

2009-2010 and 2010-2011 Council Meeting Minutes

2009-2010 PSA Council Meeting Minutes

Ginny Mulle, Secretary

The 2009-10 PSA Council was brought to order by President Michael Messner at 8:15 a.m. on Friday, April 9th during the 81st Annual PSA Meeting in Oakland. Council members present were: Michael Messner, Judy Treas, Sharon Araji, Amy Wharton, Don Barrett, Dean Dorn, Bob O'Brien, Ellen Berg, Karen Pyke, David Musick and Liza Kuecker. Also present was Ginny Mulle, Secretary and Chuck Powers and Marilyn Fernandez, co-editors of *Sociological Perspectives*. Newly elected members Beth Schneider, Denise Sequra, Stefanie Mollburn and Karen Steinheimer were also in attendance.

The report on the journal *Sociological Perspectives* was presented by Chuck Powers. In brief (see entire report in May Newsletter), he reported there was a breadth of coverage of articles, there were 122 new submissions which is stable and healthy, the acceptance rate for 2008 was ~20%, there was a rapid review process time on average of 97 days, there were authors representing different sectors, i.e., re gender, location, regional distribution, and author rank. This year the co-authors renewed the practice of publishing Research Notes in the journal. New editor(s) should be selected by July 2011, with a one year phase in period so they would begin their authorship by July, 2012 volume.

Dean Dorn reported that the Audit Committee reviewed the financial records of the organization and found the records in order.

President Messner was excited about the program and found it a privilege to organize Presidential Sessions around the theme "Revitalizing the Sociological Imagination: Individual Troubles and Social Issues in a Turbulent World." He especially encouraged that members attend Michael Burawoy's keynote address, "On Political Imagination: C. Wright Mill's Sociological Imagination and Beyond."

After 17 years guiding the PSA Dean Dorn announced that he is retiring as Executive Director of the organization. There are two candidates for the position, Don Barrett and Chuck Hohm. Sunday's Council will interview both candidates and make the hiring decision at that time.

Executive Director Dorn reported that the membership for 2009 was 1,276; comprised of 703 faculty members and 573 students. A record number of 1,064 attendees were at the 2009 meeting in San Diego. There will be a report issued by the Membership Committee within the next year reporting on membership issues facing the organization. One major issue that was discussed by Council was the fact that more and more program presenters either drop out of sessions at a very late date, or do not even notify the session organizer that they will not attend. Karen Sternheimer,

Program Chair, mentioned that many sessions that had been proposed “disappeared” by the time of the meeting.

Other topics covered in the Executive Director’s report were that the financial status of the organization is very healthy and that the Endowment Fund, which is used for student travel money is also very strong. Dorn expressed his desire to become more involved with the Endowment Fund after his retirement.

The Secretary’s Report was given by Ginny Mulle. She noted that this year, due to the excellent work of the chairs of the Teaching and Awards Committees, Michelle Camacho and Teresa Ciabattari, two teaching awards will be presented at the Awards Ceremony. One will be the Dean Dorn Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award and the other the Early Career Award for Innovation in teaching Sociology. The next award that will be reviewed will be the Practice Award which now focuses on community work rather than university work, which has eliminated many worthy candidates.

Two motions were presented to Council for a vote. The first was to correct an inconsistency in the language of the description of the chair of the Nominations Committee in the PSA Constitution. The language would now correctly state that the past-president of the PSA serves as the chair of the committee. It was unanimously passed.

The second motion regarded adding to the duties of the current PSA vice president. The past vice president is the chair of the Committee on Committees (C on C). This motion would create a position of co-chair of the C on C which would be filled by the current vice president. Thus, the past vice president would be lead co-chair of the C on C, and the current vice president would be co-chair of the C on C. The motion passed unanimously.

Judy Treas suggested to Council that anew ad hoc committee be created called the Emeritus Committee. It would be comprised of emeriti faculty members and would be a way to more fully integrate them into the organization. A motion to create an ad hoc Emeriti Committee was proposed and seconded, and was unanimously passed. The Committee on Committees will be responsible to appoint members to the committee.

Executive Director Dorn and President Messner thanked those members who will be leaving Council for their time in service to the organization and told them that their work was much appreciated.

The meeting was adjourned by President Messner at 10:30 a.m.

2010-2011 PSA Council Meeting Minutes

Ginny Mulle, Secretary

President Sharon Araji called the 2010-2011 Executive Council meeting to order at 8:15 a.m. Attending were: Sharon Araji, President, Mike Messner, Past-President, Beth Schneider, President-Elect, Don Barrett, Vice President, Dean Dorn, Executive Director, Council members

Liza Kuecker, David Musick, Lucas Kirkpatrick, Stefanie Mollborn, Karen Sternheimer and Peter Collier, and Secretary, Virginia Mulle.

The two candidates for the position of Executive Director of the PSA, Chuck Holm and Don Barrett, were interviewed by Council members. Chuck Holm was selected by Council members for a five-year term as the new Executive Director, who will immediately begin working with retiring Executive Director Dean Dorn during a transition period.

There was no old business carried over from the meeting on Friday, April 9, 2010.

President Sharon Araji reported on plans for the 2011 PSA program which include bringing in businesses from outside of academia to the meeting; inviting members of the Sociology Department at Ohio State University to conduct a workshop on issues relevant to rural sociology; developing a session that will take an historical look at Criminology; along with the Student Affairs Committee setting up a table at registration on Student Orientation to the meeting; developing an ad hoc committee that will incorporate more attention to Native American issues and include Native American scholars and students in the 2011 program; extend outreach efforts to include Canadian members; and increase involvement of University of Washington faculty and students.

For the 2011 meeting The Endowment Committee has proposed an Honorary Reception for Dean Dorn for which raffle tickets will be sold. The Membership Committee will forward to Council a list of recommendations that were the result of two surveys sent out by the committee over the past two years regarding the state of the PSA as perceived by the members.

President Araji and Past-President Messner delegated authority to the 2010-2011 Nominations Committee and Committee on Committees to solicit nominations for elective office and appointed positions on the sixteen PSA committees. Council unanimously approved that 50 travel awards from the Endowment Committee in the amount of \$150 each be offered to students who will be on the program at the 2011 meeting in Seattle.

Various sites in the southern region were suggested for the 2012 annual meeting including Pasadena, San Diego, Los Angeles and Long Beach. The site selection committee will take these suggestions into consideration in selecting the meeting location.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m. by President Araji.

Business Meeting Report

Report from the 2010 Business Meeting

Dean S. Dorn Executive Director

The PSA Business Meeting was called to order around 5:15 PM on April 10th in Oakland. As usual do to the extremely large program and the fact that four receptions were going on at the same time, only five members were in attendance: Chuck Powers, Dean Dorn, Gordon Clanton, Vern Cromartie and Don Barrett.

Dorn reported that the 2010 meeting would be attended by around 1050 paid registered attendees. This is down from the 2009 meeting in San Diego, which saw the largest paid registration in the history of the association. The meeting turn out was quite robust given the

decline in the economy generally and specifically support for higher education. Dorn also reported that a significant number of those listed on the program were absent. This is a continuing problem for the association. With presenters submitting proposals in October and the annual meeting occurring in April, many events can take place that prevent presenters from attending the annual meeting. Another issue is that some presenters fail to inform the PSA Office or session organizers that they will not attend.

Dorn also reported on the financial shape of the association, which continues to be solid.

The meeting in 2011 in Seattle is being organized by president Sharon Araji and program chair, Lucy Dwight. It appears to be on schedule.

Some time was spent discussing the search for a new executive director. Council will announce the new director after its meeting in Oakland on Sunday April 11th. In addition, those present at the business meeting were encouraged to begin to solicit names for possible editor or coeditors of the journal. The current coeditors will be closing the editorial office around July 1 of 2011.

President elect Beth Schneider has indicated to Dorn that she will be considering Long Beach as the site of the 2011 annual meeting.

The Business Meeting adjourned around 5:45 PM.

2009-2010 Committee Reports

Report for the Committee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Don Barrett, Chair

The committee met on Friday, April 9, from 3:30 – 5 PM. Present at the meeting were:

Membership:

Don Barrett (CSU San Marcos)
Marcia Marx (CSU San Bernardino)
Dennis Loo (Cal Poly Pomona)
Byron Lee (Temple)
Akihiko Hirose (U Colorado Denver)
Patricia Little (CSU San Bernardino)*

Sine Anahita (U Alaska Fairbanks) did not attend but had previously notified the committee that she would not attend due to the meeting being held in California and California's vote for Prop 8.

Not present were Susan Palmer (Walla Walla CC), Jodie Dewey (Concordia), and Mary Texeira (CSU San Bernardino)

Ginny Mulle represented the executive offices at that meeting.

* Patricia Little has come to meetings in the past and is interested in the committee. The committee agreed to having her replace one of the existing members who has not been present. We also proposed Mike Harrod (Central Washington) and Jodi O'Brien (Seattle U) as other new members.

2010: Sessions sponsored by the meeting at 2010 have had a mixed results.

Session 24 (listed below), on opening night, was not well-attended with one presenter neither showing nor providing a paper and a second presenter providing a paper but not showing.

24) State Sanctioned Violence

(spons. by Comm. on Civil Rights & Liberties)

organizer: Byron Lee, Temple Univ.

Marie Elizabeth Berry, UCLA: *Mass Violence & the Political Empowerment of Women*

Shayla Jean Chilliak, McGill Univ.: *Governmentality, Surveillance, & the Exception: Citizenship & Immigration Detention in Canada*

Matthias Thiemann, Columbia Univ.: *From State as Provider to State as a Market Enabler: The State-Sanctioned Violence Of Consumer Credit*

Session 58, also on the opening night (listed below) was well-attended with about 20 signing up for an email distribution list of films and strong interest by grad students on teaching the area.

58) Using Film to Examine Gender, Race & Class in Human Trafficking

(spons. by Comm. on Civil Rights & Civil Liberties)

[note, wine and cheese will be served]

organizers: Patricia Little, Marcia Marx, Elsa Valdez, & Mary Texeira, CSUSB

Session 95, on Friday, had all of the presenters show and started out with an audience of only one but expanded to 5 over time. Though small, the discussion was lively and one attendee later reported to me that it was the most interesting and challenging of sessions that she attended. Note that though this session was sponsored by the committee, that fact did not appear in the description of the section).

95) Military & Education

organizer: Donald Barrett, CSUSM

Dara Elizabeth Naphan, UNR: *The Experiences of Military Veterans in Higher Education*

Donald Barrett, CSUSM: *To ROTC or NOT? Perceptions of the Military*

Phillip Fucella, UCB: *Love's Duty: Context Effects on the Creation of Sentiment Among Military Spouses*

After the committee meeting was Session 145 (listed below), which had an attendance of about 15 and was generally a good discussion.

145) The Turn Against the “Public Option” for Higher Education

(Spons. by Comm. on Civil Liberties & Civil Rights)

Organizer: Don Barrett, CSU San Marcos

discussants: Don Barrett, CSU San Marcos, Sharon Elise, CSU San Marcos & Marcia Marx, CSU San Bernardino

Also presented by the committee was session 202. Details on attendance are not currently available.

202) Wars & Occupations

organizer: Dennis Loo, Cal Poly Pomona

(spons. by the Comm. on Civil Rights & Liberties)

David Flores, Univ. of Michigan: *Experiencing War & Politics: the Sources of Vietnam Veteran Political Attitudes*

Yousef K. Baker, UCSB: *Exceptionality to Normalcy: Legitimation of Foreign Intervention in Iraqi Law*

Dennis Loo, Cal Poly Pomona: *The Limits of Power: U.S. Empire v. the World*

2011: Proposed sessions for 2011 (Seattle) include the following. In parentheses after the working title is the organizer’s name:

Civil Liberties in the Obama era (Dennis Loo)

Moral Pain (Don Barrett)

From WTO to now (Byron Lee)

Accessing liberty/accessing information (e.g, net neutrality, Byron Lee)

Whistle-blowing and government secrecy (Dennis Lee)

'Populism' and Tea Party politics (working title) (Patricia Little)

Education in Peril (with COFRAT, Marcia Marx)

Modern Day Slavery (video, Marcia Marx)

Report from the Audit Committee

Dean S. Dorn

The Audit Committee, Carolina Apesoa-Varano, UC Davis and Nicholas Miller, Sacramento City College, met in the office of the association on the campus of CSU Sacramento on April 6, 2010. After looking at the banking account, Quicken account, canceled checks and receipts for the fiscal year 2009, they found the financial records to be in order.

Report from the GLBT Committee

William Wagner III, Chair

At the 2010 meeting in Oakland, the GLBT Committee noted that our sponsored sessions this year so far had been well attended. The Committee will sponsor approximately 12 sessions at the PSA conference in 2011. Billy Wagner completed his 7th year as Committee Chair, and Byron Lee was elected as the new Chair.

Report from The Committee On Student Affairs Tina Burdsall and Joanna Gregson, Co-Chairs

During the 2009-2010 year, the Student Affairs Committee made some progress in increasing communication to student members. We got the Frequently Asked Questions online and sent out an email two weeks prior to the reception to all student members. Students appeared to appreciate having some contact information from us, and both of the Co-Chairs received emails from students who had questions or concerns.

The Student Affairs Committee organized three sessions for the conference in Oakland:

The first was titled “Thinking and Planning for your Future: Grad School?” This session was organized by Sally Rascoff (LAVC) and presided by Tina Burdsall (PSU). Mary Virnoche (Humbolt State), Randy Blazak (Portland State), Liahna Gordon (CSU Chico), and Tina Burdsall (Portland State) were discussants. This session did not have a large turn-out but the students that were there found it to be useful and expressed appreciation for the session.

The second session was titled “Where Do I Go from Here? Using Your MA or PhD in Sociology Secure Academic and Non-Academic Jobs.” This was organized by Sharon Oselin (CSLA). Presenters included Bayliss Camp (CSU Sacramento), Kate Luther (PLU), Roberto G Gonzales (University of Washington), and Jody Agius Vallego (USC). This session was well attended and the students appreciated the range of experiences present. A student later said that the session gave her many ideas to think about and was well worth her time.

The third session was titled “The Real Deal: Students Discuss Best / Worst Experiences With Faculty.” This was organized by Michael Barnes (CSU Long Beach). Lori Octaviano (UCR), Sarah MacDonald (UCB), Brian Rosenberg (UofO), and Sarah E. Cribbs (UofO) were the students on this panel. This session did not have a large turn-out, but everyone involved expressed how valuable this session was and encouraged its replication at future conferences.

- The Student Reception and Raffle was extremely successful again this year. The 81 students in attendance were thrilled with the free books and raffled checks. A special ‘thank you’ to Joanna Gregson and Karen Sternheimer for donating signed copies of their books which were raffled off to the enthusiastic students. Thanks are sent out to the publishers and the PSA for their contributions to this great event!

- The Committee on Student Affairs met on Saturday April 10th. Joanna Gregson was selected as Chair (2010-2011), Josh Meisel as Chair-Elect (2011-2012), and Ann Strahm as the Student Reception Coordinator (2011).

Four sessions will be submitted for next year:

1. Where Do I Go from Here? Using Your MA or PhD in Sociology Secure Academic and Non-Academic Jobs (Organizer, Joanna Gregson)
2. Getting into Grad School: Advice and Strategies that Work (Organizer, Shannon Bell)
3. Women Don't Ask: Negotiating Your First Job Offer (Co-Sponsored with the Committee on the Status of Women)
4. The Real Deal: Students Discuss Best/Worst Experiences with Faculty (Organizer, Michael Barnes)

Report from the Nominations Committee

Virginia Mulle, Secretary

The PSA Nominations Committee met on Friday, April 9, 2010. Members present were Judith Treas, ex officio chair, Dwaine Plaza, Amy Leisenring and Amy Orr. Ginny Mulle, secretary, was also present. Absent were Mike Messner, incoming ex officio chair, and Adalberto Aguirre. Dwaine Plaza submitted his slate of names for elected offices. Discussion was held suggesting names for the remaining elected offices by the 2010-11 committee members (Treas and Leisenring); names were identified for all offices and the meeting was adjourned. The complete slate will be submitted to the PSA office by may 1, 2010.

Report from the Publications Committee

Dennis Downey, Chair

In attendance: Dennis Downey (Chair), Jane Hood, Dina Okamoto, Rebecca Sandefur, Karen Seccombe, Kevin Wehr, Charles Powers. Marilyn Fernandez. Dean Dorn

Annual report from the Editors of *Sociological Perspectives*

Charles Powers and Marilyn Fernandez presented the Publications Committee with the Annual Report for 2010. The report was thorough, indicating strong stewardship on the part of Powers and Fernandez. Some highlights of the report included final acceptance rates for 2008 (20.7%); a discussion of thematic diversity and author diversity for *SP*; the initiation of research notes publication beginning with the current volume; data regarding review times (down to an average below 100 days); a recognition of the active role of the editorial board; affirmation of strong relations with the University of California Press; achievement of consistency in regards to

references and citations; expression of willingness to assist in any appropriate ways with the search for the incoming editor; and a brief discussion about journal prestige issues.

The Publications Committee was very impressed and thankful for the thorough report. The report itself is available on line at the pacificsoc.org.

Search for subsequent editor(s) of *Sociological Perspectives*

The focus of the meeting was a discussion of plans to conduct and complete the search for a new editor or editorial team for *Sociological Perspectives* which must be in place starting July 2011. Our plans focus on several stages: contacting appropriate and potentially interested members to cultivate interest in submitting proposals; accepting and reviewing proposals in the winter of 2011; and making a final decision on the editorial succession at our next meeting (Seattle, March of 2011).

Our discussions at the current meeting focused on the first of those stages: cultivating broad interest for submitting proposals. Collectively, the committee tried to develop a list of promising members to contact to encourage submitting a proposal.

It was decided that the Chair would contact committee members in the weeks following the meeting to: 1) compile a list of sociologists to contact, including any additional names that committee members might add; 2) provide details of our discussions, including issues to consider when selecting an editor or editorial team; 3) write up a draft message that can be sent to the list that will encourage their interest and begin to answer any questions that they might have. Our goal is to have at least several solid parties by fall 2010 who we might expect to submit proposals in the following winter.

Press arrangements:

The committee briefly brought up an issue which will have to be addressed in the future: the decision about whether to continue with our current press (University of California), or to switch to a commercial press. The working relationship with University of California is a positive one from the perspective of the current editors. The big issue, as Dean Dorn pointed out, is that a commercial press holds out the possibility of increasing income for the association from the journal. Because the issue is not pressing (i.e. if there is to be a change, it will not happen within the next couple of years), no detailed discussion nor any decisions were taken on the issue.

Chair election:

Dennis Downey was re-elected Chair for the coming year.

Report from the Awards Committee

Teresa Ciabatani

The Awards Committee had four major activities in 2009 - 2010:

\$In August 2009, the Committee, in consultation with the Committee on Teaching and with

Council, finalized changes to the teaching awards. PSA now gives two awards for teaching: the Early Career Award for Innovation in Teaching and the Dean S. Dorn Award for Distinguished Career Contributions to Teaching.

\$The Committee discussed changes to the Distinguished Contributions to Practice Award, which will be drafted and forwarded to the Committee on Practice and to Council for consideration.

\$We decided that Graduate and Undergraduate Paper Submissions will be accepted only via email, not by snail mail.

\$The Committee awarded the following awards at the 2010 Annual Meeting in Oakland:

- . Distinguished Scholarship: Kimberly Richman (University of San Francisco); Honorable Mention to Karen Bradley (Western Washington) and Maria Charles (UCSB)
- . Early Career Award for Innovation in Teaching: Lisa Wade (Occidental College)
- . Dean S. Dorn Award for Career Contributions to Teaching: Judith Liu (Univ of San Diego); Honorable Mention to Karen Sternheimer (USC)
- . Distinguished Contributions to Sociological Perspectives: (co-winners) Kelsy Kretschmer (UCI) and Jennifer McMahon-Howard (Kennesaw State Univ), Jody Clay-Wardner (Univ of Georgia), and Linda Renzulli (Univ of Georgia)
- . Graduate Student Paper: Daniel B. Eisen (Univ of Hawaii at Manoa)
- . Undergraduate Student Paper: Kira Wilpone-Jordan (Univ of Puget Sound)
- . (Note: No Practice Award was given; the one nomination did not meet the stated criteria).

FYI for Dean and Ginny: some changes for next year

1. Next year, submissions for the Graduate and Undergraduate Paper Awards will be email only. We ask that only email address, not snail mail addresses, be included on the website. I have included this change in the suggested website changes below.
2. Because the Meeting next year is so early, deadlines will likely need to be moved up. February 1 seems like a good possibility.
3. To clarify that only email submissions will be accepted for the student paper awards, we suggest the following language in place of the current mailing address info:

Nominations for the Undergraduate Paper Award should be submitted via email; hardcopies will not be accepted. Submissions should be sent both to Kari Lerum (klerum@uwb.edu) AND to Jane Ward (janew@ucr.edu).

And for the graduate papers:

Nominations for the Graduate Paper Award should be submitted via email; hardcopies will not be accepted. Submissions should be sent both to Jane Ward (janew@ucr.edu) and to Roberta Espinoza (spinoza@fullerton.edu).

4. To clarify submission deadlines, we would like to suggest that the website information be changed as follows:

NOMINATION PROCESS: Any PSA member can place a nomination. In order to be considered you must provide the required documentation as presented below for each particular award for which there is a nomination. **Nominations for the Distinguished Scholarship**

Award are due by November 1, 2010. Nominations for the Graduate and Undergraduate Student Paper Awards are due by February 15, 2011. Nominations for all other awards are due by February 1, 2011.

**Report from the Committee on Committees
Virginia Mulle, Secretary**

The Committee on Committee met on Saturday, April 10, 10:15-11:45 a.m. Amy Wharton (Past Vice-President), committee Co-Chair chaired the meeting. (Committee Co-chair Don Barrett, Vice-President, had a conflict and was unable to attend.) Six of the eleven elected committee members were present. In addition, Ginny Mulle represented the PSA Council.

Ginny walked us through the committee's tasks. Thank you, Ginny. The Committee on Committee suggests appointments to all of PSA's standing committees that have vacancies. She reviewed the following documents that will assist us in our tasks: List of openings by committee for appointment in 2010; List of PSA members who have indicated interest in serving on committees or have been recommended by other committee members; List of current members on the various committees to which appointments have to be made; Procedures for C on C members that describes the tasks and procedures to be followed to do the committee's work; List of faculty and student members of PSA.

The deadline for Committee Co-Chairs to send the slate of appointees to Ginny Mulle is December 1, 2010.

We then divided up the work of soliciting PSA members for appointments to vacant positions. Before sending the names of appointees to the committee chair, the committee members were reminded that they will verify with the nominee that they will accept the appointment.

The Committee vacancies and assignments are listed below (numbers in parentheses refer to the number of openings):

<u>Committees and Openings</u>	<u>Assigned</u>
(3) openings on Awards	_____ James Dean _____
(4) openings on Teaching	_____ Echo Fields _____
(3) openings on COFRAT	_____ Ann Traver _____
(4) openings on Membership	_____ Peter Callero _____
(2) openings on Student Affairs	_____ Faye Wachs _____
(3) openings on Endowment	_____ Michelle Jacob _____

- (3) openings on the Status of Women _____ Ann Travers_____
- (5) openings on Racial & Ethnic Minorities _____ Vicki Smith_____
- (3) openings on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties _____ Dana Collins_____
- (4) openings on Practice/Applied _____ Sheila Steinberg_____
- (3) openings on GLBT _____ Don Barrett_____
- (2) openings on Social Conscience _____ Amy Wharton_____
- need to be appointed early fall 2010
must be from the Seattle area

**Report from the Committee on the Status of Women
Camilla Sears, Chair**

Attendance: Marie Butler, Teresa Ciabattari, Patricia Drew, Judy Hennessy, Zeynep Kilic, Ginny Mulle, Rosemary Powers, Camilla Sears, and Mary Virnoche.

Regrets: Debra Guckenheimer, Jennifer Jacobson, and Cynthia Siemsen.

Reports:

- Mary Virnoche reported on the SWS breakfast and let the committee know that it went well. In total, sixteen people attended. The format of the breakfast was changed for this meeting (using reservations) and it worked well – so it will be utilized next year also. For PSA 2011, Teresa Ciabattari will act as liaison to assist in planning the breakfast.
- We reported on the panels that we sponsored this year.

Patricia Drew (Sociology of the Body) – 7 people were in attendance and two of her presenters were not able to come due to illness.

Zeynep Kilic (Immigrant Women) – 13-14 people were in attendance and there was some great discussion.

Ginny Mulle (Does Presence Mean Equality?) – The panel was a great success – it was incredibly well attended and we received a lot of good feedback following it.

Camilla Sears (Doing Feminist Research, Feminist Media Studies and Undergraduate Roundtables) – Both panels went well (15-20 people in attendance for both) and there was great discussion. The undergraduate tables organized with Cynthia Siemsen went well. But it was thought that we should limit it to one table for next year to increase the attendance.

Mary Virnoche (Love and Marriage) – Went well and was well attended. Her second panel on gender borders and boundaries was on the following day.

- One issue that came up this year at the conference was that there were a high number of people of who did not attend and also failed to inform the organizers – so we discussed that and if it happened in any of our panels.

Committee's Name:

- Last year, we talked about our name (Committee on the Status of Women) and whether it should be changed. This year, we had a brief discussion about it and consensus was that we should definitely keep it as 'women' and that we should keep the committee going because of the important role it serves.
- We discussed the issue of having panels sponsored by the committee and the visibility that this affords. To increase visibility and knowledge of the committee – we decided that we should make sure, when introducing the panel, to say that it is sponsored by the committee.

And we also discussed the fact that there are often a number of panels in the 'Call for Papers' which fit under the mandate of the committee but are not sponsored by it. And so in terms of action, *we decided that we should look over the 'call for papers' – and if sessions are relevant to the committee – we should email organizers to see if we can sponsor them.* It was thought that this work should be divided amongst the committee members.

Awards:

- We talked about the various awards that the Association offers – and we decided that we should think about people that we could nominate for the Practice Award and any of the other awards. All committee members were encouraged to do this.

Undergraduate Participation:

- We discussed the participation of undergraduate students at the conference and what we do as a committee to encourage it. The reception that we have was highlighted – which serves as a mixer between undergraduate and graduate students, and faculty. And conference wide – there is the student reception.

- This led into a discussion about possible panels around this area – and other panels that we would like to sponsor for next year.

PSA 2011 – Panels:

- ‘Women Don’t Ask’: Negotiating Your First Job Offer – an invited panel to be organized by Patricia Drew (and Ginny Mulle was going to ask the Student Affairs committee if they would like to cosponsor it).
- Teaching Women and Gender Studies – to be organized by Teresa Ciabattari.
- Teaching Abortion – to be organized by Teresa Ciabattari.
- Feminist Activism: Bridging Theory and Practice – to be organized by Judy Hennessy.
- Gender and Sexuality – to be organized by Patricia Drew.
- Women and Military – to be organized by Teresa Ciabattari.
- Doing Feminist Research – to be organized by Camilla Sears.
- Feminist Media Studies – to be organized by Camilla Sears.
- Sociology of the Body – to be organized by Cynthia Siensen.
- Gender and Migration – to be organized by Zeynep Kilic.
- Using Film and New Media to Teach Gender and Immigration – a workshop to be organized by Rosemary Powers.
- Gender and Poverty – to be organized by Judy Hennessy.
- Gender and Education – to be co-organized by Marie Butler and Rosemary Powers.
- Undergraduate Roundtable – to be organized by Ginny Mulle.
- We also talked about the possibility of organizing an ‘author meets critics’ session – we did not decide on a possible book for PSA 2011 – this is something that we should think about and if not for next year, then for PSA 2012.

Nominations for membership to the committee:

Marie Butler
Rosemary Powers

Cynthia Siemsen (to extend membership past next year)
Zeynep Kilic

Chair of the Committee:

It was decided unanimously that Cynthia Siemsen will be the Chair of the committee for this next year.

The meeting went very well. We had some great discussion and made some great decisions for the coming year. Thank you to everyone for your participation.

Report from Committee on Freedom of Research and Teaching .Sharon K. Davis, Co-Chair

Members: Sharon K. Davis, Co-Chair (sdavis@laverne.edu); Glenn Goodwin, Co-Chair (ggoodwin@laverne.edu); Virginia Mulle (ginny.mulle@uas.alaska.edu); Daniel Renfrow (drenfrow@wells.edu); Monika Ulrich (mulrich@astate.edu); Elsa Valdez (evaldez@csusb.edu); Kooros Mahmoudi (kooros.mahmoudi@nau.edu); Jeffrey Houser (jeffrey.houser@unco.edu)

I. Call to Order/Additions to the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 by Sharon K. Davis. There were no additions to the agenda.

II. Election of COFRAT Chair for 2010-2011

The committee elected Sharon K. Davis as chair for 2010-2011. Since Glenn Goodwin's committee membership term is expiring, he will not serve as co-chair for next year. He remains very interested in the committee.

III. Nominations of New Committee Members for 2010-2011

The committee recommended that Glenn Goodwin be reappointed as a committee member. Glenn served only one year on the committee because he was a replacement for a member who resigned during his term. The committee felt that Glenn was a committed and valuable member and should be nominated for a full term.

IV. Current Issues Concerning the Freedom of Teaching and Research

The committee first reviewed a handout that contained a profile of the demographics of college/university professors today. There were no new or current issues that were noted or discussed. As an addendum, the Jodi O'Brien case that developed in May 2010, subsequent to the meeting, has been noted and discussed informally by some committee members. Some

committee members have written letters of support for Jodi and condemnation of administrators who made the decision to rescind the employment offer. The committee awaits a directive from the PSA Executive Board to send a letter representing the PSA.

V. COFRAT Sponsored PSA Sessions

- We reviewed the content and success of the 2010 Session, PSA Past Presidents: The Current State and Future of the University
- We had two suggestions for Session(s) at the 2011 PSA Meeting in Seattle
- Suggestion 1: An invited speaker session on the topic: Is Education a Right or a Privilege?
- Suggestion 2: A panel session on the topic: New Directions in an Established Science: Ensuring the Viability of Sociology in the Future

VI. Other Business from the Floor

Members in attendance noted that several committee members did not attend the COFRAT meeting although they were on the PSA program. While one member indicated in advance that he could not attend the PSA meeting this year, the others did not respond to an emailed call for agenda items or to the emailed agenda to indicate that they would not attend. The committee proceeded without their presence but desired their future participation.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Report from the Committee on Practice Applied and Clinical Sociology (CPACS) Bob Kettlitz, Chair

Minutes 2010 Annual CPACS Committee Meeting (Oakland, CA)
Saturday April 10, 2010 12:00 Noon

Members Present: Bob Kettlitz (Chair), Susan Mannon, David Musick, Don Winiacki
Members Absent: Meda Chesney-Lind, Richard Garvey, Richard Lockwood, Yvonne Luna, Marcus Marquandt. Guests: Dean Dorn

Agenda Item 1. Role of CPACS

The members present discussed the major role(s) of CPACS

Members agreed that the major function of the committee is to sponsor sessions for the annual conference.

Dean Dorn asked us to consider taking up an effort to propose revisions to the PSA guidelines for selecting a winner of the PSA's *Distinguished Contributions to Practice Award*. Bob Kettlitz mentioned that at the Association for Applied, Clinical and Sociological Practice conference

locals nominate agencies that do great applied, clinical or sociological practice. A committee then reviews nominations. The award is a very popular event at the conference. Bob K. will begin to contact departments of sociology in the Seattle area to find worthy nominees.

Agenda Item 2. Protocol for recording session proposals.

Members present decided that proposed session titles be forwarded to the chair of the committee (Bob Kettlitz). Bob would keep record of titles and session organizers. Session organizers will be responsible for submitting session proposals to the PSA. Last year the Committee on Practice Applied and Clinical Sociology (CPACS) sponsored five sessions that were held at the 2010 PSA conference. To date nine sessions have been proposed. We are hoping to have a much better showing at the conference in Seattle in 2011.

Report from the Membership Committee

Keith Farrington, Chair

The Membership Committee of the Pacific Sociological Association met on the morning of Friday, April 9 at the Oakland Marriott City Center in Oakland, California. Committee members in attendance included Keith Farrington (committee co-chair for 2009-2010), Dennis Downey, Vikas Gumbhir, and Amy Orr. PSA Secretary Ginny Mulle was also present.

Membership Report:

The meeting began with a report on the status of PSA Membership, both for the current academic year and on the longer-term, using information provided to us by Ginny Mulle.

According to these data:

- PSA Membership for **2009** (as of the beginning of this year's PSA meeting) was **1,276**.
- 703 of these PSA members were faculty members (55.1% of the total), while 573 were students (both graduate and undergraduate) (this is 44.9% of the total).
- So far in **2010** (as of the time of our meeting), we have a total of **997** PSA Members. This number is obviously quite a bit lower than the final membership figures for 2009 (as reported above). However, as in years past, a good deal of membership takes place at the PSA Meeting itself (and during the remainder of the calendar year following the meeting), and it appeared from the large number of "walk-ins" reported at the conference registration desk at this year's meeting that 2010 would be no exception to this general rule.
- Of these 997 2010 PSA members reported at our committee meeting, 473 were faculty members (47.4% of the total) while 524 were students (52.6% of the total).

- With regard to the attendance by PSA members at our annual meeting the previous year, it was reported that we had a total of 1064 conference registrants in 2009.
- 545 of these conference registrants were faculty members, thus suggesting that slightly over three quarters (77.5%) of all PSA-registered faculty members did in fact attend this professional meeting.
- For students (again including both graduate and undergraduate students), the comparable figures were 519 registrations at the 2009 PSA Meeting (this figure represented 90.6% of the total student PSA members for the year).
- For the current year (2010), and looking at preregistration (rather than final registration) figures, it was reported that a total of 422 faculty had preregistered for the meeting (this figure represents 77.4% of the total faculty PSA members at that time).
- Comparably, 487 graduate and undergraduate students had preregistered for the meeting (representing 92.9% of the total students who held membership in the PSA at the time that conference preregistration took place).
- A suggestion was offered that it might be desirable in the future to distinguish between graduate and undergraduate students in the recording of PSA membership, since there is obviously good reason to think that graduate students are much more likely to be in a position to make a long-term commitment to our organization, and thus may be more amenable to subsequent membership renewal initiatives.
- Based on the figures which she reported to us, Ginny Mulle expressed with confidence (and happiness) her view that PSA membership is robust – “the best that it has ever been.” Our success in this regard in recent years should not be taken for granted, however, as it has been the result of a good deal of hard work on the part of former PSA Executive Director Dean Dorn and many others within the PSA. It is clear that we should continue, both through the efforts of our particular committee and through other PSA initiatives and strategies, to do whatever we can to generate as healthy and stable a membership as possible.

The Report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Conference Format

The remainder of our meeting was spent discussing a Report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Conference Format prepared and submitted by a subcommittee of the Membership Committee chaired by Dennis Downey, and consisting also of Kristin Bates and Vikas Gumbir (with the assistance of Dean Dorn). As agreed at our meeting last year, this subcommittee – with special thanks extended to Dennis Downey for his great efforts in leading and providing much of the substance of this project – sought to look at a whole range of issues relating to the content and format of our PSA meetings at present, with a particular eye toward (1) identifying current practices that may discourage or drive away potential PSA members and (2) coming up with new and creative ways of addressing these problems or flaws, so as to make our conference as attractive to current and potential PSA members as it can possibly be.

Specifically, the recommendations offered – at least preliminarily – fall into the general categories of (a) restructuring conference format, (b) restructuring the process of conference organizing, (c) new ways of scheduling conference presentations, and (d) taking additional steps to solicit the involvement of faculty members from doctoral-granting institutions in the PSA.

The twenty page report generated by this subcommittee was exhaustive in scope, insightful in its analysis, and creative and well-thought-out in the many solutions that it proposed, and we were only able to scratch the surface of this important document in our 90-minute committee meeting. Since we felt it much better to work our way through the entire report to identify those key recommendations with which our entire committee would feel comfortable (and since Ginny assured us that there was enough taking place within the PSA Council more generally that our input in these important matters would not be considered immediately), we agreed to continue our discussions via e-mail and telephone as soon as the current academic year has ended, and to send to the PSA Council a final version of our final recommendations as soon as those discussions have taken place – hopefully by the end of this summer.

The Mission Statement of the PSA Membership Committee and Its Chairperson Position:

It was also decided at our meeting last year that we should carefully look at and consider revisions of the official mission statement of the PSA relating to its Membership Committee and the responsibilities of the Chair(s) of that committee. Keith Farrington took responsibility for reviewing and suggesting revisions to this official PSA statement, and distributed these proposed revisions to the members of our committee for discussion at this meeting. However, our discussion of the PSA Membership document (which is obviously much more important in the overall scheme of things) left no time for this matter. We thus agreed to consider this matter as well during the next several months, and to send our final recommendations in this regard to the PSA Council following those deliberations (also hopefully by the end of the summer).

Nominations for New Representatives to the Membership Committee:

According to official PSA guidelines, the Membership Committee consists of six members, each of whom is appointed for a three year term of office, with the terms of membership terms staggered so that each year two members end and two members begin their terms. For reasons which I do not fully understand, we currently seem to have a total of seven continuing members of our committee, with only Dennis Downey rotating off (four of our members have terms of office ending in 2011, two ending in 2012 and one ending in 2013). In any event, it is unclear to me whether we should in fact attempt to solicit nominations for new members of this committee at this time, as we normally do, or whether we should wait until next year to begin adding new committee members.

I might take a moment to thank Dennis for his wonderful contributions to our committee during the past several years. He has been a fountain of good ideas, a wonderful colleague with whom to work and discuss matters, and someone who could definitely be counted on to do whatever it was that he said that he would do. His presence on our committee will definitely be missed.

On behalf of the entire Membership Committee, I would also like to thank outgoing Executive Director Dean Dorn for all of his support of, and wise counsel to, our committee during the past several years.

The Election of a New Membership Committee Chair:

As our final order of business, nominations were sought for someone to replace Jennifer Eichstedt and I as the Co-Chairs of the PSA Membership Committee for the upcoming 2010-2011 academic year. Amy Orr was unanimously elected to fill this position.

Our meeting was adjourned as the clock approached 12:00 noon.

Report from the Committee on Teaching Michelle Camacho, Chair

In Attendance: J. Meisel; R. Powers; A. Denissen; C. Bush; B. Martinez; N. Raza
M. Camacho, Chair
A. Rafalovich, Co-Chair

Discussion of teaching award: collection of materials and sending them to Awards Committee; mentioned that there was a glitch: old criteria on website didn't match the new criteria; now corrected.

- 1) Question regarding teaching award: increase letters limit for nomination, or set limit; currently five; move it to "as many as possible"? We will put it to the Awards Committee with regard to a manageable amount of letters; a minimum and maximum.
- 2) We discussed one member having a possible discussion with Laurie, the director of Inside/Out and have her talk about prison exchange programs.
- 3) Talk to Lauren McDonald regarding debate about distance education.

Session topic suggestions:

- 1) dealing with "assessment expectations;" "critical examination of assessment;" two sessions topics:
 - a) managing assessment mandates (New Taylorism? Scientific Management of faculty work) "Surviving Assessment."
 - b) research on assessment
- 2) Public Sociology and Community Service Learning
- 3) Experiential Learning in the Sociology Classroom
- 4) Teaching Statistics
- 5) Tips and Tricks on Teaching Social Problems
- 6) Making Theory Accessible
- 7) (conversation) Engaging Students: What are Your Tips and Tricks for the Classroom?

- 8) (workshop) Online Learning; strategies? Hybrid courses? Technological Innovations: Translating Sociology to the Virtual Classroom.
- 9) (possible debate) Online Learning: Pros and Cons.
- 10) Difficult Dialogues: Sensitive Subjects in the Classroom
- 11) Teaching with Data

**Report for the Committee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties
Don Barrett, Chair**

The committee met on Friday, April 9, from 3:30 – 5 PM. Present at the meeting were:

Membership:

Don Barrett (CSU San Marcos)
 Marcia Marx (CSU San Bernardino)
 Dennis Loo (Cal Poly Pomona)
 Byron Lee (Temple)
 Akihiko Hirose (U Colorado Denver)
 Patricia Little (CSU San Bernardino)*

Sine Anahita (U Alaska Fairbanks) did not attend but had previously notified the committee that she would not attend due to the meeting being held in California and California's vote for Prop 8.

Not present were Susan Palmer (Walla Walla CC), Jodie Dewey (Concordia), and Mary Texeira (CSU San Bernardino)

Ginny Mulle represented the executive offices at that meeting.

* Patricia Little has come to meetings in the past and is interested in the committee. The committee agreed to having her replace one of the existing members who has not been present. We also proposed Mike Harrod (Central Washington) and Jodi O'Brien (Seattle U) as other new members.

2010: Sessions sponsored by the meeting at 2010 have had a mixed results.

Session 24 (listed below), on opening night, was not well-attended with one presenter neither showing nor providing a paper and a second presenter providing a paper but not showing.

24) State Sanctioned Violence

(spons. by Comm. on Civil Rights & Liberties)

organizer: Byron Lee, Temple Univ.

Marie Elizabeth Berry, UCLA: *Mass Violence & the Political Empowerment of Women*

Shayla Jean Chilliak, McGill Univ.: *Governmentality, Surveillance, & the Exception: Citizenship & Immigration Detention in Canada*

Matthias Thiemann, Columbia Univ.: *From State as Provider to State as a Market Enabler: The State-Sanctioned Violence Of Consumer Credit*

Session 58, also on the opening night (listed below) was well-attended with about 20 signing up for an email distribution list of films and strong interest by grad students on teaching the area.

58) Using Film to Examine Gender, Race & Class in Human Trafficking

(spons. by Comm. on Civil Rights & Civil Liberties)

[note, wine and cheese will be served]

organizers: Patricia Little, Marcia Marx, Elsa Valdez, & Mary Texeira, CSUSB

Session 95, on Friday, had all of the presenters show and started out with an audience of only one but expanded to 5 over time. Though small, the discussion was lively and one attendee later reported to me that it was the most interesting and challenging of sessions that she attended. Note that though this session was sponsored by the committee, that fact did not appear in the description of the section).

95) Military & Education

organizer: Donald Barrett, CSUSM

Dara Elizabeth Naphan, UNR: *The Experiences of Military Veterans in Higher Education*

Donald Barrett, CSUSM: *To ROTC or NOT? Perceptions of the Military*

Phillip Fucella, UCB: *Love's Duty: Context Effects on the Creation of Sentiment Among Military Spouses*

After the committee meeting was Session 145 (listed below), which had an attendance of about 15 and was generally a good discussion.

145) The Turn Against the "Public Option" for Higher Education

(Spons. by Comm. on Civil Liberties & Civil Rights)

Organizer: Don Barrett, CSU San Marcos

discussants: Don Barrett, CSU San Marcos, Sharon Elise, CSU San Marcos & Marcia Marx, CSU San Bernardino

Also presented by the committee was session 202. Details on attendance are not currently available.

202) Wars & Occupations

organizer: Dennis Loo, Cal Poly Pomona

(spons. by the Comm. on Civil Rights & Liberties)

David Flores, Univ. of Michigan: *Experiencing War & Politics: the Sources of Vietnam Veteran Political Attitudes*

Yousef K. Baker, UCSB: *Exceptionality to Normalcy: Legitimation of Foreign Intervention in Iraqi Law*

Dennis Loo, Cal Poly Pomona: *The Limits of Power: U.S. Empire v. the World*

2011: Proposed sessions for 2011 (Seattle) include the following. In parentheses after the working title is the organizer's name:

Civil Liberties in the Obama era (Dennis Loo)

Moral Pain (Don Barrett)

From WTO to now (Byron Lee)

Accessing liberty/accessing information (e.g. net neutrality, Byron Lee)

Whistle-blowing and government secrecy (Dennis Lee)

'Populism' and Tea Party politics (working title) (Patricia Little)

Education in Peril (with COFRAT, Marcia Marx)

Modern Day Slavery (video, Marcia Marx)

Editors Report

Report from the Editors, Sociological Perspectives

Charles Powers and Marilyn Fernandez, Co-editors

Kay Boissicat, Managing Editor

Report to PSA Council and Publications Committee

Covering Calendar Year 2009 (Volume 52)

(April 24, 2010)

Overview

Executive Summary

The journal is currently being published in its historical standard for size, with each of four quarterly issues (spring, summer, fall, winter) typically having six articles and running around 150 pages.

The overall appearance of the journal remains attractive and, generally speaking, professional.

The journal remains thematically rich, open to submission of work representing the full substantive range of the discipline.

Total number of submissions vacillates somewhat but seems to be relatively stable, and is generally healthy in comparison with the past.

The quality of submissions is up somewhat in the judgment of the continuing editors.

The journal is currently meeting its stated targets for expeditiously processing submissions and moving accepted work to publication.

Mission and Goals

A. Primary Responsibility

The co-editors understand their first responsibility to be to the Pacific Sociological Association, its members, and journal readership. As we see it, our first responsibility is to do what we can to make *Sociological Perspectives* a high quality general interest outlet for sociological scholarship. This means trying to publish articles that we believe may be broadly read, cited, and used (built on) by members of the PSA and others in the discipline. We understand our main challenge as identifying submissions with superior potential, and then helping to shepherd the development of those submissions into high quality articles which are readable for and useful to a broad audience.

B. Additional Responsibilities

We understand our responsibilities to authors to be very important. Responsibilities to authors include timeliness, clear guidelines about issues to address when inviting R & Rs, and making sure the primary reason(s) for disqualification or rejection without invitation to revise and resubmit are clearly written.

(1) Timeliness in Cases of Disqualification based on Internal Review. (a) “Disqualification” is the term we use (within the editorial office) to distinguish those rejections reached after an internal review without going to external ‘blind’ reviewers. (b) Under our co-editorship, “disqualification” is used ONLY after both co-editors have read and discussed the paper, and agree that neither co-editor could support publication of the paper without such substantial recasting that we would deem a satisfactory recasting effort as a new submission. If both co-editors strongly feel this way, we reject the submission on the basis of internal review. We identify what we see as the main concerns that would need to be addressed to make a submission viable. We have had a number of “disqualified” papers recast and sent in as (in our view much more viable) new submissions. (c) It is our feeling that in cases when an initial in-office editorial review results in a “disqualification,” that this decision should be made in *less than 30 days*, except under highly atypical circumstances.

(2) Timeliness in Cases of Rejection after the First-Round of Blind Review. It is our feeling that, in cases where manuscripts are sent out for blind review, authors should normally be notified on the editorial decision (to reject, invite R & R, or accept) within *an average 100 days* of the time

the submission was first sent to us, and in any case not more than 152 days of our receipt of the manuscript.

(3) Success with R & Rs. Our own targets are to have a minimum of 75% (and hopefully higher) resubmission rate when R & Rs have been invited, and to raise the acceptance rate on resubmissions to a minimum of two thirds (and hopefully higher) by the conclusion of the R & R process. This would mean eventual publication of a minimum of 50%, and hopefully higher (perhaps 2/3), of all R & Rs invited.

(4) Other Issues. Beyond our sense of responsibility for timely reviews, we feel we owe authors four other things. (a) We are cognizant of confidentiality. (b) We are obliged to arrive at our own honest editorial evaluation, with our decisions informed by, but not absolutely governed by, outside reviews as we may seek and receive. (c) We feel obliged to highlight, in an encouraging tone, what we see as main problem areas needing attention, so that authors are alert to the direction in which the paper would have to change in order to address key issues which surfaced during the review process. (d) Although we do not publish accepted articles solely on a “first in-first out” basis, we do try to minimize the lag time from acceptance to publication. We have set as a goal, having *an average acceptance-to-publication lag of no more than six months and a maximum acceptance-to-publication lag of no more than eleven months, beginning with this year (Volume 53).*

Stopping to Look Back a Year; A Short Recap on 2008

A. Articles Appearing in Volume 51 (2008)

Although we were editors for the purposes of processing submissions starting in July 2007 and for the purposes of processing the production of journal issues starting with Volume 51 (2008), the entirety of Volume 51 (2008) was taken up in publishing the backlog of papers accepted by the previous editors.

B. Outcomes of the Revise and Resubmit Process for New 2008 Submissions

It will be a year before the results of the Revise and Resubmit process for new 2009 submissions will be known. However, we can now report the results of the Revise and Resubmit process for new submissions arriving during 2008. (1) Of the 116 new submissions that arrived in 2008, 32 submissions (or 27.6% of all submissions) were invited to Revise and Resubmit after completing the first round of internal and external review. (2) Of the 32 papers which were invited to R & R, 31 ultimately submitted a first set of revised versions. This is 96.9 % of those invited (exceeding our target of at least 75 % of all the resubmissions invited). (3) Of the 31 first resubmissions that arrived, 24 led to eventual acceptance. This is 77.4 % of resubmissions received and 75% of resubmissions invited.

C. Acceptance Rate for New 2008 Submissions

Of the 116 new submissions made in 2008, 24 were accepted for publication. This is an acceptance rate of 20.7 % of all new submissions to the journal that year. [An additional two submissions (or 1.7 % of all submissions) remain “in play” in the sense that authors have received invitations to Revise and Resubmit a second time (R2) and their deadline (180 days) for doing so has not yet passed.]

Our Report on 2009 Activity

A. Incorporation of 2009 Suggestions from the Executive Council and the Publications Committee

(1) Thematic Bundling of Articles in Each Issue: In response to April 2009 feedback from both the Executive Council and the Publications Committee, the co-editors abandoned their attempt to have whole issues focus on a single theme (52:1 on Beliefs and 52:2 on Education), and adapted the *American Sociological Review*'s design of having two or three different themes in each issue. The co-editors are pleased with the results because each issue still has some degree of thematic concentration, but each issue also has a broad topical range to appeal to a more complete spectrum of reader interests.

(2) Acceptance-to-Publication Time Lag: In response to April 2009 feedback from both the Executive Council and the Publications Committee, the co-editors added a new criterion to be used in scheduling papers for upcoming issues. This criterion is *minimizing the length of time between acceptance of a paper for publication and that paper's actual publication*. We can report that the acceptance-to-publication lag for papers published in Volume 52 (2009) was an average of 218 days and a maximum of 398 days. However, the acceptance-to-publication lag for articles published during Volume 52 (2009) should be understood to have been artificially elevated somewhat, as the journal cleared its backlog of acceptances made by the previous editors.

B. Substantive (Thematic) Diversity in Volume 52 (2009) of the Journal

Volume 52 is thematically rich, including papers on beliefs, education, social movements, race, organizations, institutions, national development, and methodological and theoretical issues.

C. Author Diversity in Volume 52 (2009) of the Journal

The current co-editors do not consider location, rank, gender, or any other author characteristics when evaluating submissions. However, the PSA is justified in having an interest in the distribution of authors being published in its journal.

Sociological Perspectives continues to be a journal publishing work of both men and women from all geographic areas and the full spectrum of professional ranks. Of the 36 authors published in volume 52 (2009) we can report the following distributions:

Gender

Female	52.8 % (19)
Male	47.2 % (17)

Inside or Outside the United States

United States	86.1 % (31)
International	13.9 % (5)

Regional Distribution

Pacific Region	44.4 % (16)	
Western United States		38.9 % (14)
Western Canada		5.5 % (2)
Eastern United States	13.9 % (5)	
Southern United States	25.0 % (9)	
Midwest	8.3 % (3)	
International Outside Western Canada	8.3 % (3)	
Eastern Canada		5.5 % (2)
Chile		2.8 % (1)

Professional Status at Time of Publication

Full Professor	22.2 % (8)
Associate Professor	11.1 % (4)
Assistant Professor	33.3 % (12)
Researcher or Center Director	13.9 % (5)
Graduate Student or Former Student	19.4 % (7)

D. Research Note Submissions during 2009

Sociological Perspectives will resume publishing some Research Notes beginning with Volume 53, number 2 (summer, June). Typically Research Notes will be short papers that have something new and interesting to offer, even though the paper does not meet the journal's standard criteria for a full length manuscript.

Research Notes submissions are anticipated to be 4-8 pages in length; no more than 2000 words. Submissions in the category of Research Notes are peer reviewed, and submission does not guarantee publication.

There were four submissions in the Research Notes category during 2009. One of these was rejected and three were accepted for publication. None has yet appeared in print. (The first of these is scheduled for publication in 53:2, Summer 2010.)

The current co-editors have a very broad concept of what might be considered a Research Note for purposes of possible publication in the journal. Among other things, Research Notes can (a) report confirmation of earlier research findings tested in a new setting, (b) report unusual or non-intuitive findings that await deeper analysis at a later time, (c) suggest a methodological approach to a particular kind of research challenge, (d) offer a preliminary conceptual idea or provisional theoretical insight, or (e) provide details about a teaching strategy that has proven to work.

At the present time, it is NOT our intention to count Research Notes in our count/analysis of (a) number of article submissions, (b) time to reach first editorial decision (disqualify without external review, reject after first set of external reviews, invite revision and resubmission, or accept), or (c) acceptance rate.

E. Number of Original/New Full-Length Manuscript Submissions during 2009

In 2009 there were 122 new full-length article submissions; as far as we know an all-time high for the journal. This figure includes only “new” or original submissions and does not include manuscripts arriving with a Revise and Resubmit status or Research Notes.

F. The Review Process for Full-Length Manuscript Submissions arriving during 2009

(1) Disqualification (Rejection without External Review). “Disqualification” is the term we use for rejecting a paper following internal review, without going to external ‘blind’ reviewers. (a) Under our co-editorship, “disqualification” is used ONLY after both co-editors have read and discussed the paper, and agree that neither co-editor could support publication of the paper without such substantial recasting that we would deem a satisfactory recasting effort to be a new submission. (b) Of 122 new “article” submissions in 2009, 27 were disqualified (rejected without external review). This is 22.1 % of all article-length submissions coming to the journal in 2009. (c) It is our feeling that a co-editors’ decision to disqualify should normally be reached within 30 days of our receiving the manuscript. During 2009, our average time to reach a disqualification decision was 16 days and the maximum time taken was 24 days.

(2) Outcome Following First-Round of Blind Review. (a) We sent 95 of the 122 article-length new 2009 submissions out for blind external review. These 95 article-length submissions sent out for review represent 77.9 % of all article length submissions received. (b) The blind reviews of initial (unrevised) 2009 submissions resulted in 57 rejections without invitations to revise and resubmit. This was 46.7 % of all new submissions for 2009. (c) The blind reviews of initial

(unrevised) 2009 submissions resulted in 38 invitations to revise and resubmit. This is 31.1 % of all new submissions for 2009.

The Review Process and Outcomes for New 2009 Submissions

Total Number of Manuscripts Received:	122	(100 %)
Total Disqualified through Internal Review	27	22.1 %
Submission is Rejected on the Basis of First Blind Review	57	46.7 %
External Review is Followed by an Invitation to Revise & Resubmit	38	31.1 %
Outcomes Following Invitation to Revise and Resubmit Full-Length (Article) Manuscripts	38	
Number of First Resubmissions Sent In	knowable by Oct 2010	
Number of Papers Eventually Accepted (not including Research Notes)	Knowable by mid-2011	

(3) Average Time Taken in the Blind Review of Initial Submissions: It is our feeling that, in cases where manuscripts are sent out for blind review, authors should normally be notified on the editorial decision (to reject, invite R & R, or accept) within an average 100 days. During 2009, our average time to complete first blind reviews and arrive at a decision to either reject after blind review, invite a Revise and Resubmit, or accept was 97.37 days.

(4) Minimum and Maximum Times Taken in the Blind Review of Initial Submissions: It is our feeling that the process of first-round blind reviews of original submissions should, whenever possible, be complete within 152 days from initial submission to issuing a decision (to reject, invite an R & R, or accept). During 2009, the minimum time taken for a first-round blind review was 46 days. During 2009, the maximum time taken for this process on all 2009 new submissions was 150 days.

(5) Eventual Acceptance of 2009 Submissions. The acceptance rate for 2009 submissions will not be available until later. For example, the hypothetical time line for submissions arriving in late 2009 is as follows: (a) A first external review of a new/original submission arriving in late December 2009 should be complete by about April 1, 2010. (b) Authors receiving an invitation to Revise and Resubmit have six months to do so, taking the process out to October 2010 before we can reliably expect to have a first resubmission, should one be coming. (c) Reviewing and deciding whether or how to carry forward from a first revision takes additional time. This cannot be precisely predicted, but six months is reasonable. Hence, we should arrive at almost all acceptance/rejection decisions regarding 2009 submissions by March 2011, and we believe all such decisions should be made by late 2011.

The Special Role for Members of the Editorial Board

A. The Role of Editorial Board Members at *Sociological Perspectives*

Generally, editors of journals do not call on many members of the editorial board to do much, except to lend their names for the masthead. Our strategy has been different. We invite people to the board on the condition that they will have significant reviewing responsibilities, and that these reviewing responsibilities might even extend outside of their areas of specific substantive expertise. As a strategic planning decision, we want to be able to rely on our editorial board as a pool of reliable reviewers we can trust as careful readers who are mindful of the general-interest character of the journal and needs of its readership. We are deeply appreciative of the members of the *Sociological Perspectives* Editorial Board.

B. Board Members' Term of Service to *Sociological Perspectives*

Invitations to the Editorial Board are on a one year renewable basis. This allows us to not only infuse the board with new energy over time, but also to work on the balance between the kinds of submissions being made to the journal and the interests of members of the board.

C. Current Editorial Board Diversity

The Editorial Board currently has 36 members. To our knowledge, 9 members of the board (25%) have a primary racial/ethnic identity as African American, Asian, Asian American, Hispanic, Latino/Latina, or bi-racial. In other respects, the distribution of the 2010 Editorial Board is as follows:

Gender

Female	44.4 % (16)
Male	55.6 % (20)

Inside or Outside the United States

United States	86.1 % (31)
International	13.9 % (5)

Regional Distribution

Pacific Region	47.2 % (17)
Western United States	44.4 % (16)
Western Canada	2.8 % (1)

Eastern United States	8.3 % (3)	
Southern United States	11.1 % (4)	
Midwest	22.2 % (8)	
International Outside Western Canada	11.1 % (4)	
Asia		2.8 % (1)
Europe		5.6 % (2)
Latin America		2.8 % (1)

Career Stage

Mid to Senior	64.9 % (23)
Junior to Early-Mid	36.1 % (13)

The Special Role of the Managing Editor and Support Staff

A. The Managing Editor

“Unless you have done it yourself you could never appreciate” how chaotically busy and crisis laden/tension driven the role of the Managing Editor is. The journal is fortunate to have a very good Managing Editor in the person of Ms. Kay Boissicat.

B. Unheralded Support Staff

Smooth functioning requires that someone maintain bookkeeping, order supplies, and fill the gap when the journal has to mind its business fundamentals. Ms. Sandra Chiaramonte, the Office Manager of the Department of Sociology (and also, of the Department of Anthropology) at Santa Clara University, has been a great help in maintaining our ledgers and requisitioning our supplies.

Working Relations with the University of California Press

Overall, we feel that University of California Press has been very responsive to us and helpful. After some protracted effort, we have institutionalized a new “current” style sheet (very similar to ASR). The co-editors strongly adhere to the viewpoint that our insistence (a) on following a *single* style sheet for citations and references, and (b) that this style sheet be the style sheet affirmed by the *current* co-editors as being appropriate to our particular journal at this particular point in time, will help us in the future to (1) give the journal a more professional appearance by

promoting more uniform citation and reference style on the printed pages of the journal, and (2) also bring the journal into closer conformity with citation and reference conventions broadly prevalent among journals in our discipline.

Anticipating the Future

A. Reference and Citation Consistency in Future Issues

There has been some increase in reference and style format consistency between volume 51 issue number 4 (winter 2008) and volume 53 issue number 1 (spring 2010). We hope for a punctuated increase in reference and style consistency starting with volume 53 number 2 (summer 2010).

B. Production Schedule

The current co-editors were originally appointed to serve for a three year term (Volumes 51-53, 2008-2010) and were subsequently asked to continue for a fourth year (Volume 54, 2011). We anticipate producing issues of normal size (four issues per year with an average of 6 “articles” per issue, not counting “research notes”) for the balance of our editorship. After our term as editors officially expires, we anticipate serving as “contributing editors” for two additional issues in order to clear the backlog of papers accepted under our editorship.

C. Transition to a New Editor or New Co-Editors

The transition to a new editor or editorial team will be as clear and as helpful as we can make it. (a) We understand that in the last six months of our editorship (July – December 2011) the incoming editors will begin reviewing new submissions. We will help smooth that process. (b) We understand that in the first six months of the new editorship (January – June 2012) we will serve as contributing editors and produce two issues (55:1 and 55:2) to be filled with the remaining papers submitted through the end of June 2011, processed by us, and accepted by us for publication. (c) We look forward to serving on the editorial board under our successor(s) as has been the journal’s custom. (d) As we pass through the phases of being outgoing editors, and then contributing editors, and finally as editorial board members, we are committed to respecting and supporting the editorial vision(s) and promoting the editorial visibility of our successors.

D. Concern about Journal Prestige

One ranking which is easy to use for comparison purposes is the Eigenfactor scores (<http://www.eigenfactor.org/>). Two ways Eigenfactor scores are reported are in terms of percentile location of a journal among other journals (a) for overall journal influence and (b) for number of article citations.

Overall Journal Influence/Number of Article Citations

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2004</u>	
<i>ASR</i>	86.8/98.0	87.2/97.9		89.0/98.3	87.2/97.9	89.7/98.1
<i>Social Forces</i>	79.9/88.6	91.6/91.0		81.2/92.2	78.8/92.1	81.0/93.6
<i>Sociological Forum</i>	23.3/34.0	36.6/52.1		30.4/42.0	28.3/37.2	40.2/54.2
<i>Sociological Inquiry</i>	36.3/61.9	33.3/50.4		23.9/33.6	17.5/22.9	25.3/32.5
<i>Soc Perspectives</i>	31.0/51.6	29.9/47.7		33.6/56.7	29.0/49.2	
	36.5/59.1					
<i>Sociological Quarterly</i>	39.6/53.3	37.6/46.8		37.6/47.4	33.4/40.6	
	42.8/55.4					
<i>Sociological Spectrum</i>	18.8/23.7	9.5/13.1		5.4/ 9.0	14.4/23.0	
	5.5/10.7					

(Journals appear alphabetically in this list.) Scores vary considerably from year to year. While the meanings of these scores are open to discussion, the scores do provide an easily accessible way of trying to roughly monitor journal impact. [2008 is the most recent year for which data are posted.]

E. Your Assistance in Improving the Position of the Journal

Maintaining and improving the ranking of the journal will require that we work hard to increase the stream of submissions which are both creative and well developed. This is something all members of the Publications Committee, Executive Council, and Editorial Board are requested to help with. If *Sociological Perspectives* is to be and remain a leading outlet for scholarship, members of PSA Council, the Publications Committee, and the journal's Editorial Board members will need to help us by encouraging submissions from authors who have well developed papers, dealing with projects of clear sociological significance and written in a way that can inform the work of our "general" (all substantive areas) audience of sociologists. [We do not view membership on one of these bodies as precluding submission of that person's own work to the journal. Such submissions are treated exactly like every other submission; neither given favorable nor unfavorable treatment in the process.]

Appendix: *Sociological Perspectives*

Official Citation and Reference Style Sheet

(February 24, 2010)

In-text Citations.

Citations in the text of a submission are made within parentheses at every point where those citations are relevant.

(1) Standard citation format for Sociological Perspectives must be followed; for example (Mencken, Bader, and Embry 2009). Please note that:

(a) The last names of each author are listed, beginning with the last name of the first author.

(b) When there is more than one author "and" should be used instead of "&" before the name of the last author.

(c) The last (or only) author name in a citation is followed (by one space without any punctuation and then) by the year of publication.

(2) When page number(s) are included in a citation to mark the specific pages where something can be found,

(a) a colon follows immediately after the year of publication,

(b) page numbers follow immediately after the colon, without any space, and

(c) continuing page numbers are truncated, for example (Rippeyoung 2009:243-6).

(3) When citing more than one source for the same point at the same place in the text of a paper, the different sources cited should be separated using ";" (Kalogrides 2009; Collins 1979).

(4) When citing more than one work published in the same year by the same author(s), the date should be modified by adding "a" or "b" to the end of the year (Blau 1981a; 1981b).

(5) In the case of citations to any work having several authors, the journal regards it as important that last names of all co-authors should appear within the citation on the first occasion when that multi-authored work is cited in the paper. The et al. form can be used only in the second and subsequent citations to a particular work. The *ibid* and *op cit* forms are not used by this journal.

References.

(1) Submissions to the journal must include a double spaced "References" section following the main body of text.

(2) The first line of each reference should be left justified, and subsequent lines of each reference should be indented by half an inch.

(3) All sources cited in the submission (body of paper, footnotes, tables) must be included in the reference section.

(4) The reference section should not include any sources unless those sources are specifically cited somewhere in the paper.

(5) All references must be organized alphabetically by the last name of the first author.

(6) Provide the full and proper names of all authors; not simply nick names or initials. However, in the case of an edited volume, the first initial(s) of the editor(s) will suffice.

(7) Where an individual is the sole author or first author of more than one source listed in the references, the name of the first author (but only the first author) should be replaced by a series of five dashes in all but the first source where the same person is sole or first author.

(8) Multiple references to different works by the same author(s) should be listed chronologically beginning with the earliest source first.

(9) When a journal article is referenced, (a) please include issue numbers for journal articles in the reference section. The issue number should be placed in parentheses immediately following the volume number. Also, (b) remove extra spacing from the volume/issue/page information. For instance, if someone were to cite the Menchen, Bader, and Embry paper which is found on pages 23-38 of the first issue of volume 52 of *Sociological Perspectives* the volume/issue/page number would be noted in the following form; 52(1):23-39.

(10) When page numbers are part of a reference, please truncate continuing numbers. For example: 529-59 instead of 529-559.

(11) The titles of articles and chapters should appear in quotation marks and in non-italicized form, unless italics are actually parts of those titles. The names of the journals and books in which those articles/chapters appear should appear in italics and without quotation marks unless quotation marks are officially a part of the name/title of the journal or book.

(12) Common examples follow, but when uncommon cases arise, authors are advised to follow as closely as possible the form they understand to be used in current issues of *Sociological Perspectives* or the *American Sociological Review*.

Examples of Journal Articles

Feliciano, Cynthia. 2009. "Education and Ethnic Identity Formation among Children of Latin American and Caribbean Immigrants." *Sociological Perspectives* 51(2):135-58.

Mencken, F. Carson, Christopher Bader, and Elizabeth Embry. 2009. "In God We Trust: Images of God and Trust in the United States among the Highly Religious." *Sociological Perspectives* 52(1):23-39.

Examples of Authored Books

Turner, Jonathan H. 1988. *A Theory of Social Interaction*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

-----, 1998. *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Sixth Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

An Example of a Chapter in an Edited Collection

Emerson, Richard. 1981. "Social Exchange Theory." Pp. 30-65 in *Social Psychology; Sociological Perspectives*, edited by M. Rosenberg and R. Turner. New York: Basic

Books.