manuals describing the job of the legislator in each of sixteen states. The program provides grants amounting to about \$138,000, fully financed by the foundation grant, a figure, which (like the fellowship funds we administer) does not appear in the Association budget since we act primarily as transmitters of funds. The overhead and administrative costs of the program are about \$22,000, fully covered by the grant.

It is my personal view that we have not done enough in this research and public policy area; we could serve as neutral brokers of information between our research community and the governmental policy-making community with consequences that would, over a period of time, make government more responsive, reduce the inequities of certain programs, improve the delivery of health and welfare assistance to the poor, and increase the participation of Blacks, Chicanos, and others in framing the policies that affect them.

*Governing the Association.* Recent changes in the Association (lodging authority in a 26 person Council, as contrasted to a nine person Executive Committee; mail ballots for elections, referenda, constitutional revision, etc.) have required additional expenses. Not counting staff time, these costs are estimated at about \$56,000 in fiscal 1971. The largest items are \$25,000 for Council meetings (it costs about \$6,000 for each of the four Council meetings we have been having each year for three years), elections, including printing and mailing, handled by the American Arbitration Association for a charge of about \$13,000 (plus Nominating committee and Elections committee costs of about \$2,000), and the special costs of the Annual Business Meeting (professional parliamentarian, professional tellers, special floor microphones, etc.) about \$7,000. The cost, and the values, of democracy are high. Of course, there is no offsetting income from these operations; we would hardly expect this to be subsidized by anyone except our membership.

*Overhead and Administrative Costs.* In order to keep these operations going, the Association must maintain a building, provide an up to date membership list, maintain a bookkeeping office, answer the mail (nearly 2,000 first class items a week), handle requests for permission to reprint articles in the REVIEW, and other matters. The costs that can be allocated are as follows:

Membership department (4 persons)	\$39,000
Bookkeeping department (2 persons)	\$19,000
Auditing and legal fees	\$ 8,000
Building costs	\$38,000

There is some income received from sales of membership lists (it is about \$13,000) and from renting part of the building (\$27,000). The salaries not included in any of the above calculations (secretarial, librarian, receptionist, Executive Director, etc.) are about \$79,000. The costs of supplies, telephone, staff travel, stationery, reproduction, postage, etc., come to another \$74,000. It is a busy office, some of these expenses will be reduced next year, but some services will suffer from these reductions.

*Summary:* As you can see, the Association is engaged in many activities, some of them of direct benefit to our members and others designed to improve our society. The allocation of costs and income is difficult, largely because it is

**Open Letter to Members of the  
Association from Robert E. Lane,  
President**

**APSA INCOME AND EXPENDITURES FOR 1970-71 (Estimated)**

(in Thousands)

Program	Direct Expenditures and Administrative Costs		Program Income		Net Income or (Cost)
	Items	Program	Items	Program	
Publications and Information Exchange		\$222		\$154	(\$ 68)
Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.	\$162		(154)		
PS	51				
Info. Exch. (Abstracts, comm., etc.)	9				
Annual Meeting		79		65	( 14)
Manpower		27		14	( 13)
Personnel Svc. (Incl. Natl. Reg.)	27		14		
Directory			1		
Education		69		64	( 5)
Pre-Collegiate	2				
Undergraduate	6		3		
Graduate					
Internships	38		38		
Public & Continuing	23		23		
Ethics & Academic Freedom		4			( 4)
Professional Equality (Blacks, Chicanos, Women)		51			( 51)
Public Affairs (Leg. Svc.)		22		22	
Governing Association		55			( 55)
Council	25				
Elections (Am. Arbitr. Assoc., Nom. Comm., Elections Comm.)	15				
Business Meeting	7				
Other (Pres. Trvl., Rules Comm., Const. Rev. Comm., etc.)	8				
Administrative & Overhead		257		40	( 217)
Membership lists	39		13		
Bookkeeping	19				
Auditing & Legal fees	8				
Building (maint., custodial, etc.)	38		27		
Office salaries (not incl. in above)	79				
Office exp. (not incl. in above)	63				
Other (APSA memb. fees, cost of sales)	11				
<b>Totals</b>		786		360	( 426)
				359	( 427)
Income not attributable to programs				238	
Individual dues	172				
Dividends and interest	41				
Sales (panel papers, reprints, dept. chmn. lists, back issues)	12				
Royalties	10				
Miscellaneous & contributions	3				
<b>Total Income (program and other)</b>				597	
<b>Total Expenditures</b>				786	
<b>Projected deficit for 1970-71</b>				(189)	

impossible to allocate administrative costs to specific matters. Let me try to recapitulate what I have said in rough terms, in a way I hope will give a reasonably clear picture of income and expenditure.

There are some lessons in this:

(1) Individual dues represent a relatively small fraction of our income. Even if next year, with the full increase of 1970 in effect, they come to the projected \$225,000, this will not keep the Association going at its current level; the dues increase barely accounts for the inflation that has taken place since dues were set at \$15. Even at their present rate, they represent a smaller fraction of a member's salary (or fellowship?) than was true when the \$15 and \$6 were set. I think a referendum authorizing a gradual dues increase over the next five years is necessary.

(2) We must pay more attention to outside sources of income, especially foundation programs and government educational programs, when the interests of the donors correspond with ours.

(3) We must charge for our services at an economic rate where we can.

(4) We must economize in all phases of our operations.

(5) We must explore the possibility of departmental fees, such as those charged by some of the natural sciences.

The Association is in a position to improve the discipline and serve society; it should be financed so that it performs these services adequately.

**Robert E. Lane**  
President