

Minutes
WPSA Executive Council
Thursday March 28, 2013
Lowes Hollywood Hotel
Room: Preston's Private Dining Room
8:00am – 11:45am

Present: Peri Schwartz-Shea, Gary Segura, Victoria Farrar-Myers, Carrie Currier, Michael Bowers, Richard Clucas, Elsa Favila, Karthick Ramakrishnan, Louis DeSipio, Rudy Espino, Mark Bevir, Mary Caputi, Jeanne Morefield, Gabriel Sanchez, Jessica Lavariega-Monforti, Tony Affigne, Chris Shortell

Ex-Officio Members Present: Cornell Clayton, Jay McCann

Members Absent: Chris Parker, Martin Johnson

Guests Present: Lisa Garcia Bedolla, Mark Button, Leah Fargotstein, Ange-Marie Hancock, Julie Novkov, Michelle Phillips, Katie Cahill, Jose Marichal

Call to Order: President Peregrine Schwartz-Shea calls the meeting to order at 8:33am

I. Approval of Minutes

- A. March 2012 WPSA Executive Council Meeting
Motion to approve by Michael Bowers (he also noted that his name was misspelled in the last minutes). Second from Mary Caputi.
- B. June 2012 Action without a Meeting
Motion to approve by Cornell Clayton. Second from Victoria Farrar-Myers.
- B. September 2012 Action without a Meeting
Motion to approve – Mary Caputi. Second from Mark Bevir.

Question about the 2012 business meeting missing from the agenda – but no concerns noted.

II. Reports

- A. Executive Director's Report: Richard Clucas
 - Richard thanked Peregrine for her service and welcomes new members serving on the committee. Outlined six areas of work he is doing:
 - 1) Preparation for the Hollywood convention was a main activity. Items mentioned include: the short course – where we have a good format for these and don't charge like the APSA. Also he approached exhibitors differently and asked them to run ads. This time he asked members of the association where they were publishing and he asked

their editors. This year there are a few more panels on authors and authors meet critics. The deal with Alaska Airlines helped get a few free flights for the association and saved a few dollars. We are working to publicize special events more – we do many interesting things and need to get the word out more. Overall a very successful conference – we broke the record for preregistration by three people (which was previously set in San Francisco). The total number is 1063.

- 2) Second thing is focusing on convention planning for 2018. Tried to find something in Hawaii but it didn't work out. Discussion later on San Antonio and Austin.
- 3) Conference work for Seattle next year. Victoria has already gotten the call for papers ready. Local arrangements chair is Christine DeStefano – and UW will kick in 5k for next year. Dates for Seattle are April 17-19, 2014 at the Sheraton Seattle Hotel.
- 4) Publications. Working with the people involved in the publications and working to publicize the new journals. Will discuss the search for PRQ new editor later (4 applications are already in). Worked on the newsletter and reached out to members with regard to who they have published with lately and tried to find out if we can get more support from them. Members are also happy that we care to ask about their publishing.
- 5) Money/Finances. Trying to increase the number of exhibitors and attendees. Also put together a financial planning committee that hasn't done as much as hoped yet, but working on it. We do take donations – we get them from the Wall Street Journal but we haven't been as good about getting out there to ask and need to think about endowments in the future. Also working on restructuring our fees. Finally, talked to Oxford University Press to give us a 20% discount on books and asked them to run advertisements for us
- 6) Administrative work. This includes: votes by email, work with committees, get agendas out, keep website up, the new committee on information technology, and other issues as they arise. For instance, there are many people who want an award for Joel Olsen and they want to see if we could create an award for this. Richard sent it to the financial investment committee to see if we should do it, and perhaps create an endowment for this. We should try to figure out how to put together endowments.
 - Questions/Comments raised: Jeanne Morefield – said Joel was a theorist at NAU and died at the age of 45 and WPSA was his home organization. People love his work and want to remember him – so they want it here.
 - Next tasks: Begin APSA planning for Chicago, update the online registration, work on a car rental deal for future conferences and continue to think about finances.

B. Program Chair's Report: Gary Segura

- Thanked program committee, usually some defaults of those on committee but this year only had one person who couldn't fulfill duties. Had 1300 paper proposals and ended up with 1200+ individual presentations/papers. This year we benefitted from the APSA being cancelled by bringing in new members and picking up panels, giving us a chance to grow. The structure has now been regularized by Peri Schwartz-Shea and those structures were replicated with one addition – LA politics. Program consistency for future years was encouraged. A reminder that two Pi Sigma Alpha lectures are being given tomorrow (on the future of Latino Politics), rather than the usual one.
- Peri Schwartz-Shea added – a graduate student reception was added by Gary (this year) and it is in her suite.
- Richard Clucas encouraged more faculty/board members to attend the events because people have commented on how they had few faculty around before.

C. Local Arrangements: Ange-Marie Hancock

- The goal was to make us not hate LA. Christian Gross (USC) and Dianna Obrien (USC) were also part of the committee. The organizing committee members were all relatively new to LA so they had fun and also had Eric Coola (grad student) who helped them. They made a conscious choice to make all recommendations based on the public metro system – to reduce the carbon footprint. Also made sure to include things that are ONLY available in LA.
- Projectors/screens have all been purchased and it is available in every room. All 25 rooms have LCD projectors/screens. They did need to have technological help to get it all set up.

D. Nominating Committee Report: Julie Novkov

- Committee recommends: Louis DeSipio (VP), Michael Genovese & Kim Nalder (Region A), Regina Branton (Region B), Celeste Montoya (Region C).
- Regional system (memo sent by Julie Novkov to the executive committee) – wants to have a committee to revisit the regional system issues. What was the original intent of the regional system? Perhaps to avoid California from overtaking. But the Western should embrace its identity as an idea rather than a regional association and draw from that. Looking at the data from the last meeting – NY had a lot of representation in the conference attendees. So we need to have a committee work on this because it will also impact the by-laws. She urged that it is time to reconsider the rule that was implemented in the 1950s. No motion was needed to recommend the slate.

E. Financial Report: Michael Bowers

- WPSA financial fact sheet showing income and expenditures. Portland was very successful for us and made almost \$59k, whereas San Antonio was \$35k and San Francisco was \$50k. Fiscal year runs from March 1, 2012 to February 28, 2013. Started with balance of \$315k, earned interest of almost \$3k, \$81k in membership, total assets of almost \$457,000. The net assets were \$369,000 so we increased net assets by \$55k, last year was only \$20k but we still felt good about that given the state of the economy.

F. PRQ Report: Amy Mazur and Cornell Clayton

- Cornell gave the report, Amy was unable to attend. PRQ continues to do well with an impact factor of .921, making it the 45th of 148 journals in the world. It has nearly doubled since 2007, when it was 56th of 93 journals. It is 18th in top publications in political science. Review time is currently 65 days and the turnaround time is down from 127 days in 2007. They continue to reach out to areas traditionally underrepresented by trying to approach scholars in those areas and with mini symposiums– like the one on gender and media and politics. Last year they had 375 submissions and gave out 50 R&Rs, and the R&R rate is down from 160 in 2007 to 50 in 2012. Submission by field is standard and steady and American continues to be the most popular field, Political theory only had about 5% submitted. The acceptance rate is almost cut in half since 2006, last year it was only 10%, which is down from 18% in 2006. The reviewer pool is currently 3000 people; they are trying to increase it and would like more individuals in theory. There is a close connection between submissions and the reviewer pool so need to build up both. He noted that there is a best article review and best reviewer awards that Sage gives out. It's a gift certificate to Sage. The best reviewers have done a lot to do a good job or do a lot of reviews for the journal.
- Questions: Karthick asked what is the future of PRQ on race, ethnicity and gender with the new journal coming? Cornell responded that it should be fine because they get good manuscripts and they can recommend it to PGI if it doesn't fit PRQ as a good general approach.
- Page the Sage Representative spent time talking about open access issues, open access journals and what this means for the future. It started in the science/medical fields (open journal issues) – she discusses the background for moving to the online area and how open access is more accepted in sciences so they are talking more about if it's a good model in academia so everyone can get better access to research. As background: she discussed the Harvard mandate from a few years ago asking all faculty to publish in open access journals – but this was hard to get people to submit due to tenure issues and needing to publish in key journals. In the US anything from the NIH has to be made open access. In addition the Obama administration says any federal agency that issues more than \$1bil in public grants now has to request it be published in open access. They publish journals and sell the subscriptions to the libraries. Right now the issue is the charge of \$3k is a lot to ask from people to pay to get into open

access. One issue that has not been discussed is the impact on universities, etc. For instance social science researchers cannot afford to pay these charges. The change happened very quickly in the sciences, and we are seeing third tier journals in the sciences lose revenue quickly because of open access – so this is something to fear in the future. They have to figure out how to make up revenue. The subscription model works well.

- Questions – why are publishers even needed today... publishers do offer a good service like tagging and search optimization that helps people find their articles – so publisher argues that they do help. They help with archiving and have the articles backed up in several different places so that makes them valuable. They also distribute quite a bit, market, and give journals to some countries that would not otherwise be able to get them. We will circle back to this issue as we move through the agenda.

G. PGI Report: James McCann

- Reported on a few things about the architecture of the journal, logistics and then outreach. The biggest news is that the journal is now in print and the inaugural issue is out. In terms of architecture there is a certain amount of education that was needed because it is an initial product. They are getting a lot of submissions in stand alone articles but that is just one piece. They have a dialogues section that they plan to build into each issue as an engagement across authors of big concepts and big issues. Finally review essays – the goal is not to do short 500 words “with the standard 2 holes in the argument and yes you need to adopt it” overview. They want more engagement, and a different approach not just the standard cookie-cutter format. They are currently working on building a reviewer pool and inviting volunteers. They are also trying to feature more comparative and international work as well. In terms of logistics they are asking for reviews to come back in about a month so time to decision is about 2 months for the first round. They have a healthy number of papers at the R&R stage but reject 48%. They are doing a lot of outreach – with a presence at the major conferences and a reception at WPSA, as well as some other items like a consortium workshop at Purdue and a two-day workshop on papers. They are now looking to outreach to junior scholars and graduate students. The upcoming table of contents was also shared with the council.
- Michelle (representative from Routledge) – gave an overview of the subscribers and said at this point in the year if there were 0 it would be okay but 2 is great and that is what they have thus far. 1753 institutions can already access the journal – one thing that they need to do still is to get it included as part of a sales package to help more subscribe.
- Question – are WPSA subscribers automatically getting access to PGI? Yes original contract was for a hard copy but will get an electronic version in the future too but they need to get that info out to the membership more clearly.

- Open access debate – (a return to this argument again). In the UK it is moving faster than in other countries – it works well in the sciences where you need access to research immediately, but not all disciplines are like this. Librarians are concerned about speed of implementation and their roles and controllers of funding, so they are worried about it. Article processing fees differ across journals so there are worries about how that may impact where people will choose to publish or if they will be encouraged to publish in certain outlets. Early career academics are also worried – if departments are given only a small amount of funding who will get the funding for the costs - a new academic or an established/published individual?

H. Western Newsletter Report: Stephen Stambough, Val O'Regan

- none

I. WPSA Committee on Information Technology: Jose Marichal

- This committee was created a year ago to address how we can use social media to do three things: 1) a vehicle for disseminating the work of the association (some academics blog but not all), 2) enhance communication within the association (find a way to support subfield conversations and build community and extend conversations that come out of the conference), 3) how to use social media for new recruitment (making the conference more interactive and an enjoyable experience to get more people involved like grad students). They started meeting in the fall of last year and there are 5 members: Jose Marichal, Caroline Helgman, Jessica Fizel, Mario Guerra and Meredith Conroy – mix of junior, senior, private/public institutions, etc. They met monthly by Google+ and created a Twitter feed @thewpsa, an official hashtag #wpsa2013, a Facebook page (but they haven't done much with the page yet), and a blog thewpsa.wordpress.com called "the new west" – keeping in mind the west is an idea, innovation and openness. They also asked people to submit their blogs if they have personal blogs to help feed into the WPSA blog. They created a virtual brownbag series to do an online brownbag using spreecast and they had 150+ people online for this first one. You can also watch the entire thing with the URL that is listed on the blog. For Seattle next year they thought there were several good opportunities to connect with the Google or other technology folks to try to get a little funding.
- Karthick offered a suggestion for next year on the registration form to ask people if they have twitter accounts, blogs, etc. and for that information - to get them engaged from the beginning.
- Question: Is it possible to do what they have with myapsa for the western so we can download an interested panel calendar and sync it up with Google calendar, etc. Also it might be helpful to let people complete tracks like those found on myapsa –people can complete tracks and get a certificate. So this evidence of participation might add incentive to get people to go to more panels (this might be good for Las Vegas where there

may be problems with people registering but not going to a lot of panels). It could also be good for graduate students who may want this kind of tracking.

- Question: Would it be possible to webcast the more popular panels and have Twitter questions? This may be helpful to get grad students who cannot afford to come to the conference to go. However these issues may increase costs for the association.
- Jessica Lavariega-Monforti commented that Pi Sigma Alpha is also trying this to get people to do similar things and to webcast - so there are opportunities to cosponsor or work together to help publicize and increase traffic in both areas – WPSA and Pi Sigma Alpha to help build the audience.

III. Old Business

A. PRQ Editor Search: Bill Haltom

- Bill was not there so Richard Clucas gave the report. A lot of outreach for recommendations on people to approach for editing the journal and very pleased by the number of people who want to be involved. More outreach as the deadline approaches. Anticipate both single and team editors who are applying, and diversity in scholarly areas is expected.

B. Future Convention Sites: Elsa Favila, Richard Clucas

- They tried to look for something in Hawaii for the 2018 conference, but it did not work. Discussion on Austin and San Antonio for site visits. Austin was JW Marriot (not built yet), Hilton Austin, and the Renaissance (they don't have the rooms to take us – not enough breakout rooms and too far out of Austin). Also went to Hyatt Regency in San Antonio (same place used in 2011). JW has all the facilities but the problem is that they haven't been built yet and they haven't answered all of the questions. Hilton is in a good location, has 27 breakout rooms but we probably need 28. Concerns – it will cost us a lot to go there because they charge us for things that we don't normally get billed for like rooms (an extra \$5k). Bid for rooms is \$169/night but they want a 3% increase per year budgeted in so that could take it up to \$194/night. They want to do reservations with the first night payment up front. They want a guaranteed room block size of 1250, but we usually do 1000. So we might make it, but if we don't we have to pick up the costs. Also a very legalist contract to get the site and a lot of little things they charge for. In contrast San Antonio has had us before – and have a similar contract to what we had before. Free Internet service to all members in their room, rooms at \$175/night. Costs are lower in San Antonio and they clearly want us there, the upside is that it is more of a known entity. Note that when negotiating in the future we need to remember we say up front we have NEVER paid for conference rooms.

- Victoria commented that the UT system recently held a conference at the Austin site and had a lot of problems.
- The discussion on the two sites raised several points. Many want to look at the possibility of Austin at some point. Suggestions that we might get more people to Austin but it was also noted that the San Antonio turnout was very good. Several were concerned about the extra costs for Austin and the bad deal Austin was offering – we don't want to get locked into a precedent where we start to pay for the extra items. A positive about San Antonio is that it was very accessible and a walkable city, it is also better to get there for travel in terms of airport accessibility. Of the room share they want 80% in San Antonio and 85% in Austin. So a lot of issues with the rooms and costs that make it unattractive to go to Austin in 2018. However the point was raised that it is important for the Western to try to go to new locations when it can and not just the same places – something to consider for future conference decisions.
- Motion to approve San Antonio made by Tony Affigne, seconded by Mary Caputi. 16 voted yes, 0 no, 1 abstention.

C. Change in WPSA Policies on Participation: Richard Clucas

- Approved a change in policy at the last meeting but voted to give it formal approval. Motion by Victoria Farrar-Myers, seconded by Mary Caputi.

IV. **New Business**

A. Budget: Michael Bowers

- In almost every instance (except professional fees) we spend less than what we have allocated. Last year we also approved a committee to look at staff compensation - those numbers were increased and we went over budget slightly but are making up for that in the proposed budget. The other item to notice is PGI memberships – for members to get copies of the PGI (they don't know what that number is yet) they are guessing just \$10k. They don't think it will be an issue and should come in under budget next year.
- Peregrine with a brief comment on the budget based on her experience as program chair– at some point we need to think about making a m investment in the software upgrade and may need a committee to think about and plan for it.
- Motion by Karthick Ramakrishnan to approve, seconded by Gary Segura.

B. Graduated Membership Rate (First Reading): Richard Clucas

- Discussion on charging more for different ranks. He looked at other associations to make sure we are in line and not more expensive than those of other regional associations. The graduated rates were full professors at \$90, associates at \$85 and untenured at \$80. The proposal is for rank rather than income levels because people will lie about their income levels as they have found out from the APSA. The income ranks were based on

looking at the lowest average salary of full professors to make sure our full professor fees were lower than the income scale.

- Comments on the scale included discussion by Tony and Jeanne that not as many people lie as APSA may think, and believe we might be able to make more money from the income scale. For instance higher income assistant professors won't be paying as much as they could/should with the new scale so maybe we would actually lose money by doing it according to rank instead of income? Gary raised concerns that state universities and smaller institutions may not reimburse those costs. Victoria asked if we might want to look like the conferences of APSA and MPSA with a standard income scale and questioned why we are trying to be different. If it is about marketing and branding then let's be similar. Karthick raised the suggestion to add an adjunct gradation to help those individuals out. Mark commented that some don't feel comfortable when asked about their income so it is easier to just do rank.
- Straw poll on how things look: income/rank approach is about 50/50. Concluded that we need more investigation and should have two proposals so we can compare income versus rank graduated fees, and all agreed to adding an adjunct category.

Final comments: Peregrine suggested we need a committee on the open source issue to educate ourselves on the issues because it is hard to understand. Tony and Jeanne raised concerns about reminding attendees to get their papers in on time and to crack down on people who do not submit papers or back out of the conference. Do we need a list of bad people and have it impact their future participation?

Meeting adjourned by Peregrine Schwartz-Shea at 11:45am.