2009-10 ASA Council Second Meeting
Final Minutes

Friday-Saturday, February 12-13, 2010
Via conference call

Officers Present: Margaret Andersen (Past Vice President), Catherine White Berheide (Secretary-Elect), Patricia Hill Collins (Past President), Randall Collins (President-Elect), Evelyn Nakano Glenn (President), John Logan (Vice President), Donald Tomaskovic-Devey (Secretary).

Officers Absent: David Snow (Vice President-Elect)

Members-at-Large Present: Marjorie DeVault, Sarah Fenstermaker, Rosanna Hertz, Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, Jennifer Lee, Omar McRoberts, Debra Minkoff, Clara Rodriguez, Marc Schneiberg, Sandra Smith, Sarah Soule

Members-at-Large Absent: Robin Stryker

Staff Present: Janet Astner, Les Briggs, Karen Edwards, Lee Herring, Sally T. Hillsman, Michael Murphy, Jean Shin, Roberta Spalter-Roth, Margaret Weigers Vitullo.

1. Call to Order

Inclement weather in Washington, DC, as well as along the Mid-Atlantic coast, caused severe travel disruptions that necessitated restructuring the two-day Council meeting into three sessions of conference calls. The conference calls were scheduled on Friday, February 12, at 11:00am – 2:00pm and 3:00 – 5:00pm, and on Saturday, February 13, at 11:00am – 2:00pm. President Glenn called the meeting to order at 11:09am EST on Friday, February 12, 2010.

A. Approval of the Agenda

The original agenda was revised to adapt for holding the meeting via conference calls.

MOTION: Accept the agenda as revised for the three conference call sessions. Carried.

B. Approval of Minutes

No revisions were requested in the minutes for the final meeting of the 2008-2009 Council.

MOTION: Approve the minutes for the Council meeting on August 11, 2009. Carried.
2. Financial Reports and Budget Analysis


The Secretary provided a brief recap of two major factors affecting the ASA budget, namely, the purchase of office space in 2007-08 and the accompanying three to five years of expected deficit budgets, followed by the economic crisis in the US and elsewhere. The 2009 budget originally proposed to Council projected a $250,000 deficit. Council had requested that EOB and the Executive Office revisit the budget proposal and prepare a revised contingency budget with an eye toward reducing expenses by 5-10%. The Executive Office was able to implement nearly $250,000 in expense reductions during 2009, but revenues fell much more than anticipated. For example, income from the Job Bank was down by $100,000 due to hiring freezes in colleges and universities. This was accompanied by drops in journal revenues and meeting registration. From the Secretary’s viewpoint, ending the year with a deficit of under $100,000 was good, and kudos were offered to Executive Office staff for their hard work in cutting costs and retaining members.

EOB recommended a balanced budget proposal to Council for 2010. In general, expenses are expected to be lower primarily due to changes in the publications arena (e.g. outsourcing journal publication and eliminating printing/mailing Footnotes to all members). Some governance expenses are higher, partly due to support for ASA representatives and officers to attend the ISA World Congress in Sweden in July.

Discussion by Council members affirmed the need for caution on expenditures, and a question was raised about whether income projections were overly optimistic. Most universities are cutting back in particularly difficult ways this year, and there is expectation that the next 2-3 years will continue to be bad for institutions of higher learning especially in the public sector. It was noted that further budget cuts would require the Executive Office to carve into existing programs, so guidance from EOB and Council would be necessary to identify which programmatic elements should be eliminated. Current programs are all initiatives and services that Council has thought ASA should invest in over time.

There was some discussion about the relationship between budget and the on-going EOB and Council discussion about restructuring dues. The latter is a longer-range issue intended to address the decrease in the progressivity of dues during the last decade. It is necessary to start that process now in order to give due consideration to all the elements involved and allow for time for member feedback. The proposed 2010 budget represents the short term, and the President affirmed that EOB went through the expense side of the proposal carefully in order to present a very lean budget to Council.

The Executive Officer noted that Council and EOB have been pushing the Executive Office since 2003 to develop models for making dues more progressive. It had become clear that making the dues structure more progressive would result in some increased revenue. As a result, EOB and Council agreed not to look at changing the dues structure until ASA reached a time when more revenue was needed.

A suggestion was made to ask EOB to do an analysis of what cuts would be recommended if it became necessary to reduce the budget by 5%. Differing opinions were voiced, including the fact that Council has responsibility for making decisions that will cut programs.
MOTION: To ask EOB to prepare a contingency budget for Council review in March-April that would provide a projected 5% reduction in expenditures. Defeated (1 yes, 15 no).

The Secretary assured Council that both the EOB and the Executive Office will be paying close attention to the state of this year’s budget, and EOB will be taking a careful look at the mid-year projections when it meets in June.

Before voting on the 2010 budget, Council discussed the request from a journal for additional pages.

B. Extra Pages for Sociological Theory (ST)

A 50-page increase for Sociological Theory (ST) was recommended by the Committee on Publications and the Committee on the Executive Office and Budget. In response to questions about submission and acceptance rates, the Publications Director indicated that submissions to ST had not increased over the past few years, but the acceptance rate went up under the current editorial collective because each of the four editors had acceptance powers.

Council members sought assurance that this action was a one-time-only allocation and that editorial backlogs would be monitored more carefully in the future. It was noted that the motion of approval from EOB recommended that the Committee on Publications add some language about transition backlogs to its template for ASA contracts with editors. Council endorsed the EOB recommendation.

MOTION: Council approves a one-time 50-page increase for Sociological Theory. Carried.

The Secretary noted that the expense of allocating extra pages for ST was included in the proposed 2010 budget and asked whether there was further discussion of the 2010 budget. In response to a follow-up inquiry about how many members opted in for the print version of Footnotes, the Executive Office was requested to provide that information to Council.

MOTION: To approve the 2010 operating budget. Carried.

C. Proposed 2010 Spivack Budget

The Spivack Fund is a separate restricted account that is not part of operating budget. EOB and Council monitor the use of the funds with the advice of the Spivack Advisory Committee, and Spivack programmatic activity is approved by Council. Last summer, Council added $35,000 to the Spivack budget to support Contexts.

Discussion turned to the status of publishing Contexts. Council’s decision in August approved the continuation of Contexts for an additional three years, through 2013; and directed that the Executive Office immediately begin a competitive search for a publishing partner, with the goal of eliminating Contexts’ financial deficit as soon as possible. Council also determined that current and future Contexts-generated deficits would be covered from the Spivack Fund.
The Executive Office proceeded with an RFP for a *Contexts* publishing partner, which many publishers asked to see. Most of the RFP recipients were unable to fit the concept of the magazine into their marketing capacity, however; there is currently on major contender for the contract. A major stipulation of the RFP is cost-neutrality to the Association, which shifts the burden of any future losses to the publisher. Private publishers are more willing to shoulder that burden, whereas university presses are not. The final 2009 year-end statement from the University of California Press (*Contexts*’ current publisher) shows last year’s loss to be $22,500.

The focus then turned toward ensuring that other Spivack-supported activities are not penalized or restricted due to this budget change. Assurances in that regard were supplied by Council members and staff liaisons serving on the Spivack Advisory Panel. Since the prior Council had directed that support for *Contexts* be provided by the Spivack Fund, action was taken on the proposed Spivack budget for 2010.

**MOTION:** To revise the 2009 Spivack budget to provide $23,000 for support of *Contexts*, and approve the 2010 Spivack budget as proposed (including $35,000 for *Contexts*). Carried.

**E. Member Contributions and Donations**

1. *Minority Fellowship Program (MFP) Fundraising*

Past Vice President Margaret Andersen reported that SWS voted at its winter business meeting to contribute $100,000 to the MFP. This brings total leadership campaign contributions to $425,000, which is very close to goal of $500,000. Council members were invited to provide help in identifying potential leadership donors. When the goal is reached, there is hope of convincing a foundation to match member contributions.

In responses to questions about terms connected with the SWS contribution, it was reported that the SWS’s understanding is that the contribution will support student stipends for the MFP “SWS Minority Scholars.” Both ad hoc MFP committees Council created to provide guidance in fundraising and the transition from federal funding in 2010 had decided earlier that all funds raised by member contributions would be used for student stipends. If the MFP is transformed in any major way, such as there are no stipends or money is being used for things other than the support of individual scholars, then Council would need to discuss what the new program structure would look like and go back to contributors to obtain their agreement and support of the repurposing.

The MFP Director reported that other sociological associations have long contributed annually to the support of MFP fellows, included Alpha Kappa Delta ($15,000), Midwest Sociological Society ($10,000), the Association of Black Sociologists and the Southwest Sociological Association (both at varying amounts). Also, the Miller-McCune Foundation made a one-time $2,000 donation at the request of a board member who is a long-time supporter of the MFP.

Discussion then focused on the work of the Committee on the MFP Transition. The transition committee, chaired by Deborah King, has been considering options for restructuring some aspects of the MFP. Early ideas included possibilities that the program might move away from individual fellowships, but as the NIMH withdrawal loomed, opinions
went in the direction of continuing individual stipend support, potentially emphasizing students at the doctoral dissertation stage.

Any final decision about major changes in the direction of the MFP would be a Council decision, informed by recommendations from the MFP transition committee. There is considerable on-going fund-raising activity. The MFP Director has submitted two proposals in the past few months to NIDA and NSF, along with reapplying to NIMH/NIH for funding support. The study of MFP Fellows being done by Denise Segura on behalf of the ASA Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Sociology (CSREMS) will soon have its report ready. Four committees—CSREMS, MFP Transition, MFP Advisory Panel, and Member Giving—are all in motion. Attention should be paid to finding a way to move forward while keeping all parties informed.

There was some interest in a new direction on best practices, which might prove to be of interest to foundations. This could create the conundrum of having future funders who are uninterested in providing money for stipends while having a program built on providing stipend support. This gap between the current program and a potential future direction is one example of the challenges under consideration by the transition committee.

The President confirmed that overview by Council is important and a summary is needed of all the different pieces that are going on. The Executive Office staff will work with the transition committee to prepare a final report and future operating plan for Council in August.

**MOTION:** By acclamation, Council votes to send a letter of thanks to SWS for its $100,000 contribution to the ASA Minority Fellowship Program.

2. **Status of Council Subcommittee on Member Giving**

The current subcommittee was appointed to look at the low number of members making contributions to ASA programs and to consider ways to increase member charitable giving, such as having a planned annual contribution drive rather than relying on members noticing the opportunity to do so on the renewal form. With the looming challenges to MFP funding, the subcommittee took as its first priority to support an MFP leadership campaign. Now that the MFP pledge campaign is about to meet its objective, the subcommittee can revisit its broader charge.

It was suggested that consideration of the status of this committee be deferred to the August meeting. The subcommittee chair indicated a report would be prepared that would reflect on the charge to the committee and the type of committee needed to accomplish that work.

With a cheer for success of the funding subcommittee, Council accepted the suggestion to defer action on the committee’s composition to the August meeting.

4. **Audit Committee Report**

EOB convenes during its winter meeting as the ASA Audit Committee that makes recommendations to Council. The Secretary reported that, at its meeting in January, EOB considered the audit schedule and addressed the fact that hiring the audit firm should be
done at its summer meeting. Preparatory auditing work typically begins before EOB meets in January, though the week-long, in-depth visit by the auditors occurs in the spring. In addition to combing through the financial books, auditors look at basic control procedures in the Executive Office for financial and office processes (e.g., computer system backup, server room security, signing for payroll documents, etc.).

The final audit report goes to Council for approval at its August meeting. It was pointed out that Council members should expect to see two audit reports, one for general/operating funds and the other for federal grants.

The first conference call session ended at 1:55pm EST to provide a lunch/meal break for Council members. The second conference call session convened at 3:05pm EST.

5. Publications

A. Selection of Editors for SPQ and JHSB

As liaison for the Committee on Publications, the Secretary presented the recommendations for appointing editors for *Social Psychology Quarterly* (SPQ) and the *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* (JHSB).

MOTION: To accept the recommendations from the Committee on Publications for the editorships of *Social Psychology Quarterly* and the *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. Carried.

MOTION: To authorize the Secretary to go to the second-ranked editorial nominee if the first declines. Carried.

B. Sage Partnership Update

Publications Director Karen Edwards reported the ASA had just received the 30-page proposal from Sage Publications to publish *Contexts*. Full review of the proposal will occur as soon as possible, but first impressions are positive. If the proposal is deemed satisfactory, the new publishing arrangement would start in January 2011.

The contract with Sage for the new Mental Health Section journal, approved by ASA last year, is now complete. The Secretary commented that the Executive Office has gotten quite good at working out these contracts to protect Association's intellectual content and financial basis. The contract for this new journal is greatly improved over the arrangements a few years ago with Wiley-Blackwell for *City & Community*.

The final item from the Publications Committee was the editors' discussion of the transition to working with Sage. One issue about copy editing was dealt with promptly, so overall the experience has been positive and professional. Discussion closed with a commendation of Karen Edwards for her excellent contracting work.
5. Task Force Reports

A. Final Report of the Task Force on Sociology and Criminology Programs

The work of this task force started nearly three years ago while Carla Howery was still at ASA. The new Director of ASA’s Academic and Professional Affairs Program, Margaret Weigers Vitullo, reported that the sometimes contested relationship between sociology and criminology/criminal justice in departments made the task force’s work rather complex. Some task force members also belonged to other organizations, such as the American Society of Criminology (ASC), so allegiances played out within the task force were similar to what often occurs in departments.

The final report outlines historical contexts of departmental arrangements. Departments where sociology remained a core part of the curriculum had fewer difficulties. As some departments grew lopsided (e.g., more students in criminology/criminal justice than sociology), misunderstandings and conflicts increased. The task force’s report provides data on the number and type of departments, identifies issues and problems they have identified and presents specific questions that departments should consider in light of the data as they seek to develop strategies that will work for their own situation. The submitted report does not ask Association to do anything or propose steps to be taken by Council or the Executive Office.

It was suggested that if Council found the task force’s work acceptable, it could disseminate the report by posting it on the ASA website, etc., for reference by anyone who is interested. One Council member noted that her department has already been in discussion with administrators about consolidation, so having the task force report available will be crucially important for department leaders and faculty members who have not yet thought much about these issues.

MOTION: Council accepts the final report, thanks the task force for its stellar work, and directs that the report be made available to ASA members, the American Society of Criminology, and the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. Carried.

6. Status Committee Updates

A. Committee on the Status of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered Persons in Sociology

The GLBT committee’s report was approved in August but discussion of the recommendations and their possible implementation was deferred to this meeting. The Executive Office staff liaison for this committee, Roberta Spalter-Roth, provided a brief recap of the findings, and Council directed that the recommendations in the report appear in the minutes of meeting (see below). For the complete report, see the status committee webpage (http://asanet.org/about/statuscommittees/GLBT.cfm).

CSGLBTPS Recommendations to Council

1. Regarding the GLBT Committee. In light of the forum findings and task force discussions, the committee recommended that:
   A. Council extend its term for another five years;
B. As recommended by the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology, Council appoint members of the committee as a five-year cohort so they can work together to provide implementation strategies for meeting challenges reflected in their current report and develop their next report; and
C. Because GLBT scholars active in this work tend to come from under-resourced schools, provide some travel subsidies for junior members.

2. **Regarding the Annual Meeting Programs.** Council should:
   A. Encourage ASA Presidents-Elect to consider organizing invited sessions focusing on the sociological study of GLBT issues; sessions that include GLBT scholars on whatever topics; and workshops on GLBT issues developed and organized by the APAP Director in collaboration with the committee;
   B. Encourage section sessions to consider sessions on GLBT issues and featuring GLBT scholars both to increase the overall number of GLBT papers and to inspire focused discussions among section members about how they can address GLBT issues in their substantive areas;
   C. Not select future Annual Meeting sites in states that have passed anti-same-sex marriage legislation (aka DOMA legislation). The American Political Science Association has such a policy.

3. **Regarding ASA Journals.** Council should recommend to the ASA Publications Committee that it:
   A. Ask journal editors of ASA and Section journals to be more aware of GLBT-related articles and authors in order to increase their presence in ASA journals; and
   B. Ask the editor of *Contemporary Sociology* to consider a review essay on the state of GLBT scholarship.

4. **Regarding Council Statements.** With the assistance of the committee, Council should consider taking more public stands on GLBT issues.

5. **Regarding the ASA Job Bank.** Council should ask the Executive Office consider requiring job postings to mention whether the academic institution provides domestic partnership benefits to same-sex partners and/or whether the university includes sexual orientation and gender identity/expression in its non-discrimination policy. The American Anthropological Association has adopted this policy.

Council focused first on the committee’s renewal and restructuring. Concern was raised about continuity on the committee if membership terms were changed to a set number of years. While status committees are normally renewed for five years, the members typically have three year, overlapping terms. However, from the committee’s viewpoint, having members rotate in and out during that period is more problematic than productive.

It was pointed out that the primary purpose behind establishing status committees was that certain groups within the association and discipline were receiving insufficient support, and a cookie-cutter approach does not resolve issues nor address what isn’t working for that group in the discipline. Status committees are created by Council, and they are the only standing committees of the Association. (Other committees are constitutional/by-laws or ad hoc.) All status committees have the same generic charge and the same five-year renewal period.

Council members were sympathetic both to the importance of quality and the usefulness of standardization across committees. The projects that the various status committees undertake, however, speaks to their taking different paths. Setting one template for status committees assumes that Council knows what committees need. Listening to feedback from each committee is an important part of respecting the tasks it is trying to accomplish.

Given the difficulties that governance encounters in getting members to accept three-year appointments to committees, there was concern about being able to find members willing to commit to five-year terms. A suggestion was made to set terms of appointment at three years, renewable to two additional years.

MOTION: To appoint a cohort of committee members with three-year terms beginning January 2011, with eligibility to renew for two years. Carried.

Council declined to consider travel subsidies for junior scholars since ASA has a longstanding policy about not providing travel support for committee meetings held during the Annual Meeting.

After determining to discuss the Annual Meeting program recommendations in the context of revising the diversity policy, Council looked at the recommendation to avoid taking the Annual Meeting to states that have passed anti-same-sex marriage legislation. Current site selection criteria affirms looking for sites where members are afforded legal protection from discrimination on the basis of age, gender, marital status, national origin, physical ability, race, religion, or sexual orientation. Not specifically citing “states” or “cities” is intentional in order to create some flexibility for the Association to deal with cities that want to be universally welcoming and have a policy of not actively enforcing discriminatory state laws.

With the current site criteria in mind, Council reviewed the statement by the American Political Science Association and agreed to the following policy that reflects ASA’s current practice.

MOTION: In locating its future meetings, ASA presumes that states or cities with legal restrictions on rights afforded recognized same-sex unions and partnerships create an unwelcoming environment for our members in locations where ASA might meet. ASA would notify authorities at all levels that these conditions make it difficult for ASA to site its meetings in these locations. ASA would closely examine practices on a case-by-case basis in such locations to assess whether demonstrated positive local practices or other Association goals warrant holding ASA conferences there. Carried.

It was suggested that dealing with revisions to the ASA Diversity Statement would address the status committee’s journal-related recommendations along with the Annual Meeting program issues. Before moving ahead to the diversity statement, Council directed the Executive Office to look into ways to implement the committee’s recommendation for the ASA Job Bank and report back to Council.

i. Amending Council Diversity Statement

When the first diversity statement was passed, it was viewed as a policy asking ASA members to be inclusive and proactive. Proactive strategies may be different for GLBT populations than for others mentioned in the statement. There was consensus that it should be the policy of ASA to promote diversity in every possible dimension.
MOTION: To approve the revised diversity policy, as follows:
“Much of the vitality of the ASA flows from its diverse membership. With this in mind, it is the policy of the ASA to include people of color; women; gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered persons; sociologists from smaller institutions or who work in government, business, or other applied settings; and international scholars in all of its programmatic activities and in the business of the Association.” Carried.

Council directed that an article be published in Footnotes to announce the updated diversity policy with narrative text incorporating the committee’s other recommendations along with examples about how members might go about implementing the diversity policy.

B. Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology (CSWS)

The CSWS report was accepted at the August Council meeting, but discussion of the committee’s recommendations (shown below) was deferred to February. For the committee’s complete report, see the status committee webpage (http://asanet.org/about/statuscommittees/women.cfm).

CSWS Recommendations to Council
1. That the CSWS be continued for another five years, providing a full final report at the end of that period including updates in the indictors used in the 2009 report, and providing interim reports as appropriate.
2. That CSWS members be appointed as a cohort for the full five years because the current arrangement of rotating membership every year does not work well; the Committee on Committees (COC) should be encouraged to use self-nominations in making its recommendations to Council because the cohort should be interested in working on this committee and its report, perhaps because this is one of their research areas.
3. That Council support in principle the Executive Office assisting the CSWS to collect more data on women’s career trajectories over time by
   A. launching a second longitudinal study of the career trajectories of PhDs modeled on the 10 year panel survey of the 2996-2997 PhD cohort conducted by ASA which emphasized work and family issues and policies as well as career information. A new study might be started while the respondents were still in graduate school to focus more on the transition from graduate school to careers; and
   B. conducting a survey of the number of years of professors in rank such as the one done by the Modern Languages Association’s Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology (see http://www.mla.org/assocprof_survey), over sampling for underrepresented race and ethnic groups.
4. That the CSWS consider ways to obtain more information on the processes which produce gender parity in appointments, hiring, or “supply side” factors that impact achieving parity. (This was a major recommendation in the previous CSWS report as well.) Including a scholar in this area on the committee would be useful.
5. That the CSWS assist the Executive Office formulate strategies that would produce a higher response rate to the ASA Department Survey and identify specific survey items would improve the survey. The department survey data are important to all four ASA Status Committees, and there should also be input from the members of these other committees.
6. That the Chair of the CSWS maintain a page on the ASA Website with the support of the Executive Office staff liaison that provides copies of surveys and reports on the status of women obtained from regional sociological societies and individual institutions in order to provide models for other groups embarking on such efforts.

Having already discussed the pros and cons of five-year committee terms while considering the GLBT committee’s recommendations, Council moved quickly to approve a similar structure for CSWS.

MOTION: To appoint a cohort of committee members with three-year terms beginning January 2011, with eligibility to renew for two years. Carried.

The continued collection of data on women's career trajectories in sociology elicited concerns about budgetary implications and ensuring that efforts do not duplicate research already in progress (e.g., study by Dana Britton on women in STEM fields in multiple schools). Council support in principle will permit the Executive Office to look at costs, demands on staff time, funding possibilities, etc., and set parameters for the data collection projects.

MOTION: Council supports in principle the Executive Office assisting the CSWS to collect data on women's career trajectories over time. Carried.

Having completed the afternoon's agenda items, the President recessed the Council meeting. The second conference call session ended at 5:35pm on Friday, February 12, 2010.

Council reconvened via conference call at 11:07am on Saturday, February 13, 2010.

7. New Business

A. Task Force on Sociology and Global Climate Change

The ASA Section on Environment and Technology submitted a proposal requesting that Council approve the development of a task force to produce a report applying sociological analysis to the issue of climate change, and to make a series of public policy recommendations based on that analysis.

It was noted that the American Psychological Association had already produced a lengthy report on psychology and global climate change, and the International Human Dimensions Program and the Environmental Communications Association are in the preliminary stages of organizing task forces to write reports on their disciplines’ perspective on climate change. The Section asserted that it is imperative that ASA develop a comprehensive and accessible report addressing climate change in order to ensure that the perspectives of Sociology are included in this dialogue.

Council members expressed strong interest in the proposal and support for formation of a task force to identify what is specifically sociological about this issue. There was enthusiasm for the report as a scholarly product with a public policy edge. Public policy is regularly influenced by economic advisors, and this will provide an opportunity to make sociology input more available.

MOTION: To establish a Task Force on Sociology and Global Climate Change. Carried.
ASA members will have the opportunity to volunteer to serve on the task force in various capacities, based on their areas of expertise and interest. The proposal offered Riley Dunlap (Oklahoma State University) as a possible task force chair and suggested John Logan (Brown University, ASA Vice-President) to serve as ASA Council liaison.

**MOTION:** To accept the suggestions for the task force chair and Council Liaison, and use normal governance procedures to constitute the task force. Carried.

The outline of topics that might be covered by the report included social and cultural driving forces of climate change, mitigation of climate change, adaptation to climate change, climate justice, civil society and climate change, environmental communication and individual beliefs, and governance. Council requested that the task force make sure to cover environmental racism in the climate justice section of the report.

### B. Statement on Native American Sports Logos (Blackhorse et al. v. Pro Football Inc.)

In March 2007, Council passed a resolution calling for discontinuing the use of Native American nicknames, logos, and mascots in sports. It took this step after receiving a resolution proposed and signed by a number of ASA members. The Council resolution was accompanied by a bibliography of sociological and related social science research on this topic, and both resolution and bibliography are posted on the ASA website (see [http://asanet.org/about/Council_Statements/use_of_native_american_nicknames_logos_and_mascots.cfm](http://asanet.org/about/Council_Statements/use_of_native_american_nicknames_logos_and_mascots.cfm)).

Several member sponsors recently contacted ASA officers requesting that Council sign another statement to be submitted in the case of *Blackhorse et al. v. Pro Football, Inc.* regarding the sociological literature to date on the use of Native American nicknames, logos, and mascots in sport.

After discussing the variances between the 2007 resolution and the recently submitted statement, Council reiterated its 2007 resolution.

**MOTION:** To send Council’s previous statement calling for discontinuing the use of Native American nicknames, logos, and mascots in sports to the parties involved in the case *Blackhorse et al. v. Pro Football, Inc.* Carried.

### C. ASA Dues Restructuring

The Secretary indicated that EOB has been planning to propose a revised member dues structure for some time. There are two related problems with the current income-based dues structure for Regular members. The first is that it has become significantly less progressive over time. The second is that the dues categories no longer reflect the actual income structure of the profession.

Several models were available for Council to consider and provide feedback for EOB as it continues to wrestle with restructuring dues. It was noted that three categories of members were not yet included in the current models—students, associates, and emeriti—but would be when a final regular member model was selected.
Discussion circled around how “income” is defined. The dues form says “gross annual income” but provides no definition of that label. The Association has historically left this unarticulated; the system is entirely self-reporting and self-monitored. The Executive Office has no ability, and no wish, to verify income, so it seems best to leave it up to people to find their place in the income ranges and live with their consciences.

One suggestion for EOB was to take into account the possibility that when higher income categories are added, the result might be that more members will make choices about how to categorize themselves that will move them down on the rates. People might not behave the same in the future as they have in the past.

The ASA bylaws permit annual COLA increases to dues as determined by Council without a membership referendum. Preventing loss of progressivity in the future might be done by indexing the income brackets. There was discussion of how far higher income category members should subsidize the lower income groups, students and emeriti. There was consensus that it was important to have a separate Student category, even if the dues were the same as the low income category of Regular membership. There was less clarity about how to structure an Emeritus category or whether there should be one.

One premise of a new dues structure should be to fold the cost of the now mandatory journal subscription back into the annual dues as it was before 2002. The publishing partnership with Sage Publications makes this much more feasible now than when dues and subscriptions were decoupled in 2001. When the dues structure is changed to be more progressive, it is important to ensure that increases are as small as possible and that members continue to receive meaningful benefits. The journals are very important, especially for members who are not at research-one universities.

An observation was made about likely human behavior when it comes time for the membership referendum. Sociologists celebrate the concept of progressivity in the abstract, but when it comes down to sending in their membership dues (and voting for a dues structure), everyone will be looking at the amount of increase in their own category.

The President indicated that the sense of the discussion was that Council would like this exercise in planning to go forward. The Secretary promised that EOB would be concerned and vigilant about the details.

MOTION: To ask EOB to take into account today’s discussion and come back in the summer with the next iteration of scenarios for changing the dues structure. Carried.

With thanks to Council members for their participation, input, and suggestions, President Glen adjourned the meeting at 1:47pm on Saturday, February 13, 2010.