

**2012-2013 ASA Council  
Second Meeting  
Final Minutes**

**Saturday, January 26, 2013**

Liaison Capitol Hill Hotel, Metropolitan East-West Room  
Washington, DC

**Officers Present:** Catherine White Berheide (Secretary), Jennifer Glass (Vice President), Annette Lareau (President-Elect), Brian Powell (Vice President-Elect), Cecilia Ridgeway (President), Mary Romero (Secretary-Elect), Edward Telles (Past Vice President), Erik Olin Wright (Past President)

**Members-at-Large Present:** Stephanie Bohon, David Brunisma, Kelly Joyce, Amanda Lewis, Cecilia Menjivar, Dina Okamoto, Monica Prasad, Jane Sell, Laurel Smith-Doerr, Robin Wagner-Pacifici

**Members-at-Large Absent:** Joya Misra, Mario Luis Small

**Staff Present:** Janet L. Astner, Sally T. Hillsman, Kareem D. Jenkins, Michael Murphy, Jean Shin, Brad Smith, Roberta Spalter-Roth, Margaret Weigers Vitullo

## **1. Introductions and Orienting Documents**

President Cecilia Ridgeway convened the second meeting of the 2012-2013 ASA Council at 8:36am on Saturday, January 26, 2013. She reminded Council members that they are the elected governing body of the Association, with duties as a result of holding office, and expressed the hope that business would be handled efficiently so that there would be sufficient energy for the items that really mattered, such as publications issues, financial reports/budgets, and new business/initiatives.

### *A. Approval of the Agenda*

No changes were made to the agenda.

MOTION: To approve the agenda. Carried (no opposed).
--

### *B. Approval of the August 2012 Minutes*

One revision was proposed and accepted for the minutes of the meeting on August 21.

MOTION: To approve the minutes of the last meeting of the 2011-2012 ASA Council on August 20, 2012, and the minutes as revised for the first meeting of the 2012-2013 ASA Council on August 21, 2012. Carried.
--

## 2. Financial Reports and Budgets

After outlining the structure of the Committee on the Executive Office and Budget (EOB) and identifying the current EOB members, Secretary Berheide summarized the annual schedule of budget review and oversight. EOB carefully scrutinizes the budget proposal at its mid-January meeting in order to make its recommendation to Council. The budget status is reviewed mid-year at EOB's summer meeting. August is the time when new things may arise from committee meetings held during the Annual Meeting (e.g., additional journal page requests).

### *A. Current (2012) Financials & Proposed 2013 Operating Budget*

The 2012 budget originally projected a small surplus, but year-end projections show a \$126,000 deficit. [Final audited deficit was \$67,000.] The Secretary indicated several factors contributed to the net loss. Revenues were lower than expected due to a decline in membership, in part because changes in the dues structure for 2013 made it impossible to offer certain types of promotions in August-September. On the expense side, there were several Annual Meeting lines that came in higher, including audio-visual support and program planning. Also, the cost of renting the convention center (\$55,000) was omitted from the budget. Accounting and budget procedures have been changed to ensure that this type of omission will not happen again when a convention is being used in the future, and a mid-year review of program planning activity has now been instituted.

The outlook for 2013 is somewhat positive, although the proposed 2013 budget was built conservatively on the dues revenue side. The new dues structure does not appear to be adversely affecting the renewal rate at this stage in the process. Members with incomes below \$70,000 experience little change in their dues; the changes primarily affect the higher income categories. The good news so far is that the higher categories of membership are showing the strongest pace of renewal.

One of the primary factors affecting renewal decisions is participation in the Annual Meeting. The 2013 Annual Meeting is situated in New York City, which usually draws high attendance, so registration should be strong. The record number of paper submissions received (4,424) supports the likelihood of high participation in this year's meeting.

There was some discussion to clarify the mid-year review of program planning by the Program Committee. Most program planning expenses are for travel support to bring in non-sociologists and/or international presenters who are invited for major sessions. Some 2012 issues in this expense area arose from late requests from people who assumed their expenses were being covered, along with outside funding that did not materialize for the New Wave poetry slam presenters. Program planning support for 2013 appears modest at this time, but the mid-summer review will still occur. The 2014 Program Committee is now also in the middle of its planning process, so its planning budget has not yet been fully developed. Planning is always a balancing act for a program committee, and some themes lend themselves more to international participation.

Action on the proposed budget for 2013 was deferred until all pertinent agenda items were dealt with. When discussion of publications issues was finished, the following action was taken.

MOTION: To approve the 2013 operating budget. Carried (17 – yes, 1 – no, 0 abstentions).
--

### *B. Memorandum from At-Large Council Members*

A memo received previously from five Council members, including three belonging to the newest cohort, expressed some concern that the decision-making process they had so far experienced in Council (the August 2012 Council meeting) dealt with spending issues individually rather than in relation to each other and the total budget. Since such decision-making can lead to more and more spending, the Council members asked EOB to propose new procedures for putting a check on constant upward pressures on spending.

Secretary Berheide commented that receiving this memo at the beginning of the fiscal was good timing. The winter Council meeting is when the budget is discussed fully and the new operating budget voted on by Council. While the money side should not rule what Council does, it does have to be taken into account. She then relayed an anecdote about the decision-making effort involved with a future meeting site when it appeared that Council was going to overlook the possibility of saving \$300,000 through proposed contractual benefits for signing at that specific time. One important part of the Secretary's role is to point out to Council when budget considerations require attention.

In terms of what happens at the August meetings of Council, it was noted that budget materials are available for reference, but incoming members who were not able to attend the last meeting of the outgoing Council, or who do not look at the agenda packet for that meeting, will be unaware of budget parameters. There was consensus in EOB that a copy of the budget should be inserted into the materials for the first meeting of a new Council in August. Any memo to Council that involves a request for funding should include a statement about the budget status.

The importance of paying attention to whether the membership is satisfied that the Association is spending its money wisely was emphasized. The membership report in Council's agenda book included information on member responses about what benefits they consider to be most important as they completed the joining or renewing process during 2012. The seven benefits most often selected included Annual Meeting participation/registration, professional identity, journal access/discounts, section membership, Job Bank access, networking opportunities, and career development.

Council Member Monica Prasad pointed out that 2011 budget totaled \$5.8 million and the 2013 budget proposal covered \$6.3 million, almost a 10 percent increase in two years. President Ridgeway noted that part of the increase was a result of reinstating activities that had been drastically cut, including returning to printing and mailing the newsletter *Footnotes* to members, along with moving support for *Contexts* into the 2012 operating budget.

There was consensus that integrating the budgetary implications of actions into discussions during a Council meeting is highly desirable, and the Secretary confirmed she would continue to insert such cautions.

### *C. Proposed 2013 Spivack Budget*

Executive Officer Sally Hillsman reported that less than half of the approved 2012 budget for the Spivack Program had been spent; expenditures were estimated to be \$97,485 at year's end. Activities supported by the Spivack budget include the ASA Congressional Fellowship, Congressional briefings, CARI grants, the ASA Award for Excellence in Reporting Social Issues, and communications efforts to enhance public policy and policy research. Also, last year Council allocated \$40,000 to the Minority

Fellowship Program (MFP) to fund two additional Fellows. That was a one-time action, however, so MFP support was not included in the Spivack budget proposal for 2013.

It was noted that preparation of an amicus brief for a DOMA-related case likely to be on the docket of the U.S. Supreme Court could be supported by the Spivack Fund, if Council so wishes.

The vote on the Spivack budget was deferred until Council discussed the MFP budget (see item 2D). When discussion of agenda item 2D was completed, Council took the following action.

MOTION: To approve the 2013 Spivack Budget with addition of \$40,000 to support the Minority Fellowship Program, as recommended by the EOB Committee. Carried (no opposed).

#### *D. MFP Budget 2013-2014*

On behalf of the MFP Advisory Panel, MFP Director Jean Shin expressed gratitude for Council's allocation of support from the Spivack Fund in 2012. There were 113 applications for the five fellowship slots last year, so the additional funding was very important.

The flood of applications in 2012 led to some changes in eligibility for 2013. Students must now have successfully completed one year of a doctoral program in order to apply for a fellowship. The extent to which this change may affect the number of applications is not yet known; the application deadline is the end of February.

It was noted that there was no specific designation of "Spivack Fellow" in 2012. The Spivack funding was used to support parts of several stipends and to provide travel support for several Fellows. The viewpoint in Council was to retain flexibility and not differentiate between "ASA" and "Spivack" in terms of designations. A suggestion was made to consider having a member of the Spivack Advisory panel serve on the MFP panel.

There was consensus to approve the MFP budget as proposed, and to allocate \$40,000 from the Spivack Fund to support MFP fellowships.

MOTION: To approve the proposed 2013-2014 MFP budget of \$84,000 for four MFP Fellowship awards (at \$20,000 each) and up to two non-stipendiary MFP awards (at \$2,000 each), plus \$40,000 from the Spivack Fund to support two additional fellowship awards. Carried (no opposed).

#### *E. Development Program*

##### *1. Member Contributions*

As part of the annual membership renewal process, members are offered the opportunity to contribute to several ASA programs. For 2012, these included the American Sociological Fund, Congressional Fellowship Fund, Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline, Minority Fellowship Program, Soft Currency Fund, and Teaching Enhancement Fund.

At the close of the 2012 renewal period (September 30, 2012), member contributions to these funds totaled \$19,810. The 704 contributions made during the 2012 membership year came from 474

individual contributors (compared to 538 individual contributors for 2011). The Minority Fellowship Program (MFP) continued to be the strongest, drawing 324 contributions in 2012 totaling \$11,177.

Individual contributions via the dues renewal process dropped significantly in 2010, increased somewhat in 2011, and dropped again in 2012. ASA Finance Director Les Briggs confirmed that these contributions are considered charitable contributions, and donors receive an acknowledgement letter at the end of the year.

## *2. Small Grants Program and Fundraising/Development*

In February 2012, ASA Council approved the concept of a single small grants program that would serve as an umbrella for fundraising purposes for all three ASA current small grants programs: the Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline (FAD) grants, the Teaching Enhancement Fund (TEF) grants, and the Community Action Research Initiative (CARI) grants. Of these three, CARI had never been included on the list of donation options offered to members during the renewal process, so Council specifically authorized that CARI be added to the donation options provided during the 2013 renewal process.

The 2013 online renewal application was revised to reflect the small grants umbrella, permitting members to donate to a specific grant program or make a general contribution to support small grants. Deputy Executive Officer Janet Astner reported that as of January 1, 2013, CARI had received 18 contributions totaling \$274, while the new Small Grants general umbrella has received \$342 from 15 contributors.

Other suggestions generated by the Member Giving Subcommittee were put on hold, pending implementation of the new Association Management System (AMS). Whenever the AMS transition is completed and ASA staff is well underway with training, newly available options such as regularized giving (payment schedule options), pledge reminders, and a "contributions portal" will receive attention.

Council took a short break at 10:10 – 10:25am.

## **3. ASA Investments and Reserves**

### *A. General Financial Picture of ASA Investments*

Secretary Berheide reported that the Investment Committee meets with ASA's investment advisor from Bernhardt Wealth Management (BWM) prior to EOB meetings; this committee is advisory to the EOB. The conservative investment strategy chosen in 2005 by EOB has been successful for the Association. A brief overview of the cumulative investments noted that the balance of the building fund was withdrawn from long-term investments just before the economic downturn, which was good timing. The investment portfolio subsequently has experienced solid returns and the value is now over \$6.6 million. The allocation of long-term holdings was outlined for the general fund and the six restricted funds.

### *B. BWM Year-End Investment Report*

The Secretary reviewed the asset allocation portion of the BWM report and indicated that the portfolio is reviewed regularly and rebalanced as needed. One of the issues being discussed by the

investment committee is how much is invested in international stocks (international exposure v. domestic/US), given how “international” is defined in this era of global corporations.

It was also noted that the investment portfolio had been divested of certain corporate bonds previously questioned by Council members, and Council expressed thanks to the committee for its prompt action on that matter.

#### *C. Reserves*

ASA defines “reserves” as the unrestricted long-term investments of the Association, also referred to as the “General Fund Investment Account.” These general reserves are available for emergencies or for investments in future Association activities Council believes should be made. As of November 30, 2012, the reserve amount was \$4,564,187, or 74.2% of the 2012 operating expenses. EOB has set the floor for reserves at 50% and the upper limit at 100%, and the Secretary report that there were no concerns about the current status of reserves.

### **4. Audit Committee Report**

The EOB Committee convenes as the ASA Audit Committee to review the audit and deal with related issues. As previously reported to Council, a new audit firm was engaged for 2011. The Secretary reported that the first year’s experience with the new firm went well, so EOB authorized signing the letter of appointment for the next audit. The 2012 audit will be brought to Council for review at its August meeting.

### **5. Publications**

The Secretary, who sits on the Committee on Publications and the Program Committee to provide oversight on revenue/expense implications of issues under consideration, presented the publications reports and recommendations from the Committee on Publications.

#### *A. Subscriptions Report*

While traditional institutional subscriptions to individual journals continued to decline in 2012, this drop is not viewed as problematic because all ASA journals are now part of the SAGE bundled journals (as well as sold separately). The ASA journals are, therefore, both in many more libraries as a result and producing anticipated revenue. SAGE also provides free online access to libraries and institutions in developing nations, which is one of the reasons ASA selected SAGE as its publishing partner. SAGE is working not only to retain current subscribers but also to contact lapsed subscribers as well as institutions that have never subscribed to ASA journals.

ASA’s magazine *Contexts* moved onto SAGE’s ASA journals list in 2012, and editorial office costs were transferred from the Spivack Fund into the operating budget. The only two ASA publications that individuals can purchase separately are *Contexts* and *City & Community*; all other journals are available as individual subscriptions only to members.

A question was raised about how members get access to current issues of journals, because it was thought that the default option for institutional subscriptions does not include the current year. It

was clarified that members should go through the ASA website—not the SAGE website—to access their current journals. This has been indicated in two articles that have appeared in the ASA newsletter *Footnotes*, but SAGE has no instructions on their site.

There was some discussion about when ASA might move toward providing online access to all journals as part of membership benefits. Publications and Membership Director Karen Gray Edwards reported that this is under consideration. To date, 85% of the members who renewed for 2013 opted to receive their primary journal in print. Giving members options to do what they want is important, Edwards said, just as it is important not to undermine the long-term preservation and utility of journal content.

#### *B. Actions from the Publications Committee Meeting*

##### *(1). Selection of Editors (executive session)*

Council convened in executive session at 11:00 a.m. to discuss the Publications Committee recommendations for the editorships of the *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* and *Sociology of Education*. The executive session ended at 11:25 a.m. after actions were taken on the recommendations.

##### *(2). Editorial Office File Destruction/Retention*

In response to Council actions in August on issues related to the retention or destruction of old editorial office files, the Committee on Publications took two actions at its December 2012 meeting. The first action was a unanimous vote to retain all manuscript materials (both hard copy and electronic files) for ten years for *administrative* purposes only (files would not be available otherwise). After ten years, the files would be destroyed. The ten-year guideline would apply to the editorial office files from 1990 to 2010 being held at a Bethesda, Maryland, storage facility and for future electronic files. If Council accepts the recommendation, any files from 2002 and earlier would be destroyed immediately.

The second Publications Committee action, also by unanimous vote, was to form a subcommittee to create a plan for how ASA could seek permission from future authors and reviewers to make manuscripts and reviews available to researchers (after an extensive embargo period), provide a test period of seeking permission, evaluate the success of the criteria, and consider evaluating the utility of a more extensive survey.

Council discussion commenced with Past President Erik Olin Wright clarifying that the action to retain editorial materials for ten years was not a permanent archiving solution; the materials *would* be destroyed after a period in which they were held for administrative use only.

A suggestion was made that Council to defer implementation of the proposed ten-year guideline for one year so that the materials from 1990 to 2010 would not be destroyed until any interested members of the discipline could test the likelihood that authors who submitted rejected manuscripts during this period and peer reviewers from the period would provide retroactive permission for ASA to preserve these records for future research. If such a test made retention appear feasible, the interested parties would also have to pursue sources of funding that would pay for the remaining work that would be needed to review, culled and retain those with appropriate permissions should Council decide on this course of action.

The Executive Officer reported on her discussions with leaders of other social science associations at a meeting sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). Other scholarly organizations are also dealing with archival issues. While ASA's situation may have some different dimensions due to its Code of Ethics, all organizations are dealing with copyright parameters, implied contracts and ethical concerns regarding peer reviews, and historiography. ACLS is looking at getting a small grant from the Mellon Foundation to convene a group of experts to have broader discussion among scholarly societies about how to approach these issues. It would be good if ASA's decision-making allowed time for the ACLS initiative to yield fruit. One way to do that could be to amend the Publications Committee recommendation by dropping the clause about destroying materials after ten years.

It was noted that the task of the subcommittee created by the Committee on Publications was to think for the future. If a researcher wants to understand the intellectual history of discipline by looking at rejected manuscripts and peer reviews, it is necessary to get permission from authors and reviewers to use those materials. This raises implications about scholars' willingness to do peer reviews in the future if they knew the reviews would be kept and potentially used for research. One factor that contributes to the current lengthy periods for manuscript review is how long it takes to get people to agree to do a review (not how long it takes them to write a review). One reason the subcommittee would be asked to think about a survey was to find out what member responses would be to a request to give permission for research access to review materials.

Discussion again circled back to the notion of deferring action for one year so that those who wished to preserve the material would have some time to find a way to test its feasibility and to find funding for the preservation. The Secretary pointed out that one cost implication of a deferral would be that ASA would continue to have \$5,000 in storage fees for another year.

It was also noted that the current ASA policy is to keep editorial office files for three years, and SAGE has agreed to that in its electronic system SAGETrack. If ASA now wants to keep information from SAGETrack for a longer period, a new directive and new arrangements are necessary.

A proposal was made to consider tabling the recommendations from the Committee on Publications and put a one-year moratorium on destroying all records (paper and electronic). This would permit Council to be informed by the ACLS activity and allow archivists to pursue the feasibility of and funding for further preservation.

MOTION: To table the recommendations from the Committee on Publications. Carried (no opposed).

MOTION: To (1) preserve all electronic and paper records for one year, pending deliberations on archival issues; (2) make no commitment to fund preservation of records past one year; and (3) invite those interested in long-term preservation to produce feasibility and funding plans to guarantee preservation for consideration at the winter meeting of the 2013-2014 Council. Carried (no opposed, no abstentions).



Council took a lunch break at 12:00 – 1:05pm. As the meeting reconvened, the President announced modifications to the agenda so the Annual Meeting and New Business (agenda items 6 and 12) would be taken up after the publications business was handled.

### *(3). Editor Honoraria*

Honoraria for ASA journals and the Rose Series have remained largely unchanged since 1981. The Committee on Publications voted to recommend to EOB and Council that editor honoraria be increased as soon as possible by the rate of inflation since 1981 (roughly 154 percent). While EOB supported the recommendation, it voted to phase in the increase over two years.

The Secretary provided background information that the Committee had looked at including what other societies and publishers are providing in editorial honoraria and concluded that ASA was somewhere in the middle between wide-ranging extremes. ASA's honoraria levels are modest, and symbolic. Also the honoraria are per journal, so the amount must be divided among any co-editors.

A question was raised regarding whether the amount of the honorarium affects the quality and/or quantity of editorship applications. There was a general perception among Council members that ASA members are willing to be editors regardless of the honorarium or its level. It was suggested that, given the projected budget deficit for 2012, perhaps this was not the time to make a permanent increase in expenditures. While there was some shared concern about the budget, it was clear that most Council members viewed the current honoraria as embarrassingly low. Council members vouched for the fact that the honorarium is not viewed as compensation for all the time and effort involved in an editorship and that home institutional support of editors and their editorial offices is very uneven. Council members reached consensus that increasing the honoraria was important and doing so over a two-year period was a sensible approach.

The varying levels of honoraria among the ASA publication editors received some attention with particular focus on the Rose Series honorarium. The Committee on Publications had access to an extensive subcommittee report that examined differences between ASA publications, but that material was not available to Council. It was suggested that Council should refer the issue of the Rose honorarium back to the committee for further consideration.

**MOTION:** To ask the Committee on Publications to reconsider the comparability between the honoraria for quarterly journals and the Rose Series. Carried (1 no, no abstentions).

**MOTION:** That Council approve the increase in honoraria as recommended by EOB for 2013, with a presumption that the increase for 2014 will proceed pending further input from Committee on Publications. Carried (1 no, 0 abstention).

### *(4). Editorial Office Copyediting*

All independent copy editing contracts for quarterly journals were concluded as part of the transition to SAGE in 2010 because SAGE provides copy editing services. It now appears, however, that the type of copy editing SAGE provides is primarily proofreading. Some of the ASA editors need additional

substantive editing, and they would like the ability to have some additional copy editing support available from the ASA. EOB reviewed this request. Rather than inserting support for copy editing back into individual editorial office budgets, EOB recommended putting funds into the general Publications Department budget for use by the editors. ASA Publications staff would then have these funds available as they review editorial offices expenses and work with editors to devise appropriate arrangements including substantive copy editing.

**MOTION:** That Council approve \$6,000 in copy editing funds for use by ASA journals in 2013. Carried (no opposed, no abstentions).

(5). *New Section Journal: Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*

Before discussion about the proposed new journal began, three Council members indicated they had with potential conflicts of interest and left the room (Brunsma, Lewis, and Romero.)

The Secretary indicated that the Committee on Publications had reviewed the proposal from the ASA Section on Racial and Ethnic Minorities (SREM) for a section-sponsored journal devoted to publishing sociological research on race and ethnicity. The journal is expected to fill a current publishing void by creating a space for sociological research, pedagogical innovations, as well as contemporary debates in race and ethnicity. The proposed journal, *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, has strong potential to also bring more sociologists who have not found an intellectual home to the American Sociological Association. The Publications Committee unanimously approved the section's journal proposal and recommended it to Council.

Council was very receptive to the recommendation to approve the journal proposal. There was some discussion about the difference(s) between an ASA journal and a Section journal. Current guidelines stipulate that costs for section-sponsored journals be underwritten by the section, which usually includes securing a publisher that will underwrite start-up costs. The section has its own publications committee that handles applications for the editorship; the section then informs the Committee on Publications about the chosen editor. The cost of a subscription to the journal is included in the section dues and part of the income supporting the journal.

It was noted that this approach has set up a two-tiered system of journal publication within the association. But this approach lets sections experiment with new journals, with oversight from the Committee on Publications and the Executive Office. The policy guidelines stipulation that ASA can take over a section journal at any time making the journal an ASA-wide journal, but this has not occurred to date. Some concern was expressed that sections receive a great deal of support from the Association for these ventures since the Executive Office undertakes the contractual arrangements and the on-going administrative management of the journal and its relationship to the publishing partner as it does with ASA-wide journals. Revenue-sharing at some point could be appropriate. It was suggested that EOB be asked to consider provisions to reserve the right for a share of the royalties to go to the ASA operating budget when a section journal reaches the break-even point.

**MOTION:** To approve the proposal for a new journal entitled *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* from the ASA Section on Racial and Ethnic Minorities. Carried.

**MOTION:** To ask the EOB Committee and the Executive Office to review the relationship between the finances of section-based journals and the ASA. Carried (no opposed, no abstention).

*(a). ASA Publications Portfolio Guidelines*

A document containing the current guidelines was provided for Council reference.

*(6). Amended Sociological Methodology (SM) Mission Statement*

At its December 2012 meeting, the Committee on Publications reviewed a proposed revised mission statement for *Sociological Methodology*. The Committee recommended Council approve the revised mission statement, as follows.

*Sociological Methodology (SM)* is the only American Sociological Association periodical publication devoted entirely to research methods. It is a compendium of new and sometimes controversial advances in social science methodology. Contributions come from diverse areas and have something new and useful--and sometimes surprising--to say about a wide range of methodological topics. *SM* seeks qualitative and quantitative contributions that address the full range of methodological problems confronted by empirical research in the social sciences, including conceptualization, data analysis, data collection, measurement, modeling, and research design. The journal provides a forum for engaging the philosophical issues that underpin sociological research. Papers published in *SM* are original methodological contributions including new methodological developments, reviews, or illustrations of recent developments that provide new methodological insights, and critical evaluative discussions of research practices and traditions. *SM* encourages the inclusion of applications to real-world sociological data. *SM* is published annually as an edited, hardbound book.

**MOTION:** That Council approve the revised mission statement for *Sociological Methodology*. Carried (no opposed/abstention)

*C. Annual Report*

Production of an ASA annual report was included in the proposed budget for 2013. The Secretary invited comments and feedback about content of the previous annual reports and their continuation. Some suggestions included having more benchmarking reports and data on the profession. Council members were then urged to encourage their departments to respond to the Department survey sent out by the ASA Research Department to collect the data for such reports.

**6. Annual Meetings**

*A. Update on the 2013 Annual Meeting and Related Presidential Activities*

President Ridgeway outlined plans for three Plenary Sessions and a series of presidential panels. Efforts have been made to focus on multi-dimensional inequality (race/class/gender) throughout the major invited components of the program. This includes multi-disciplinary approaches to inequality and methodology sessions on micro-macro linkages. There will also be a session on the New Town

massacre. Ridgeway was thrilled both with the location of the meeting and the record number of paper submissions.

#### *B. Update on the 2014 Program Committee*

President-elect Annette Lareau highlighted her meeting theme, “Hard Times: The Impact of Economic Inequality on Families and Individuals”, and indicated that the deadline for submitting invited session proposals is February 5, 2013. The 2014 Program Committee is planning to increase the number of Author Meets Critics sessions and is making an effort to include new books (those in press now). The 2014 meeting site is San Francisco, which is usually a good draw for attendees.

There was some discussion of the advance planning schedule and the constraints that exist in order to get organizers committed and a Call for Papers produced in the fall. The invited sessions have to be in place before open submissions commence, for reasons ranging from space availability to restrictions on how many times an individual can be on the program.

#### *C. Criteria for Viable Annual Meeting Sites*

The President indicated that no decisions were needed on Annual Meeting sites. Council members were urged to read the memorandum outlining general information on some potentially viable meeting sites in preparation for a future site vote. “Viable” in this context referred to destinations offering the basic factors important for an ASA meeting site, such as: meeting space—flexibility and accessibility, air access/service, local transportation services, proximity and diversity of restaurants, and an overall comfortable climate and “city feel.” The next open years for site selection are 2020 and 2021.

## **7. Status Committee Updates**

#### *A. Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Sociology (CSREMS)*

CSREMS members, led by current chair Scott N. Brooks, continue to plan dissemination strategies for the recommendations in its 2011 report at individual campuses and regional sociology meetings into 2013 and 2014. The report will also be featured as part of a symposium at the upcoming AAAS Annual Meeting next month in Boston.

Moving forward, the Committee will continue to work with the ASA Research Department as well as the ASA Minority Affairs Program on issues and studies of common interest regarding graduate students, faculty, academic departments, and diversity, and especially in gathering further qualitative interviews.

#### *B. Committee on the Status of Persons with Disabilities in Sociology*

There was no progress to report on the committee’s plans to launch a confidential survey of ASA members who have expressed interest in receiving information about accessibility services at the Annual Meeting and other ASA events. It is expected that follow-up interviews will be planned with a subset of survey respondents who say they are willing to be interviewed and provide their contact information.

### *C. Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology (CSWS)*

Under the direction of CSWS chair Alexandra Kalev, the committee designed, edited, tested and redesigned a survey that asks about time in rank and factors that could explain differences besides gender, such as child and family responsibilities, availability and use of work/family policies, service activities, and publications. The ASA Department of Research on the Profession and the Discipline received IRB approval from the Western Institution Review Board to conduct the survey. The survey was sent out mid-October and was closed in mid-December. At the time the survey closed, there was a 62 percent response rate. Data are now being prepared for analysis, and a research brief should appear in the spring.

## **8. Task Force Updates**

### *A. Task Force on Sociology and Global Climate Change*

This Task Force is in negotiations with Oxford University Press to publish its report; the ASA Director of Publications and Membership is participating because ASA will be the contract signatory. The full volume with revised chapters is due to Oxford in June 2013.

### *B. Task Force on Community College Sociology Faculty*

The first full meeting of the task force took place via conference call in November, with 12 of the 13 members participating. As a result of that meeting, three subcommittees were established to (1) develop a sampling frame of community college faculty teaching sociology in the United States, (2) develop a survey protocol for community college faculty, and (3) develop an interview protocol for community college administrators. Subcommittees will meet once a month, and the full task force plans to meet every three months.

### *C. Task Force on the Post-Doctoral Fellowship in Sociology*

At the request of this task force, ASA Research Department staff members are currently collecting information on the number and types of post-doctoral (post-doc) positions listed in the ASA Job Bank over the last several years in order to begin the process of examining the supply and demand sides of post-doctoral training in the discipline.

One important question for the task force is whether there is a disjuncture between PhD training in sociology and the type of post-docs available to sociology PhDs, and if this disjuncture (should it exist) is important to overcome. The next step for the Research Department is to obtain a site license to use the Survey of Doctoral Recipients in order to analyze the impact of post-docs on sociological careers. The hope is to complete the analyses by the time the task force meets in August.

## **9. Report of the Executive Officer**

### *A. Overview of the Staff and Year*

Hillsman reported little turnover in Executive Office staff.

### *B. Functional Distribution of Staff*

There was no change in the staffing structure during 2012.

### *C. Information Technology Report*

There was no discussion of the technology report.

### *D. Update on ASA Amicus Curiae Brief on DOMA*

Council voted at its meeting in August 2012 to move forward with preparations to submit an amicus brief on DOMA and California Proposition 8 if pertinent cases were accepted onto the docket of the U.S. Supreme Court. Two cases were accepted in the fall by the Supreme Court, and President Ridgeway recruited Professor Wendy Manning (Bowling Green State University) to do a review of pertinent social science literature. Manning has completed a synopsis of the social science research, and lawyers are working on fitting that information into a brief. The focus will be on 41 published original studies of child well-being, not on adult outcomes or on summaries of literature. A draft of the amicus brief will be sent to Council when it is completed for its review and approval.

The lawyers working on the ASA brief have talked to other groups that are filing briefs. The APA is doing its own brief and will let other groups sign onto it but will not let them influence the content. In terms of recruiting other social science associations to join ASA on this, lawyers have advised that ASA should file its own brief, in part because family sociology is a core area of the discipline and Mark Regnerus, whose recent research has been interpreted as challenging the existing literature on the impact of gay parents compared to opposite sex parents on childhood outcomes, is a sociologist.

Council expressed its enormous gratitude to Manning for agreeing to take on this difficult task.

## **10. Executive Office Programs**

### *A. Academic and Professional Affairs Program (APAP)*

APAP Director Margaret Weigers Vitullo reported that the program has been particularly focused on two projects in the period since Council met in August – namely, launching the new ASA Academic and Professional Affairs Webinar Series, and working with the new editor for TRAILS, Professor Diane Pike, to improve the way TRAILS functions and to increase both submissions and subscriptions. Both projects are going extremely well. TRAILS now has over 1,000 subscriptions, and the webinars series has drawn over 700 registrants. APAP is exploring webinars as a way of delivering more services to members and departments.

### *B. Minority Affairs Program (MAP)*

MFP Director Jean Shin expressed thanks to Council for allocating funding to support two more fellowship slots. The program is cooperating with the ASA Research Department to look at the career trajectories and qualitative experiences of MFP Fellows. There is some hope that these data will provide a core basis for fundraising efforts.

### *C. Student Programs*

Both the Honors Program (HP) and the Student Forum continue to be vibrant. The HP is receiving more and more applications and is now having to turn away some students, unfortunately.

### *D. High School Sociology Affiliate Program*

Currently 91 ASA members list their employment sector as elementary/secondary school (including 2012 members and those who have already joined for 2013), which shows some success in bringing high school teachers into the association. Additionally, the ASA High School email list service has 244 subscribers and is becoming an active forum for comments, suggestions, and other feedback on teaching sociology in high schools.

After reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of the first two high school sociology conferences held prior to the ASA Annual Meeting, the High School Advisory Board decided to pilot test an alternative model that maintains the same basic structure and approach to content, but changes the venue from the ASA Annual Meeting to the Annual Meeting of the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS).

### *E. Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program*

The six initial 2010-2012 ASA/NSF Postdoctoral Fellows completed the second academic year of the program in August 2012. A second cohort of five new post-doctoral fellows has been competitively selected, and placements for the 2012-2014 ASA/NSF Postdoctoral Fellows were announced in the September 2012 issue of *Footnotes*.

Under the direction of Research Director Roberta Spalter-Roth, ASA has also been conducting an evaluation of the Postdoctoral Fellowship program as part of ASA's longer-range interest on the impact of postdoctoral positions on the career trajectories, scientific productivity, and overall job satisfaction of sociology PhD recipients. Some findings from the results of the three surveys of the first cohort of 2010-2012 Postdoctoral Fellows and non-recipients were reported.

Both groups—whether NSF/ASA Fellows or non-recipients—were highly-qualified candidates for the award. Yet, most of the 16 non-recipients who responded to the survey indicated that they were continuing to search for a permanent position. More than two-thirds reported that they were not trained for nonacademic positions, an important kind of preparation in a tight labor market.

Although very small in size to make defensible conclusions, half of the cohort of 2010-2012 ASA/NSF Fellows has obtained permanent positions, of which two are tenure-track teaching positions. That is in contrast to the non-recipients who responded, for which two (one-eighth) have obtained tenure-track positions.

Perhaps most noteworthy is the large number of peer-reviewed publications, conference papers, and other academic publications to which the ASA/NSF Fellows contributed, in contrast to the volume reported by the larger cohort of 16 non-recipients.

### *F. Research on the Discipline and Profession*

Spalter-Roth reported that eight projects were underway in the ASA Research Department. Staff is also working on a large proposal submission to the National Science Foundation (NSF) to look at broader career trajectories with minorities in economics. NSF has requested that ASA put together a

workshop on how to get sociological research into the policy process. This will look at what the networks/relationships are that result in research being read and/or used in public policy processes.

#### *G. Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline (FAD)*

There were 23 proposals submitted for the June 2012 cycle of FAD grants; awards were given to six applicants. At the end of each cycle, Research Department staff compare applicants who receive the grant with those who do not. Applicants come from a broad spectrum of colleges and universities, all academic ranks, and a range of years since receiving their PhDs. The modal grantee is an assistant professor from a research university.

#### *H. Public Affairs and Public Information Program (PAPI)*

Throughout the fall of 2012, ASA joined more than 3,000 national, state and local organizations in warning the U.S. Congress and President Barack Obama that automatic budget cuts set for January 2013 (sequestration) could have “devastating” effects on research and education. Federal funding for social science research, and research in general, remains problematic even though the outpouring of support against sequestration was greater from the science industry than any other group.

Hillsman indicated that the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) has been having special meetings to look at what can be done to broaden COSSA’s impact this year. The long-time director of COSSA, Howard Silver, is retiring at the end of 2013, but he is fully focusing on carrying the ball while the board searches for his replacement.

There have been discussions within the Executive Office regarding what ASA needs to do to prepare for any major push to cut funding for social science in general, or that targets sociology in particular (e.g., what happened to political science). ASA has not done grassroots advocacy to date. The question is whether there are ways to strengthen the capacity to do that without falling afoul of lobbying laws, spending a lot of money, or bothering members unduly.

PAPI Director Brad Smith pointed out that one reason COSSA has evolved the way it has is because the member groups bring different elements. For example, the Population Association of America has a full-time lobbyist, while the American Economic Association does little or no advocacy to date. ASA brings a lot of passionate members and the ability to promote sociological research in the press.

Sociologists do public sociology and talk a lot about social policy, but they do not do a lot of talking directly to their members of Congress. There was some interest in Council about the idea of meetings with representatives in one’s home state. It was suggested that a representative could be invited to come to a class and make a presentation, then participate in discussion with students. Undergraduate majors in sociology are usually very enthusiastic, and it would be good to tap into that. Another route could be to demonstrate how much government funding is supporting activities in a particular Congressional district.

Grassroots advocacy does not have to be explicit lobbying. If an organization is not a registered lobbying group, however, it has to be careful about grassroots outreach. Council members were encouraged to send additional ideas and suggestions to the Executive Officer.



## 11. Membership

### A. 2012 Membership Report

The 2012 membership year ended with a final count of 13,125, a decrease of 928 members. As of January 4, 2013, there were 6,507 members who had renewed for 2013, which was 6.5 percent higher than on the same day in 2012. While ASA Membership staff is not putting too much stock in the comparison, they are paying close attention to how members are renewing across the expanded set of membership categories, particularly those who are selecting membership categories that reflect income higher than the previous top category of "Over \$70,000". Thus far, 1,210 members (nearly 35 percent of all regular members across all income categories) have selected the top four categories (income of \$85,000 or more), with 340 selecting the highest income category (income of \$150,000+).

The Secretary indicated that this year's Annual Meeting site is conducive to high participation, and since there is a segment of the membership that only joins when planning to attend the meeting, the outlook is cautiously optimistic for higher membership counts.

### B. 2012 Sections Report

For sections, the 2012 membership year came to a somewhat disappointing end, with most sections ending the year with fewer members than in 2011. This outcome was not unexpected given the decline in ASA membership for 2012. The good news is that 2012 saw a continuation of the trend toward a greater number of section memberships per member. The average number of section memberships per participating member is now 2.90 and has consistently increased over the last decade.

There are a few sections with low membership, and some that are not submitting annual reports. The Committee on Sections is paying attention to both those issues. Evidence that a small section is intellectually vital and active is viewed as more important than its membership count however.

It was pointed out that many ASA members' primary connection to disciplinary life is through the sections. There is an orientation session for new section officers during each Annual Meeting, but it would be good if there was another opportunity for Section officers to get together in a more informal way. Governance Director Michael Murphy indicated that a small block of time is scheduled on the program every year. It was suggested that this might be advertised better, and that refreshments could be offered.

#### (1) Sections Bylaws Amendments

A series of amendments for sections' bylaws sections was recommended to Council by the Committee on Sections (COS). The seven sections that proposed bylaws changes were: Collective Behavior and Social Movements; Community and Urban Sociology; Crime, Law, and Deviance; Organizations, Occupations, and Work; Sociology of Education; Teaching and Learning; and Theory.

Council Member Laurel Smith-Doerr, the COS liaison, indicated that the revisions were thoroughly vetted by COS.

<p><b>MOTION:</b> To approve all the proposed Section Bylaw amendments. Carried (no opposed, no abstentions).</p>
---

## 12. New Business

### *A. ASA's Contribution to the NAS Panel on Changes to the Common Rule*

The Executive Officer reported to Council in August 2012 regarding the response to the DHHS request for comments (ANPRM) on proposed changes to the Common Rule (45 CFR 46). Nothing much was happening with the submitted comments, though there was concern in the National Academies of Science (NAS) that something would move after the November election. Late in November, Robert Hauser contacted the Executive Officer about providing support for an NRC DBASSE workshop on the issues raised by the ANPRM that were of particular relevance to the behavioral, social, and educational sciences. The workshop would be in preparation for raising a large level of funds need for an NAS expedited Consensus Panel. The goal was to identify changes that would enhance human research participation protection, streamline the IRB review process, and address issues that impede behavioral and social science research by trying to fit those disciplines within a biomedical framework.

DBASSE would appoint an interdisciplinary panel of 9-10 members for the workshop panel. Areas of expertise include social, behavioral, educational, and biomedical sciences and research ethics, as well as expertise in the protection of human research participants. The entire fast-track project would be conducted in two phases. Phase 1 included a planning meeting and a public workshop in early 2013, whose proceedings would be published in a workshop summary report. In Phase 2 a panel would prepare a consensus report based on the workshop, previous NRC and IOM reports, and other evidence, providing additional funding was obtained beyond that provided by NSF.

The urgent funding request to ASA asked for \$25,000. When Council is not in session, the ASA Constitution invests fiscal authority in the Secretary. Due to the time constraints, the ASA Secretary authorized allocating \$25,000 for DBASSE from the American Sociological Fund. Council heartily agreed with the Secretary's decision and the funding allocation.

### *B. Proposal Regarding ASA's Use of Social Media*

President-Elect Lareau presented a proposal regarding ASA's use of social media. Three different areas of concern were identified. The first concern was that there are no references to non-ASA blogs on the ASA website, and bloggers would like a warmer reception from ASA.

The second concern was promoting books and articles. Members want to get their research noticed but lack the expertise to accomplish those goals. Lareau proposed to create a task force to consider specific ways to provide services for members in marketing and promoting their research.

The third area was improving the ASA website. Lareau proposed to establish an advisory committee to assist ASA staff in serving members/users better during the "refresh" of the site that is being planned.

In general, the proposal was favorably received by Council members. The Executive Officer noted that current ASA policies about not linking to other sites come from earlier times when there were some legal reasons for not doing so, some issues of selectivity, and concerns about maintenance. ASA also did not have a full-time webmaster on staff until relatively recently. If some financial support is needed for the proposed task force or committees, the President suggested that perhaps initial funding would come from the Spivack Fund.

Council members were invited to volunteer to serve on the task force or propose names for appointment to the committee and/or advisory group. It was suggested that the call for task force volunteers should encourage young people to apply. However, the value of involving young, adept, graduate students should go hand-in-hand with including knowledgeable members with the experience to produce appropriate content.

**MOTION:** That Council appoint an *ad hoc* committee on social media policy issues, create a Task Force on Using Media to Increase the Visibility of Sociological Research, and recommend ASA members for an ASA webpage Advisory Group. Carried (no opposed, no abstentions).

There was agreement that Lareau would chair the task force, and Council members Brunsma and Smith-Doerr volunteered to serve where useful. The invitation to members to volunteer for the task force will appear in the next available issue of *Footnotes*.

### *C. Hyatt Hotels*

The Executive Officer provided a report on an issue that arose for the Southern Sociological Society (SSS) and its meeting sites for 2013 and 2014. SSS had contracted with Hyatt hotels that were included on a recent UNITE HERE boycott list. Former ASA Secretary and current SSS President Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, along with other SSS leaders, talked with the ASA Executive Office staff about the situation. ASA Meeting Services staff provided generic information about dealing with facilities that have union issues, and SSS was able to negotiate rebooking its meetings with only a small penalty involved.

Hillsman emphasized several important points to Council. ASA pays careful attention to what is in contracts and looks carefully at unionization issues at potential sites. In the case of Chicago and the eventual change of venue for the 2011 Annual Meeting, there was nothing that would have predicted the problem that developed. That meeting was scheduled for two years after the expiration date of the hotel workers contracts; while the collective bargaining started long before the contract expiration, no contract got signed because of issues that developed involving the City of Chicago. It is simply not possible to control all issues and/or actors. ASA has done its best to schedule meetings appropriately and has developed its own contract template that includes priorities that Association has laid out (ERA, accessibility, labor/union issues). That template is used to negotiate all contracts at each meeting site. The only person who can sign contracts on behalf of the Association is the Executive Officer, and all contracts are run through legal review before signing. The process of executing a contract for ASA has a well-defined structure.

Another important factor for Council to be aware of is that ASA has well trained and experienced Meeting Services staff that keep in close contact with national representatives of hotel corporations that the Association does business with, as well as maintain communications with staff at the major hotels that ASA revisits. The Executive Office can try to help colleagues in other associations to think about principles that their organization needs to set in place and implement in its contracting, but it cannot negotiate on behalf of those organizations.

Lastly, while ASA does not have a policy that requires it to meet in union hotels, it gives priority to union properties.

*D. ASA slates for the election of the Association's national leadership*

Past President Wright noted that in the current slate of candidates for the upcoming 2013 ASA election has a representation of women that is substantially out of proportion to the members of discipline. He affirmed the importance of increasing the number of women in the discipline and their representation in senior roles, but he wondered how the ASA processes for diversity were working and whether outcomes such as the 2013 slate might be a problematic signal about leadership in the Association. He noted that there were obviously several reasons for disproportionate representation, including which nominees decline the opportunity to stand for election.

The possibility of producing a gender-based report on nominees and acceptance rates was discussed. There are many stages in the election process including who is on the nominations committees, who is nominated and the rank order, who declines to stand for election, who votes and who gets elected. The composition of the committees creating the list of nominees is the first step.

Governance staff indicated that there some data are available for the past 4-5 years of ASA elections that could provide some information on the ratios of nominees and acceptances to running and winning elections. A question was raised about looking at other indicators of diversity, such as type of institution and geographic location. President Ridgeway indicated that the Executive Office should make an effort to get whatever data are available and report back to Council in August.

*F. ASR editorship term*

An issue was raised about the way that ASA deals with setting the length of editorship for ASR, its flagship journal. The initial term of editorship is three years, with an option to renew for 1-3 years. New editors are usually asked within the first year of their editorship whether they want to renew. The timeframe seems somewhat problematic for such decisions. It is a little early for problems to show up, and in theory it would be possible to end up having a problematic editor for 6 years.

An argument can be made for having a more limited timeframe for the ASR editorship, perhaps a three-year term with the option of a one-year extension. This would permit a more frequent rotation in the editorship of the flagship journal, which could have positive effects in several ways, including giving more chances for other types of work to be considered.

There was consensus in Council to have the Secretary take this issue to the Committee on Publications.

*G. The president who serves on the Publications Committee*

AS the meeting drew to a close, President Ridgeway commented on a difficulty with meeting all the Presidential obligations during the Annual Meeting. The President serves on the Committee on Publications, and that committee currently meets all day on the second day of the meeting, right up to the start of the plenary featuring the ASA Awards Ceremony and Presidential Address. One suggestion was to have the President-Elect or Past-President sit in the committee meeting instead of the President. Any formal change would require amending the ASA Bylaws.

With thanks to all the Council members and ASA staff in attendance, President Ridgeway adjourned the second meeting of the 2012-2013 ASA Council at 5:46 p.m. on Saturday, January 26, 2013.