

Council Meetings

The 2008-2009 Council met at the Westin Gaslamp Quarter in San Diego on Thursday April 9th, 2009.

President Judy Treas brought the 2008-09 PSA Council to order at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, April 9, 2009, during the 80th Annual PSA Meeting in San Diego. Council members present were: Judy Treas, Jodi O'Brien, Michael Messner, Bob O'Brien, Amy Wharton, Dean Dorn, Belinda Robnett, Rosemary Powers, Michelle Inderbitzen, and Karen Pyke. Also present were, President-elect, Sharon Araji, Vice President Elect Don Barrett, Charles Powers and Marilyn Fernandez, co-editors of *Sociological Perspectives*, and Ginny Mulle, Secretary.

Charles Powers, co-editor *Sociological Perspectives* presented the report (please see Report from the Editors of *Sociological Perspectives* for the complete report). Highlights of the report were that the co-editors have established a clear vision for the journal and of their responsibilities. Their first responsibility is to the Pacific Sociological Association, its members and journal readership; to make the journal a high quality general interest outlet for sociological scholarship. Published articles should be cutting edge, advance sociological knowledge, be well worked out and written, and appeal to a broad audience. Responsibilities to authors include timeliness, clear guidelines about issues to address when inviting revise and resubmissions, and making sure the primary reason(s) are clear for disqualification. A total of 116 manuscripts were received during calendar year 2008, which compares positively to prior years. As their term as co-editors expires in 2010, both Powers and Fernandez volunteered to be available through 2011. This will be reported to the Publications Committee during the meeting.

Keith Farrington, co-chair of the PSA Membership Committee, reported on the results of "The PSA Membership Survey for Sociologists at Ph.D. Granting Institutions in the Pacific Region," conducted by the Membership Committee during the year (please see report from the Membership Committee for the complete report). A total of 1030 surveys were sent via email to faculty of the 29 Ph.D. granting institutions in the region; 170, or 16.5% were returned. Farrington was not sure if the low response rate was an accurate representation of the larger population or was a result of self-selection. In support of self-selection, 40% of those responding to the survey were members of the PSA, 32% had been members but were no longer, and 25% had never been a member of the organization. Results indicated that respondents found the location of meetings, the overall atmosphere (friendly, welcoming and collegial), and the opportunity to connect and network as the most attractive attributes of the organization. The least attractive attribute reported was the quality of the work presented. The PSA was also perceived as an effective socialization agent for undergraduate and graduate students. However, respondents did not support the presence of undergraduate and graduate student work in sessions. To address this, the PSA has required that all undergraduate submissions be in either roundtable or poster format, and sessions for graduate students will be created as well. Karen Pyke suggested that sessions for graduate students could be conducted as

“workshops” where the students could be mentored by senior faculty in both the content of their work and presentation skills, and Jodi O’Brien queried whether qualitative data regarding the sessions might be possible. She suggested that a representative sample of sessions could be selected and a survey concerning the session be distributed at the end of the session. This could yield data on the quality of presentations and presentation skills of those participating in the session. Discussion ensued on the purpose of a local organization versus a national; Thomas Scheff wrote that the purpose of a local association was “to be messy,” to allow participants to raise new ideas rather than present those ready for publication.

Dean Dorn reported that the PSA Audit Committee had reviewed the organization’s financial records and declared and signed off that the financial account of the PSA is in order and the organization is financially sound. The report was distributed to Council members, noting that membership is stable and that the PSA continues to be the largest local sociological association.

President Treas reported that this year’s meeting was the largest in the history of the PSA, with 256 sessions. She focused on creating more “Author Meets Critics” sessions and organizing Presidential Sessions that focused on various dimensions of inequalities in society. There were nine Presidential Sessions and seven “Author Meets Critics” sessions. She was excited about all of the sessions and that they closely followed the theme of the meeting, “The Shifting Foundations of Social Inequality.” She thanked Dean Dorn for his continued excellent fiscal management of the organization as well as Council members and officers for their service to the association.

Executive Director Dorn reported that the PSA membership was at 1293, very steady, with 540 students and 650 faculty members. Registration for the meeting was high, and that he expected on-site registration (as opposed to pre-conference registration) to be the highest in the history of the PSA. There were many students who were registering on-site, from high school to graduate students. The Endowment Fund was in very good shape financially, and had awarded \$7000 in travel awards to students for this meeting. The Endowment Committee would appreciate more donations for both the auction and raffle for future meetings. Three issues of the PSA newsletter *The Pacific Sociologist* continue to be published out of the PSA office, both in electronic and hard copy form; however, more of the publication would be electronic only in the coming year.

President Treas thanked those Council members who were leaving Council this year

(Jodi O’Brien, Robert O’Brien, Rosemary Powers, Belinda Robnett and Candan Duran-Aydintug) for all of their hard work, and adjourned the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

The 2009-2010 Council met at the Westin Gaslamp Quarter in San Diego on Saturday April 11th.

President Michael Messner brought the 2009-10 PSA Council to order at 8:30 a.m. on Saturday, April 11th during the 80th Annual PSA Meeting in San Diego. Council members present were: Michael Messner, Judy Treas, Sharon Araji, Amy Wharton, Robert

O'Brien, Don Barrett, Dean Dorn, Michele Inderbitzen, Ellen Berg, Karen Pyke, Mia Tuan, Liza Kuecker, David Musick, Katie Furuyama, and Virginia Mulle, Secretary.

President Messner thanked Past-President Judy Treas for an excellent meeting, noting that the Presidential Sessions were especially well presented; announced that the theme for next year's meeting will be "Revitalizing the Sociological Imagination: Individual Troubles & Social Issues in a Turbulent World," in recognition of the 50th anniversary of C. Wright Mills' *Sociological Imagination*; that the Program Committee chair will be Karen Sternheimer of USC; and he and his committee welcomed suggestions for sessions. Messner reported that Michelle Camacho of the University of San Diego will help organize the "Author Meets Critics" sessions, and he hopes to have several of these sessions at next year's meetings. Tina Burdsall of Portland State has offered to organize volunteers to work at the registration and endowment tables at the meeting.

A report on the long range plans for the PSA was presented by Executive Director Dean Dorn, and focused on two major issues. The first is that the term of the current co-editors of *Sociological Perspectives*, Marilyn Fernandez and Charles Powers will be up next year, but that they have offered to extend their tenure by one year. This means that new editor(s) must be appointed by 2011, and that Dorn will begin advertising for the editorship in the January 2010 issue of *The Pacific Sociologist*. The second issue was that Executive Director Dorn will be resigning from his post as Executive Director by 2012, so Council should begin to explore options to run and manage the association after his departure. Dorn presented four possible options: 1) to locate a new Executive Director who would replace Dorn continuing to do all of the functions he currently performs; 2) to establish a constitutionally acceptable new format where there would be three members to run the association – a secretary, treasurer, and executive director. This model would distribute the workload; 3) to hire a professional office manager to work approximately 20 hours per week for the association, and 4) investigate the possibility of hiring a for-profit management organization and negotiating a contract with them to provide various or all of the functions of the association. Discussion ensued and a committee was formed to begin to explore options. Members of the committee are Michael Messner, Jodi O'Brien, Sharon Araj, David Musick and Robert O'Brien.

Executive Director Dorn reported back from the Publications Committee that they had unanimously accepted the offer of co-editors Marilyn Fernandez and Charles Powers to continue their term for one more year. Both Charles Powers and the members of the Awards Committee recommended that the Distinguished Contribution to *Sociological Perspectives Award* be awarded every year as opposed to every other year as it is now awarded. The Awards Committee offered to set up a sub-committee to assist the journal editors in selecting a yearly winner. Dorn moved that the Distinguished Contribution to *Sociological Perspectives Award* be awarded every year, Musick seconded the motion and Council unanimously passed it. David Musick, chair of COFRAT and Council member, reported back from the committee that it unanimously recommended to Council that it adopt the AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom; it was voted on and adopted by Council. Secretary Mulle attended several committee meetings and conveyed to Council that, as part of their review of their responsibilities, the Committee on the

Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities found that they were charged “to tack the experiences of racial and ethnic minorities in the organization,” and asked for access to demographic data or suggestions on how they could collect information to fulfill this responsibility. Several suggestions were offered that will be passed on to the committee chair. Mulle attended both the meetings of the Teaching and Awards Committees as they continue their work on revising the criteria for the teaching award. Much progress was made during the year and a revised set of criteria should be passed on to Council within the next few months.

Council unanimously delegated authority to the 2009-10 Nominations and Committee on Committees to solicit nominations for elected office and appointments to positions on various committees.

Judy Treas moved, Bob O’Brien seconded, and Council unanimously approved that 50 student travel awards (undergraduate and graduate) of \$125 each be given to students who are members of the association and are on the program of the 2010 Annual PSA Meeting to be held in Oakland. Including the compensation for undergraduate and graduate student paper award winners, this would bring to \$7,500 the support to students by the PSA to attend the meeting.

Discussion regarding the northern region location of the 2011 annual meeting was held. Cities under consideration include Portland, Eugene, Seattle, Vancouver and Spokane. The site selection committee will meet to decide then announce the selection for the 2011 meeting.

Dorn stated that he plans to evaluate who has shown up for this year’s meeting; he expects that attendance will be the largest ever. He noted that there was a very large number of undergraduate and graduate student “walk-ons” (those who did not pre-register for the meeting), and this was the first time he had seen this encouraging pattern at a meeting.

President Messner adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

Business Meeting, San Diego April 2009

Submitted by Dean S. Dorn, Executive Director

The 2009 annual business meeting was held in San Diego on Friday April 10th at 5:15 pm. Executive Director Dean Dorn presided. Few members attended, since all sessions for the day had ended and four receptions were going on.

Dorn reported on attendance at the 2009 meeting, data given were prior to the start of the conference. He indicated that the meeting might end up with a record registration for the association. He also reported on the increasing health of the Endowment Fund and that planning for next year’s meeting in Oakland was going well under the guidance of President Michael Messner and Program Chair, Karen Sternheimer. There was also a brief discussion on action items that the first Council meeting addressed, such as

changing the Distinguished Contributions to Sociological Perspectives Award from a biannual award to an annual award, The meeting adjourned around 5:40 pm.

Report from the Editors, *Sociological Perspectives*, Covering Calendar Year 2008 (Volume 51)

Submitted by Charles Powers and Marilyn Fernandez, Co-editors and Kay Boissicat, Managing Editor

Change in Reporting Practice

Starting with the current report, we depart from past practice and report on a calendar year (2008). The journal editors have four reasons for moving to a calendar year report. We list these in order of importance. First, previous reports, roughly (but not precisely) from one PSA conference to the next, had varied start and stop dates. This meant the actual length of a year could fluctuate in practice. Second, vagueness about start and stop dates for each accounting period presented the risk that some submissions might be reported in two different years and other submissions might never be reported at all. Third, under current editorial practice, we are able to report meaningfully on a calendar year because almost every submission from the calendar year just ended will have already completed the two most grueling steps in the review process (internal review by both co-editors of all submissions, and first round of blind reviewing for those submissions which pass the internal review). By contrast, April is too early to report meaningfully on the January-March submissions made just days or weeks prior to the annual conference. Fourth, the calendar year corresponds with the system *Sociological Perspectives* has for numbering volumes.

Overview

The current co-editors (Powers and Fernandez) have been at work since July 2007, which was the same time the journal converted to using MsCentral as an electronic clearing house for manuscripts. The conversion to MsCentral, while not perfect, has been reasonably effective in our view. MsCentral does not seem to us to be oriented toward customization for journals like ours, but does seem to be generally adequate (sometimes maddening for certain users, but essentially adequate).

Working relationships at UC Press are extraordinarily good for all of us on the editorial team. Everyone at UC Press has been helpful, cordial, professional, careful, and speedy. (There isn't anything else we would ask for.) Working relationships with the copy editor contracted by UC Press have been positive. Communication lines are open.

Although we have been editors for the purposes of processing the journal starting with Volume 51, Volume 51 (2008) was filled entirely with backlogged articles accepted under the previous editors. Don Barrett and Richard Serpe were consequently designated as contributing editors and Jessica Leveto as Contributing Managing Editor for each of the issues in Volume 51.

By special arrangement, UC Press (the current publisher of the journal) allowed us more pages than usual in Volume 51 (2008) in order to clear the backlog of acceptances made at the end of the previous editors' tour of duty. Starting with Volume 52 we will return to the journal's historical standard for size, typically having six articles and running around 125 pages.

New Submissions

An important part of each report concerns submissions trends, particularly in the new submissions arriving every year. Based on information from yearly reports, it seems that the number of new submissions has been relatively stable, averaging about nine per month, since 2005-6.

Calendar Year

2008 116 new submissions

For Comparison Purposes, Years ending around March 31

2008 110 new submissions
 2007 118 new submissions
 2006 121 new submissions
 2005 82 new submissions

Initial Internal and External Reviews of New Submissions: Calendar Year 2008

Total Number of Manuscripts Received:	116	
Total Disqualified through Internal Review	47	40.5 %
Sent out for Blind Review	67	57.8 %
Withdrawn by Authors During Process	2	01.7 %

Results of First Round of Blind Review:	67	57.8%
R & R Invited After Blind Review	32	27.6 %
Rejection After First Blind Review	35	30.2 %

Co-Editors' View of Primary Responsibilities

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 a broad audience.

You will notice that Volume 52, Number 1, has a thematic focus on "Shared Beliefs". For your information, the thematic focus of 52:2 will be on "Educational Outcomes and

Context”. These two thematic foci (for 52:1 and 52:2) emerged organically from among the papers that we (Powers/Fernandez) have thus far accepted for publication. It is our hope that having thematic foci for these issues will help make a powerful intellectual statement about sociology, about intellectual life in the Pacific Sociological Association, and about *Sociological Perspectives* as a publishing outlet. What we are anticipating is that each of the upcoming issues of *Sociological Perspectives* will spotlight a discernable frontier of social scientific investigation as one way of making it clear that the journal and each paper the journal publishes is contributing to cumulative exploration along one of sociology's many frontiers of understanding.

Additional Responsibilities of the Co-Editors

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) are clear for disqualification or rejection without invitation to revise and resubmit.

(1) Timeliness in Cases of Disqualification based on Internal Review. It is our feeling that in cases when an initial in-office editorial review results in a “disqualification” (a rejection based on internal review without going to external blind reviewers), this decision should be made in less than 30 days except under highly atypical circumstances. During 2008, our average time to reach a disqualification decision was 21 days and the maximum time taken has been 36 days.

[Under our co-editorship, “disqualification” is used ONLY after both co-editors have read and discussed the paper. Use of “disqualification” (a) is a growing trend in the discipline, (b) was recommended by the previous editors in their 2007 report, and (c) was called for in the editorial prospectus submitted by the current editors prior to their appointment.]

(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, and in any case not more than 152 days, of our receipt of the manuscript. During 2008, our average time to complete first blind reviews and arrive at a decision to either reject or invite a Revise and Resubmit was 93 days. The maximum time taken for this process on all 2008 new submissions was 150 days.

[This represents an appreciable shortening in the review process, when compared with an average of 130 days and a maximum of 242 days based on sample information provided by the previous editors.]

(3) Success with R & Rs. Our own targets are to have at least a 75% resubmission rate, and to raise the acceptance rate on resubmissions to at least two thirds. This would mean eventual publication of 50% or more of all R & Rs invited. While it is too early to know exactly how many of all the invitations issued in 2008 to Revise & Resubmit will be utilized (by the end of the six month time period our journal gives authors to complete revisions and resubmit), we have already come close to our success targets. We offer

three pieces of evidence. (1) Of the 116 new submissions that arrived in 2008, 32 submissions (or 27.6% of all submissions) were ultimately invited to Revise and Resubmit, after going through blind external review. This rate seems generally appropriate under the journal's current publication projections of 24 papers per year during our editorship. (2) Of the 32 papers which were invited to R & R, 23 have already submitted revised versions (denoted by R1); this represents 71.9% of all the resubmissions invited. Eight more authors (25% of all resubmissions invited) still have time to revise and resubmit; that is they are still under the 6 month time frame for submitting revisions. The eligible time has passed without a revision being resubmitted in only one case so far in 2008, although we expect this number to increase over time. (3) Of the 23 papers resubmitted so far, twelve have been accepted for publication, and eleven more are currently under review or were given second R & R invitations (R2). In conclusion, although the data are necessarily incomplete at this point, it appears that we will exceed our targets for both (a) an increase in the resubmission rate, and (b) an increase in the rate of eventual acceptance of resubmissions.

(4) Other Issues. Beyond our sense of responsibility for timely reviews, we feel we owe authors three 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 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 issues which surfaced during the review process.

The Special Role for Members of the Editorial Board

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 invited people to the board on the condition that they would 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 wanted to be, and have been, 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 Editorial Board's service to *Sociological Perspectives*.

Prospective board members are invited by us to join the board 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. The Editorial Board currently has 27 members.

Anticipating the Future

The current editors have been appointed to serve for a three year term (Volumes 51-53, 2008-2010). We volunteer our willingness to continue for a fourth year (volume 54, 2011) at the discretion of the PSA Council.

We anticipate producing issues of normal size (four issues per year with an average of 6

articles per issue) for the balance of our editorship. Whenever 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.

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, 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 these bodies as precluding submission of your own work to the journal. Should you submit, your submission will be treated exactly like everyone else (neither given favorable nor unfavorable treatment in the process).]

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. These numbers 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. [2006 is the most recent year for which data are posted.]

	Overall Journal Influence/Number of Article Citations		
	2006	2005	2004
<i>American Sociological Review</i>	89.0/98.3	87.2/97.9	89.7/98.1
<i>Social Forces</i>	81.2/92.2	78.8/92.1	81.0/93.6
<i>Sociological Forum</i>	30.4/42.0	28.3/37.2	40.2/54.2
<i>Sociological Inquiry</i>	23.9/33.6	17.5/22.9	25.3/32.5
<i>Sociological Perspectives</i>	33.6/56.7	29.0/49.2	36.5/59.1
<i>Sociological Quarterly</i>	37.6/47.4	33.4/40.6	42.8/55.4
<i>Sociological Spectrum</i>	5.4/ 9.0	14.4/23.0	5.5/10.7

After Action Reviews

We end with After Action Reviews (AAR) of two sets of anomalies to identify potential lessons for the future. AAR of the submission taking the longest period of time to disqualify (36 days) found that it was one of the submissions for which there was sufficient indication of possible overlap with previously published material to warrant some examination of earlier publications. This kind of check is time consuming. An additional complicating factor was that the submission arrived just after the start of a major holiday travel season. Our AAR conclusion is that we would process a case like this the same way if it happened again. Time taken for review did not result from any malfunction in the editorial process.

After Action Review of the two submissions taking the longest period of time to complete the first external review (150 days after initial submission in each of two cases) found the following. One submission involved a case in which a reviewer used almost the entire reviewing time and then refused to review citing health problems. The other submission took us seven weeks and eleven potential reviewers before finding even the first person willing to review the paper. Our AAR conclusion is that we would process these cases the same way again. Time taken for review did not result from any malfunction in the editorial process.

Financial Report from the Executive Director, January 1 to December 31, 2008

The 79th annual meeting was held in Portland, Oregon; 536 faculty and 608 students paid regular registration fees for a total of 1,144 paid registrations. This was surprisingly a slight increase over the 2007 meeting held in Oakland. In addition, 30 students received free registration for their volunteer work at registration. The paid registration was a record for the association.

Paid memberships in 2008 totaled 1,293 (658 paid faculty members and 635 paid student members). In addition, there were over 30 student members who were given free memberships based on their volunteer work at the annual conference. Paid memberships were almost identical to the numbers for 2007.

The Audit Committee approved this report at its meeting in the PSA Office in March (see the Audit Committee Report in this issue).

Income (in dollars)

Donations	3,821
Manuscript Fees	1,540
Memberships	35,900
Registration Fees	34,295
Misc	2,865
UC Press	38,307

Total Income	116,728
--------------	---------

Expenses (in dollars)

Annual Meeting	41,572
Awards	5,400

Clerical	2,000	
Editorial Office	14,800	
Bounced Checks	28	
Misc. Expense	10	
Phone	0	
Postage	8,458	
Refunds	1,680	
Xeroxing	120	
Travel	344	
Supplies	2,031	
ASA Advertising	0	
Honorarium Ex Dir	7,500	
Assets to CD Account	0	
Assets to Endowment Fund	40,000	
Printing/Graphics	6,213	
Liability Insurance	502	
Credit Card Cost	1,979	
<hr/>		Total
Expenses*	132,637	
Assets		
Check Book 12/31/08	23,229	
CD Endow Fund 12/31/08	207,184	
CD general fund 12/31/06	32,542	
<hr/>		
Total Assets 12/31/08	262,955	
Cost Per Member	65.84	

*Expenses minus transfers to CD accounts (47,500.00) = 85,137.00

Committee Reports and Activities

Committees were active during 2008-2009. The committee reports will serve as an account of their activities. No reports were received from the following committees: Teaching, Race and Ethnicity, and the Committee on the Status of Women.

Report from the Committee on Practice, Applied, and Clinical Sociology (CAPCS) CRISTINA BODINGER-DEURIARTE (CHAIR)

I. CPACS Annual Meeting

The Chair sent the 2009 meeting agenda and the request for session ideas for 2010 to all members in advance of the meeting via email, as well as a review copy of last year's minutes. The PSA Committee on Practice, Applied and Clinical Sociology met on Thursday, at noon, on April 9, 2009. The following members attended: C. Bodinger-deUriarte (Chair), Robert Kettlitz (new), and Richard Garvey.

As only 3 of the members were able to attend this year, we did not hold the election for Chair at that meeting, nor did we make any final decisions for the upcoming year of activity. Rather, follow-up emails were sent immediately following the PSA annual meeting. Those unable to attend were also asked: to add to the nominations for Chair and new members, for their final input on any of the agenda items, and for their ideas on sessions to sponsor in 2010. After nominations closed, a formal ballot was circulated.

II. Election, Current Membership, and Nomination(s) for 2010 Member(s)

Robert Kettlitz was elected **CPACS Chair** to serve during the year between the 2009 and the 2010 annual PSA meetings. The term ends after he submits the 2010 CPACS annual report due on May 1st of 2010.

Current CPACS Membership—2009-10

NAME	AFFILIATION	LEAVES PACS
Meda Chesney-Lind	University of Hawaii	2010
Richard Garvey	RAND	2011
Richard Lockwood	Portland State University	2011
Yvonne Luna	Northern Arizona University	2011
Susan Mannon	Utah State	2011
Robert Kettlitz	Hastings College	2012
Donald Winiecki	Boise State	2012

CPACS Members who exited in 2009

NAME	AFFILIATION
Cherylynn Bassani	University of British Columbia

Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte	CSU-Los Angeles
Amy Liu	CSU-Sacramento

One member (Meda Chesney-Lind) will be rotating off next cycle (2010). CPACS does not have the power to appoint new committee members, but we submit names of nominees for consideration by the Committee on Committees. Robert Kettlitz, new member and incoming CPACS Chair, made two tentative nominations, but only one confirmed willingness to serve if appointed. As a result, we only nominated one person. David Musick has the full support of CPACS as nominee. The exiting CPACS Chair forwarded his name and information to the Committee on Committees representative, Nancy Andes, on April 27, 2009, as follows:

David Musick (PhD UC, Riverside)

University of Northern Colorado Professor David Musick's interests include Evaluation and Applied Research, Race/Ethnic/Minority Relations, and Law and Society. He is very active in the discipline with numerous presentations and publications, including several books, most recently: *An Introduction to the Sociology of Juvenile Delinquency*. His 2009 PSA presentation with joint author Karen Musick was "Illicit Drug Addiction & Capital Murder: A Causal Analysis." In addition, he was a non-presenting organizer for 4 panels: *Crime & Delinquency II; III; IV; & V*. Finally, David Music was a member of CPACS some time back, and expressed interest in rejoining this committee.

III. Proposed Changes

Update on Old Business

The PacificSoc.org website contains posted descriptions of all the PSA committees. The end of our 2008 CPACS Annual Meeting charged us with editing/making changes to this description. We did this in a good collaborative effort, with all changes agreed upon by all members present at that meeting and through email. The changes and edits we approved have now been approved by the PSA Council and should be updated on the website in the next month or so.

New Business

This year the exiting Chair included on the formal ballot a suggested membership change and criteria for such a membership. Returned ballots unanimously favored the suggestion and accepted the criteria. Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte (exiting Chair) provided Ginny Mulle and Nancy Andes with the following, asking that the matter be taken up by the PSA Council (as they are charged with approving all committee changes) and the Committee on Committees (as they would, ultimately, be appointing such a member after considering any CPACS nominations--if the suggestion is approved):

The Committee on Practice, Applied & Clinical Sociology (CPACS) by unanimous vote (confidential email-ballot) agreed in favor of the following committee membership change and criteria:

The Committee on Practice, Applied & Clinical Sociology (CPACS) would like to request that PSA allow us to add one membership spot for a graduate student member of CPACS. The suggested criteria would be as follows: (a) graduate student status; (b) member of PSA; (c) previous presenter at PSA; (d) experience in applied, practice, or clinical work or experience in community or social agency service or in social research.

Given that PSA Council approval of this change in membership structure will need to happen prior to the Committee on Committees appointing anyone, it is doubtful that we would see a graduate student member before 2011. CPACS is advised to be ready to nominate appropriately motivated and accomplished graduate students at the 2010 meeting, if the approval goes through.

IV. 2009 San Diego Annual Meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association Panels Sponsored by Committee on Practice, Applied and Clinical Sociology—or Participated in by their Members.

CPACS attendance was down, and had an impact on the number of CPACS-sponsored sessions offered. Where the organizer was also a CPACS member, the name is bolded. Eleven sessions were tentatively identified in the 2008 meeting; however, only 6 of these were actualized.

#29 Webs of Meaning: Online Sociology Classes: organizer, **Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte**.

#49 Evaluating Social Programs: Successes Failure & Innovations: organizer, Warren Lucas.

#60 Student Experiences in Sociological Practice: organizer, **Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte**.

121 Tales from the Field: Practitioners on Practice: organizer/discussant, **Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte**.

#156 Evaluating Criminal & Juvenile Justice Programs: organizer, Josh Meisel.

#216 International Perspectives on Health: organizer, **Cherylynn Bassani**.

Members were also presenters as follows (alphabetical order):

- **Cherylynn Bassani**: *The Health of Immigrant Children in British Columbia*.
- **Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte**: *Maximizing Engagement: Unique Opportunities in Online Instruction*.
- **Yvonne Luna**: *Flagstaff Family Food Center from Informal to Formal Organization—A Case Study*.
- **Susan Mannon** (*et. al.*): *Latino Financial Practices in Northern Utah*,
- **Don Winiecki**: *Discourse/Rationality—a New Frame for Power/Knowledge and Using Ethnographic Forms of Research to Study the Social World and to Make Social Theories Study-able*.

Our broad committee purview is well reflected in our sessions/presentations that deal with: health, immigration, justice, community service, and education while focusing on: professional ethics, applied research problems, evaluation methodology, accreditation issues in applied programs, social program efficacy, and service-learning implementation and training. Several presenters had non-university-based professional practice affiliations. This supports a continuing goal to attempt to increase representation at PSA of our colleagues from these settings.

V. 2010 Oakland Annual Meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association Possible Panels to be sponsored by CPACS.

CPACS members tentatively agreed to provide 12 sessions for 2010 in these broad areas—to be refined later. Sessions may be added and/or deleted from this list between now and the deadline for PSA submissions.

These sessions are listed alphabetically by organizer (one of whom is not a CPACS member, Warren Lucas):

1. Applied Sociology and the Online Class (Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte)

2. Tales from the Field II—Practitioners Talk about Practice (Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte)
3. Doing Applied Research—Undergraduate Regular Session (Robert Kettlitz)
4. Using Sociological Theory to Frame Applied Research (Robert Kettlitz)
5. Teaching Sociology Theory as an Applied Course (Robert Kettlitz)
6. Teaching Applied Sociology (Robert Kettlitz)
7. Evaluating Social Programs (Warren Lucas)
8. Evaluating Work-Family Programs and Policies (Susan Mannon)
9. Immigration Reform for the 21st Century (Susan Mannon)
10. Assessing International Development Programs (Susan Mannon)
11. Applied Sociology in the Private Sector (Don Winiecki)
12. Applied Sociology in the Public Sector (Don Winiecki)

In Addition, CPACS members are also expected to present as follows:

- Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte is expected to present on #6 above.
- Richard Garvey is expected to present on #2 above.
- Don Winiecki is expected to present on #2 above.

VI. PSA Distinguished Practice Award

Committee members are aware of the work involved in completing a nomination package; as a result, it was agreed that more members would get involved for the 2010 award year and would begin the process in 2009. CPACS Chair will soon have members identify potential nominees and create a division of labor for completing nomination packets with external recommendation letters for the nominee(s); a listing of their contributions to the field, including publications; and verification of their relevance for a *regionally-based* award, so that all of this can be submitted to the Awards Committee prior to deadline.

Report from the Committee on Freedom of Research and Teaching

Submitted by David Musick

Members present at the 2009 meeting were David Musick, chair, Glenn Goodwin, University of La Verne, Virginia Mulle, University of Alaska Southeast, Sharon Davis, University of La Verne, and Monika J. Ulrich, University of Arizona.

Sharon Davis and Glenn Goodwin were elected as co-chairs for 2009-2010. Sharon Davis will take the lead in most matters, and will serve as the contact person with the PSA Council. COFRAT will co-sponsor a session with the Committee on Civil Right and Civil Liberties entitled “Reflections on Student-Teacher-Administration Relations and Ethics,” that will be organized by Byron Lee of CRCL. COFRAT unanimously approved a motion recommending that the PSA Council adopt the AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom. COFRAT is working on drafting a simple, straightforward set of policies and procedures to use if violations falling under the domain of the ASA Code of Ethics are reported.

The committee thanked David Musick for his leadership as chair of the committee for the last two years.

Report from the Committee on Civil Rights & Civil Liberties

Submitted by Don Barrett

The committee met on Friday, April 10 in San Diego. Attending the meeting were members Don Barrett (chair), Marcia Marx, Dennis Loo, and Byron Lee. Non-attending members Palmer and Dewey had notified committee members that they could not attend due to lack of travel funding. Former member Patricia Little also attended as a guest. During the 2009 conference, the committee hosted the following three presentations; approximate counts of attendance at each presentation are in parentheses: Academic Freedom, Student Evaluation, & the Economics of Higher Education (6), Video Session: Race-ing for Change: The Political Landscape after the Obama Victory (20), Special Evening Session: The Bush Legacy (45). One session that had been proposed was canceled due to low submissions: "United Nations, United States, "Universal" Rights."

For Oakland (2010), the committee is proposing the following sessions (contact person is in parentheses): Civil Liberties Under Fire (Dennis Loo); Wars and Occupations (Dennis Loo); Reflections on Student-Teacher-Administration Relations and Ethics (Byron Lee); State-Sanctioned Violence (Byron Lee); Gender, Race, Ethnicity and Human Trafficking: A Video Session (Marcia Marx); Military and Education (Don Barrett).

Report from the Committee on the Community Colleges

Submitted by J. Vern Cromartie, Chair

The Committee on the Community College sponsored three sessions at the 80th Annual Meeting of the PSA.

The sessions were relatively well attended. The head count for the "Issues in Race and Ethnicity" paper session was approximately 25. The head count for the "Issues in the Community College" roundtable session was approximately 6. The head count for the special presidential session was approximately 23.

The Committee on Community Colleges met on Friday, August 10, 2009. Of the 10 membership positions on the Committee on Community Colleges, 4 members will have their stints end at the conclusion of the conference. In addition to Dean Dorn, the August 10, 2009 committee meeting was attended by J. Vern Cromartie, Contra Costa College; Vivian C. Varela, Mendocino College; and Melissa Rifino Juarez, Rio Hondo College. Varela and Juarez both said they were interested in joining the committee. It is assumed that many committee members did not attend the conference because of the lack of support by their institutions regarding attendance costs (travel, hotel, etc.). It is also assumed that participation will increase at the 81st Annual Meeting in Oakland.

The Committee on Community Colleges will sponsor a minimum of two sessions at the 81st Annual Meeting in Oakland. J. Vern Cromartie will organize those sessions. He will also send emails to committee members who did not attend the conference to encourage them to organize and participate in sessions at the 81st Annual Meeting in Oakland.

J. Vern Cromartie will continue to serve as chair of the Committee on Community Colleges for the 2009.2010 academic year. He will also see a re-appointment to the Committee on Community Colleges. He is in the process of developing a written chronology of the history of the PSA'S Committee on Community Colleges.

Report from the Publications Committee

Submitted by Kathy Kuipers, Chair

The Publications Committee met on Thursday, April 9, 2009. Members present included Celestino Fernandez, Karen Miller-Loessi, Dennis Downey, Charles Powers and Marilyn Fernandez (*ex officio*, current co-editors of *Sociological Perspectives*), Dean Dorn, Executive Director and liaison to PSA Council, and Kathy Kuipers, Chair. Also present was Kay Boissicat, Managing Editor for *Sociological Perspectives*. Members were introduced and new members were welcomed.

Dean Dorn very briefly reported that the production of *The Pacific Sociologist* was running smoothly and that it will continue to be published in paper form and mailed to members through first class mail. Back issues are available in pdf form on the PSA website. The committee was generally supportive of continuing with the printing and mailing of the newsletter and thanks Dorn and the executive office for their work on its production.

Charles Powers and Marilyn Fernandez (co-editors) gave a more lengthy report on the current state of *Sociological Perspectives*. The report, covering the calendar year of 2008, was the same as that given to the PSA Council. To summarize briefly, Powers and Fernandez expressed their pleasure with the cooperative relationship that they have built with UC Press, the press's responsiveness in dealing with problems, and the opportunity to clear, in 2008, the large backlog of accepted articles left by previous co-editors Barrett and Serpe. Powers and Fernandez continue to see the use of MsCentral as effective for manuscript management and communication with authors and reviewers, although not perfect. There were 116 new submissions in 2008. They discussed the thematic foci of Volume 52, Numbers 1 and 2, and hope to continue with this practice of spotlighting a "discernable frontier of social scientific investigation" in each issue. For more details, see their full report, available in *The Pacific Sociologist* newsletter.

Committee members offered suggestions and comments. The committee also supported the co-editors in their ideas about offering an award for the best paper published in *Sociological Perspectives* each year. The committee expressed its gratitude for the high standards and work done by Co-editors Powers and Fernandez and discussed and approved the continuation of Powers and Fernandez as co-editors for an additional, fourth

year beyond their term. A search for new editors will need to be conducted beginning with an announcement in January, 2010, so that their replacements can take over in the summer of 2011.

Unlike in past years, the UC Press did not submit a report on the sales, marketing, and circulation of *Sociological Perspectives* and Rebekah Darksmith, our UC Press representative, was unable to attend the meeting.

Lastly, retiring committee members Fernandez, Gallagher, and Kuipers were thanked for their service. Dennis Downey agreed to serve as chair of the publications committee for the 2009-10 term.

Report from the Membership Committee

Submitted by Co-Chairs Keith Farrington and Jennifer Eichstedt

The Membership Committee of the Pacific Sociological Association met on the afternoon of Thursday, April 9 at the Westin Gaslamp Quarter Hotel in San Diego, California. Committee members in attendance included Jennifer Eichstedt and Keith Farrington (committee co-chairs for 2008-2009), Kristin Bates, Dennis Downey, Vikas Gumbhir, Amy Orr and Jill Weigt. 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 Dean Dorn and Ginny Mulle.

According to these data:

- PSA Membership for 2009 (as of the beginning of this year's PSA meeting) was 1140.
- Based on years past, Dean expects that an additional 70 new members (approximately) will join or renew their membership in the PSA while at our meeting in San Diego, and that another 30 (approximately) will register for 2009 PSA membership between now and the end of the year. Should these predictions hold true, this will give us a total membership for the year of approximately 1240.

- Comparable membership figures for the past five years are the following:

2008	1293 (our largest PSA Meeting ever [at least to this point])
2007	1257
2006	1276

2005 1250

2004 1299

- As Dean has suggested in looking at these longitudinal data relating to PSA Membership, these figures are actually quite consistent throughout this 5½ year period. This is a good thing in the sense that we appear to have a stable and somewhat predictable membership size that we can more-or-less depend upon from year-to-year. However, it may also have a possible downside, in the sense that there may not be all that much additional room or opportunity, when all is said and done, to increase the overall size of our membership – that is, we may have already done all that we can realistically do in this regard, short of the major overhaul and radical restructuring of either the overall objectives and organization and/or the specific membership procedures that currently govern the PSA.
- Perhaps reflecting this very point, the PSA office attempted to specifically target and recruit as members faculty members from universities in the western region that offer graduate programs in sociology (at either the MA or Ph.D. levels). As reported by Dean, a total of 380 letters of invitation and PSA brochures were sent to faculty members (not currently members of the PSA) at such institutions in fall of 2008, offering them PSA Membership for only \$20 (a full 50% discount compared to our normal membership fee for faculty). This membership initiative yielded a total of only twelve new PSA members.
- As of the beginning of the 2009 PSA Meetings, the PSA membership consisted of approximately 600 faculty members and 540 students (primarily graduate students, but some undergraduates). This ratio of faculty-to-student membership in the PSA has apparently also been fairly stable in past years, with students comprising between 40% and 50% of our total membership during that time.
- Information provided by Dean revealed that the PSA has had a total of 1260 different individual faculty members who have belonged to our organization for at least one year between 2006 and 2009. The reasons why we have such a high degree of “turnover” in our faculty membership are likely to be many and varied for individual faculty members, but this pattern does raise more general questions about the possibility of at least some of these “transitory” faculty members not being sufficiently impressed with our organization and/or its annual meetings to consistently retain membership from year-to-year. However, it also suggests the possibility that a good number of faculty members may be temporarily drawn to membership in our organization in a particular year because of the opportunity to participate in our annual meeting in that year.
- The PSA Membership Survey for Sociologists at Ph.D. Granting Institutions in the Pacific Region:

As promised at last year's meeting of the Membership Committee (held in April, 2008 in Portland, Oregon), Keith revised (with the considerable assistance of the other members of this committee) and distributed (in February of 2009) a PSA Membership Survey for Sociologists at Ph.D. Granting Institutions in the Pacific Region. To put this research effort into a larger context, it is actually something of an extension of and follow-up upon a survey which was conducted on behalf of the PSA Council in the spring of 2007. This earlier survey was sent to all current members of the PSA, to solicit their views on their regional professional association – i.e., what they like about it, what they don't like, what they would like to see changed, etc. The purpose of the present survey was to target more specifically and explicitly those faculty members who are associated with the region's doctoral programs – both PSA members and non-members – so as to determine their perceptions of the Pacific Sociological Association, its effectiveness (or lack thereof), and the possibility that they might wish to become members of our organization, if they are not already.

Some of the specific aspects of and findings yielded by this study that seem most relevant to the current charge(s) before the PSA Membership Committee are the following:

- Using information contained within the 2006 ASA Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology, a working population designed to include all of the Sociology faculty members at all of the Ph.D. granting institutions in the Pacific Region of the United States and Canada was identified. The resulting sampling frame consisted of a total of 1030 “Full-Time Faculty in Sociology” (as identified in this ASA document), as well as “Affiliated and Joint Appointments, Part-Time, and Emeritus Faculty” (again as identified in the ASA Guide), at 29 different Ph.D. granting institutions in the Pacific Region.
- On February 12 of this year, the surveys were sent out (by e-mail) to all of the persons in our working population. A follow-up reminder e-mail message was sent out to all of these 1030 potential respondents on February 22, once again attempting to enlist their cooperation in filling out and returning this survey. All respondents were asked to complete this task and submit their survey by Friday, February 27.
- When all was said and done, we received a total of 170 surveys (166 of which were completed in full). When looked at in contrast to our total working population of 1030, this figures out to a (rather disappointing) response rate of 16.5%. This low rate of response suggests, among other things, that we must be very cautious in attempting to generalize beyond this specific sample to the larger population of faculty members at these Ph.D. granting institutions – i.e., for any of a number of specific reasons, this sample of survey respondents may simply not be particularly representative of sociology faculty employed at Ph.D. granting universities more generally.
- Not to be lost in our disappointment over this low rate of response, however, is the fact that 170 sociologists did opt to participate in this study, many of them very carefully and thoughtfully.

- 77.2% of our 170 respondents were full-time faculty members at one (or, in one or two cases, several) of these institutions. Another 7.0% were emeritus faculty. The rest were graduate students (presumably with some teaching responsibility), part-time faculty members and sociologists holding administrative positions.
- Somewhat surprisingly, in light of widespread perceptions and anecdotal evidence which suggests that faculty members at our region's Ph.D. granting institutions are dramatically underrepresented within the PSA, 40.1% the respondents who filled out this survey were currently members of the PSA (indeed, this may be one of the most important ways in which our survey is not representative of the faculty at Ph.D. granting institutions in our region overall). An additional 32.5% have been members of our organization in the past, while 25.5% have never been members of the PSA.
- For those respondents who have attended at least one meeting of the PSA in the past five years, the things that they have liked most about PSA meetings are the following: (a) the location (74.0%), (b) the overall atmosphere of the meetings (54.8%), (c) the opportunity to connect with friends and colleagues (53.4%), (d) the opportunities for professional networking (32.9%), and (e) the time of the year at which the conference was held (31.5%).
- Conversely, for those respondents who have attended at least one meeting of the PSA in the past five years, the things that they have liked least about PSA meetings are the following: (a) the quality of the papers and sessions that were presented (59.0%), (b) the opportunity to be updated on the general state of the field of Sociology (16.4%), and (c) the opportunities for professional networking (16.4%). This question about the overall quality of the sociological work presented at the annual meetings of our organization has been an issue of some discussion for many years now, and will be addressed at some length a bit later on in this report.
- Somewhat related to the previous point, of those respondents who have attended meetings of the PSA in recent years, 47.2% agreed that the work that they have seen presented has often failed to meet their expectations for quality. Conversely, a somewhat smaller number (34.7%) agreed that the work that they have seen presented has generally met or exceeded their expectations for quality.
- 35.4% of our respondents indicated that many graduate students from their department participate in the PSA, while 36.1% indicated that some of their graduate students do so. Only 15.2% indicated that their graduate students do not generally participate in the PSA.
- A very small percentage of our respondents (9.4%) agreed with the statement that the PSA does not very effectively meet the organizational objectives which they see as important for a regional organization for sociologists. 16.8% indicated their opinion that the PSA meets these objectives very effectively, and another 27.5% expressed an opinion that the PSA meets these objectives somewhat effectively. Almost half of our respondents (46.3%) had no opinion on this issue or "didn't know."

- In explaining why they are not currently members of the PSA, only 5.4% of our respondents indicated that one of their reasons for not becoming a member of (or remaining affiliated with) this organization is because “they were not particularly impressed with the PSA as a regional sociological association.” The more commonly-given reasons for non-membership in the PSA included the following: (a) “there are only so many organizations that one can belong to, and there are other organizations within the discipline of Sociology that are more germane to my own work” (36.4%); (b) “the majority of the people that I wish to meet and network with belong to organizations other than the PSA” (22.5%); (c) “my university has stringent limitations on the amount of professional travel that it will support financially, and this has limited the number of organizations to which I can realistically belong and be involved with” (18.6%); (d) “at this point in my career, my professional needs are better met by other professional organizations outside the discipline of Sociology” (17.1%); and (e) “I do not feel that being a member of the PSA is worth the required membership fees and/or other responsibilities of membership” (17.1%).
- For those respondents who are not currently members of the PSA, 23.3% indicated that it is highly unlikely that they would opt to join the PSA at some point in the foreseeable future, and another 26.7% indicated that it is not very likely that they would join the PSA at some point in the foreseeable future. On the other hand, 35.6% of these respondents indicated that it is somewhat likely that they would opt to join the PSA in the foreseeable future, and 8.9% indicated that this possibility is highly likely. The fact that such a high percentage of the non-PSA members in our sample indicated some reasonable possibility of joining the PSA in the future would seem, on the surface, to be somewhat at odds with the suggestion made earlier that there may not be all that much room or opportunity, realistically speaking, for the PSA to increase its membership beyond its present size (of course, this result could also be another manifestation of the possible non-representativeness of our particular sample vis-à-vis the larger population of sociologists working in Ph.D. granting institutions more generally..

On the whole, the representatives to the Membership Committee seemed to find nothing particularly surprising or unexpected in these survey findings. Again, the major potential criticism of the PSA that seemed to underlie many of these data relates to negative perceptions apparently held by many regarding the quality of the work that is often presented at the PSA Meetings. This is an issue that has been discussed within the Membership Committee and in the PSA Council on many occasions in years past, and it was once again the basis for a rather lengthy discussion which took place in our own meeting.

While acknowledging both (a) that there are actually a multitude of reasons why critics might not be pleased with what they see and experience at PSA meetings, and (b) that only some of these reasons are specifically related to the presentation of work that is shoddy, incomplete and/or unsophisticated, we realize that this is an issue which the PSA generally and our committee in particular must take seriously and attempt to address – especially to the degree that such

perceptions of poor quality work might serve to keep sociologists in our region from joining our organization and/or participating in its annual meetings.

A number of specific issues in this regard were considered and debated, but the gist of this far-ranging and spirited discussion was the very real possibility that the “one-size-fits-all” PSA presentation prototype – i.e., the 90-minute session featuring the presentation of four or five academic papers, sometimes accompanied by critical commentary offered by a prepared discussant – may be a major part of the problem that we face. Indeed, many of the specific suggestions offered in this discussion spoke in one way or another to the desirability of the PSA moving to implement and then institutionalize a “multi-tiered and progressive” typology of presentation venues and formats, featuring, perhaps, some combination of the following: (a) workshops, poster sessions and paper presentations specifically devoted to undergraduate students; (b) general thematic discussions relating to specific substantive topics in the field of Sociology, but not involving the presentation of specific papers; (c) general workshops (perhaps facilitated by one or more sociologists with specific expertise in the area in question) based upon the less formal presentation of “research in progress”; (d) more general “mentoring sessions” designed to provide assistance to graduate students (and perhaps even young faculty) with their professional socialization into the field; (e) formal paper sessions (of the kind that dominate our meetings at present) for the presentation of written papers describing completed work, both empirically-based and more theoretical, and (f) “author-meets-critic sessions” of one kind or another, in which work that has already been presented to and disseminated among professional audiences is subjected to careful and substantive scrutiny.

Other related issues were also discussed: (a) the increased “gatekeeping” responsibilities for session organizers and chairs under a system like that described above, since these individuals would now have even greater pressure upon them in soliciting, evaluating and enforcing the placement of papers/presentations into the appropriate kinds of sessions; (b) the structural and jurisdictional problems which would most likely serve to complicate such a system – e.g., the lack of continuity from year to year, the general absence of institutional memory within the PSA, the almost complete lack of formal contact between outgoing and incoming Program Committees, etc.; and (c) “the free rider” problem (a term coined by Dennis), according to which the faculty at some graduate institutions may be using or at least sanctioning participation in the PSA as an important and convenient part of the professional socialization of their graduate students, but yet demonstrating an unwillingness to themselves participate in our organization, or to even provide their students with the support and guidance necessary to come to the PSA Meetings and make high quality presentations there.

As these discussions progressed, it became obvious that although our committee seemed to have no shortage of creative and interesting ideas in this regard and although we were clearly enjoying the momentum of a good discussion that was taking place, we simply didn’t have enough time to adequately address all of these issues and come up with the best workable plan within our allotted 90-minute meeting slot. Thus, the motion was unanimously approved to create a subcommittee (a subcommittee consisting of Vic, Kristin and Dennis) to flesh out this general notion of a multi-tiered typology of conference presentation formats and venues, and to think of ways to address the problems likely to be encountered if the PSA were to actually attempt to implement such a system. We further agreed that this subcommittee would communicate with

one another and consider these (and other related) issues during the next several months, and that it would make recommendations to the entire Membership Committee by January 1, 2010, if at all possible. These recommendations will then be discussed at the Membership Committee Meeting of 2010 in Oakland, and will hopefully be sent on to the PSA Council as committee recommendations following this discussion.

The Review of the Existing PSA Statement on the Responsibilities and Charge of the Membership Committee and its Chair:

An ongoing item of business specified in the Membership Committee's report from last year that was on this year's meeting agenda was the need for us to undertake a critical discussion of the responsibilities and duties of the PSA Membership Committee and its Chairperson(s); this is apparently part of a larger ongoing PSA initiative to evaluate all of its official statements relating to its organizational structure, so as to determine the extent to which rhetoric corresponds to actual practice, and to make changes in one or the other sides of this equation when discrepancies suggest this to be necessary. However, because our discussion of other issues left us very little time to give this matter the attention that it deserves, Keith and Jennifer (with the assistance of Amy) agreed to serve as a subcommittee to our larger committee, with the charge to investigate and consider this matter, and to make recommendations to the entire Membership Committee by January 1, 2010, if at all possible.

Nominations for New Representatives to the Membership Committee:

Ginny asked for two nominations for incoming representatives to the Membership Committee, to replace Kari Norgaard and Jill Weigt, both of whose terms of membership ended with the completion of this committee meeting. Several nominations were made as we brought our meeting to a close, and Ginny encouraged any of us on the Membership Committee with ideas in this regard to forward additional nominations to the Committee on Committees, either directly or through her, by Saturday, April 18. Ideally, these nominations will be of individuals (faculty members or graduate students) who would represent, respectively, the Northern and Southern Regions of the PSA.

Jill and Kari were thanked for all of their hard work and collegial spirit during their terms of office on the Membership Committee the past three years.

The Election of a New Membership Committee Chair (or Co-Chairs):

Jill Eichstedt and Keith Farrington expressed a willingness to once again serve as Co-Chairs of the PSA Membership Committee for the 2009-2010 academic year, if there were no other committee members who wished to take their place. Jill and Keith were unanimously selected to continue on in this Co-Chair position for the upcoming year.

Our meeting was adjourned just in time to allow us to attend the Presidential Address and Awards Ceremony.

Report from the Audit Committee

Submitted by Dean S. Dorn, Executive Director

The PSA Audit Committee examined the financial records (Quicken, Checks, Check Book, and Receipts) for the fiscal year 2008 in the PSA office at CSU Sacramento on March 17th 2009.

The Committee (Megan Seeley from Sierra College and Pam Flaherty from Sacramento City College) found the records to be in order.

Report from the Awards Committee

Submitted by Teresa Ciabattari, Chair

Thanks again to all of you for your work on the Awards Committee. It was great to see you in San Diego, and I look forward to seeing all of you in Oakland next year.

1. The sub-committee assignments for 2010 are attached (see below in the minutes). For those of you who were not present, we tried to match you with committees you have already participated on or expressed an interest in being a part of. If any changes need to be made, please let me know.

2. Like us, the Publications Committee also discussed having the Sociological Perspectives Award given every year (and I assume Council approved the change). The Editors did not feel that choosing a winner would be a burden in any way, so they are the sub-committee for that award. No Award Committee members are needed for that sub-committee.

3. The Graduate Student and Undergraduate Student Paper Awards will be submitted ONLINE ONLY for 2010. We are going to pilot this and see how it works. Other awards that require more materials (Distinguished Scholarship, Distinguished Teaching, etc.) will continue to be submitted in hard copy.

4. Ginny and Dean will be in touch about the criteria for the Teaching Award and whether or not that has officially been changed for the 2010 Award.

5. Timeline:

May and September 2009 - calls for nominations go out in the PSA newsletters. *Nominations are sent directly to the various subcommittee chairs.*

Dec. 1, 2009 Deadline for the Distinguished Scholarship Award.

Feb. 1, 2010: Deadline for all other awards

March 1, 2010: Deadline for committee decisions

Committee Assignments by Award for 2009.

Chair, Teresa Ciabattair; Distinguished Scholarship, Elaine Draper (chair), Jennifer Reich, Edward Telles or Vilma Ortiz (2009 recipients), Issac Martin (2009 honorable mention recipient); Contributions to Teaching, Vikas Gumbhir (chair) and Marie Butler; Graduate Student Paper Award (Shari Dworkin, chair and Kari Lerum; undergraduate paper, Kari Lerum (chair) and Leontina Hormel, Practice (Leontina Hormel, chair and Vikas Gumbhir, and sociological perspectives award, editors of sociological perspectives.

Report from the Committee on Committees

Submitted by Robert O'Brien, Co-Chair

The Committee on Committee met on Friday, April 10, 3:30-5:00 p.m. Robert O'Brien (Past Vice-President) and Amy Wharton (Vice-President), committee Co-Chairs chaired the meeting. Six of the nine elected committee members were present. In addition, Dean Dorn represented the PSA Council.

Dean Dorn walked us through the committee's tasks. Thank you, Dean. The Committee on Committee suggests appointments to all of PSA's standing committees that have vacancies. He reviewed the following documents that will assist us in our tasks: List of openings by committee for appointment in 2009; 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 Dean Dorn is December 1, 2009. The Committee set a deadline for nominations to be complete of early October to be on the safe side.

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	<u>James Dean</u>
(2) opening on Teaching	<u>Sheila Steinberg</u>
(2) openings on COFRAT	<u>Faye Wachs</u>
(1) opening on Membership (filled this position)	<u>Nancy Andes</u>

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| (1) opening on Practice/Applied (filled this position) | <u>Nancy Andes</u> |
| (4) openings on Student Affairs | <u>Bob O'Brien</u> |
| (3) <u>openings on Endowments</u> | <u>David Boyns</u> |
| (3) <u>openings on Status of Women</u> | <u>Amy Wharton</u> |
| (2) <u>openings on Racial & Ethnic Minorities</u> | <u>Manuel Barajas</u> |
| (3) <u>openings on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties</u> | <u>Peter Callero</u> |
| (2) openings on Social Conscience
need to be appointed early fall 2008 | <u>Michelle Jacob</u> |
| (4) openings on Community Colleges | <u>Echo Fields</u> |

Report from the Endowment Committee

Submitted by Jane Prather, acting chair and Dean Dorn, Executive Director

Dear Committee Members:

Three members were present at the meeting in San Diego, Jane Prather, David Snow, and Steven Ortiz. The committee took the following action: re-elected Wendy Ng as chair for next year, with David Snow serving as Co-Chair.

The committee discussed several questions that Dorn answered in an email to members after the San Diego meeting.

1) Are we getting sufficient publicity to departments for the travel awards? The answer seems to be that we are. The PSA office sends every department chair a letter in the fall calling attention to them, as well as the other awards the PSA provides. We also have announcements of the travel awards in the May, Sept, and January newsletter and also have a prominent link on the Web site. Only students who have paid their registration fees and membership dues and are also listed in the program as a presenter and attend the annual meeting are eligible for the travel award. Thus students don't apply until sometime after the preliminary program is published. We receive more than enough student applicants.

2) The endowment fund is invested in short term (six-months) CDs. So it is a safe investment, but as you know, pays low interest right now. The fund continues to grow because of a) donations, b) transfer of excess income from the general fund to the endowment, c) interest income and d) transfer of Executive Director Dorn's contribution of his yearly honorarium. The fund had assets of \$205,785.35 at the end of 2008.

3) The committee does need to investigate ways to get more items for the raffle. Currently, I make a pitch to all faculty members in the dues renewal mailing and with announcements in the Newsletter. Still only a handful of folks actually step up and donate items., possibly because it is somewhat cumbersome to haul items to the annual meeting or because folks find it easier to donate with a cash gift. In San Diego the raffles and silent auction raised \$669.00. Not certain how to increase donations, unless the committee sent personal pleas to some folks, such as members of Council?

4) Deidre Tyler agreed to process student e-mail applications for the travel awards for 2010.

Report from the GLBT Committee

Submitted by William Wagner, Chair

Members in attendance: Wagner (Chair), Muraco, Thing, Travers, Barrett (guest), Lee (guest). The Committee reviewed its by-laws and felt there was no need to make any changes. Several sessions were agreed upon that would be sponsored by the Committee at next year's meeting in Oakland (2010). The Committee re-elected Wagner as Chair. The Committee noted that this year's meeting (2009) had numerous successful and well attended sessions, including 3 undergraduate roundtables, a transgender-themed paper session with attendance upwards of 40 people, an MSM-themed paper session with attendance of about 30, along with several other highly successful sessions.

Report from the Social Conscience Committee

Submitted by Dean Dorn

Michelle Jacob and Robert Buck served as co-chairs in 2008-2009. After deliberation, they selected two worthy organizations in San Diego to receive the Social Conscience Award. Each received a check for \$350.00: Supportive Parents Information Network and American Indiana Recruitment Programs. Each organization sent a representative to receive the awards during the Awards Ceremony at the Westin in San Diego

Report from the Committee on Student Affairs

Submitted by Tina Burdsall, Co-Chair

During the 2008-2009 year, the Student Affairs Committee organized three sessions for the conference in Portland.

The first was titled "Thinking and Planning for your Future: Grad School?" Sally Rascoff (LAVC) and Tina Burdsall (PSU) organized this session. Kerry Greer (Indiana University) presented her research on how race and gender impact grad school experiences. Sharon Yee (ASU) gave an informative talk about tips and techniques to getting into grad school. The session was very well attended and well received.

The second session was titled "Where Do I Go from Here? Using Your MA or PhD in Sociology Secure Academic and Non-Academic Jobs." Sharon Oselin (CSLA) organized this.

Presenters included Chloe Bird (RAND), Dennis Downey (CSUCI), Matthew Mahutga (UCR), Christine Jin Oh (UCLA), and Sharon Oselin (CSLA). This session was also well attended and well received.

The third session was a round table titled "Getting a Job with a B.A. in Sociology." Cherylynn Bassani (UFV) and Liahna Gordon (CSU Chico) organized it. Presenters included Lisa Gojsic (UFV), Roberta Spalter-Roth (ASA), and Liahna Gordon (CSU Chico). Unfortunately, this table had a very low turnout, so the presentation became an informal discussion.

The Student Reception and Raffle was extremely successful again this year. Tina Burdsall and Sharon Oselin worked hard on organizing and carrying out a fun reception with additional help from Jocelyn Thomas, Heidi Strasser, Phi Su, Anna Sorensen, Joy Smith, Katie Tracey (student from all different universities). The approximate 130 students in attendance were thrilled with the free books and raffled checks. A special 'thank you' to Richard Serpe and Peter Burke for donating a signed copy of "Advances in Identity Theory and Research" which was 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 Friday April 10th. Tina Burdsall and Cherylynn Bassani were selected as co-chairs for the 2009- 2010 year. Joanna Gregson and Tina Burdsall were selected to organize next year's Student Reception.

The Frequently Asked Questions sheet seemed to be appreciated by the students. The Student Affairs Committee discussed with Dean Dorn the option of putting this online for next year.

Three sessions were submitted for next year: "Thinking and Planning for your Future: Grad School?"; "Where Do I Go from Here? Using Your MA or PhD in Sociology Secure Academic and Non-Academic Jobs"; and "Making the Most of Your Undergraduate Sociology Major." We discussed a fourth session titled "Voices of Students." This session was left as a tentative option, with a decision to be forthcoming on whether there is enough interest in the topic to go forward with it. The session on getting a job with a BA will not be offered next year because of the low interest in it this year.

Report from the Committee on Nominations

Submitted by Virginia Mulle

The 2009 PSA Committee on Nominations met on Friday, April 10 at the annual meeting in San Diego. Members present were Chair and Past-President Jodi O'Brien, incoming Chair and Past-President Judy Treas, Dwaine Plaza, and Ginny Mulle, Secretary. The committee worksheet, with vacancies to be filled for the 2010 ballot was distributed, as well as instructions for committee members, and a list of suggested names for nominations for the various positions to be filled by the Committee on Nominations. The ballot for 2009 was then reviewed, with vacancies noted. Committee members present were assigned the remaining vacancies to be filled by May 1, 2009, which will appear on the ballot distributed to PSA

members in fall 2009.