A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science

Third Edition, Revised 2022

Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms

apsa
AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science

3rd Edition

Third Edition, Revised 2022. The American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036-1206
www.apsanet.org
Copyright © American Political Science Association 2022 IBSN 1-878147-05-6

Preface

Political scientists share many ethical problems in common with scholars in other disciplines, but we also encounter many that are unique. A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science (or the Ethics Guide) is intended to provide a clear statement of ethical principles that are particularly valuable for political scientists—including faculty, students, administrators and practitioners. The principles are intended to serve as reference points to inform discussion for political scientists within the discipline and within their respective institutions. We are especially interested in offering guidance to newcomers to our profession.

Background and History

The Ethics Guide has its own robust history. In 1967 the American Political Science Association (APSA) created a committee to explore matters "relevant to the problems of maintaining a high sense of professional standards and responsibilities." That committee, chaired by Marver H. Bernstein, published "Ethical Problems of Academic Political Scientists" in the summer 1968 issue of *PS*.[1] Consisting of twenty-one rules of professional conduct, the written code contained in that essay serves as an enduring contribution to ethical issues in political science. The Bernstein Report, as it came to be known, also instituted a Standing Committee on Professional Ethics. The Committee was first envisaged as an educational body to "protect the rights of political scientists". Pursuant to that goal, it guided the professional behavior of political scientists through the issuance of advisory opinions.[2] Its original jurisdiction did not include the consideration of individual cases.

Over the last half century, the role of the Standing Committee has evolved. Not only has its title changed, but its work and authority have also expanded. Through the issuance of advisory opinions, it has sought to guide the professional behavior of political scientists. Since the Committee was established, APSA has adopted numerous advisory opinions.

In 1989, after twenty years, APSA instituted another committee, the Charter Review Committee, to review the charter of what is now known as the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms. Chaired by Lawrence J. R. Herson[3], it incorporated the advisory opinions into the basic code of the Association, revised and reorganized the statement of ethical principles, and updated other materials. This Ethics Guide, which provided a statement of ethical principles for political scientists, remains the primary charter of the Committee on Professional Rights and Freedoms.

More recently, in 2018-2022, the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms reviewed and updated the Ethics Guide. Virginia Sapiro, Alison Dundes Renteln, and Matthew Carnes, respectively, chaired the Committee during the revisions.[4] As in previous

---

[1] Its formal title was the Committee on Professional Standards and Responsibilities. Additional members of the committee were Stephen K. Bailey, Samuel H. Beer, William D. Carey, Manning J. Dauer, David Fellman, Jack W. Peltason, Douglas W. Rae, Randall B. Ripley, Wallace S. Sayre, Vernon Van Dyke, and Aaron B. Wildavsky.

[2] All advisory opinions are available for review in PS: Political Science & Politics.

[3] Additional members of the Committee were Gayle Binion, John C. Wahlke, and Nancy H. Zingale. Michael Brintnall served as Committee coordinator.

[4] Current committee members who contributed to the revision process include Cheryl Boudreau, Omar Encarnacion, John Freeman, Trisha Philips, Michael Rogers, Caroline Tolbert and Karen Zivi. The following committee members, from previous committee rosters also contributed: Catherine Boone, Alison Brysk, Kathleen Hancock, Michael Fortner, Samantha Frost, Alan

editions, the third edition of the Ethics Guide begins with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics to establish a base set of standards. The remainder builds on this foundation and prior iterations of this guide, keeping elements of a number of the foundational advisory opinions intact where possible. Part III, A. (Human Subjects Research Principles and Guidelines) and Section V (APSA Member Revocation Policy) are based on governing decisions of the APSA Council following recommendations from other APSA committees. All other advisory principles have been developed by the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights, and Freedoms and approved by the APSA Council for the discipline.

Those familiar with the previous editions of the Guide will notice substantial changes in both its scope and tone. Most significantly, the third edition of the Guide contains additional content, and updated and new sections on topics not previously addressed. They include:

- research principles for human subjects
- issues arising from conflict of interest
- issues related to teaching and mentoring
- the use of big data and commercial data
- clarification on the handling of individual complaints
- policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment, professional misconduct and discrimination
- conduct when using the internet, virtual and social media platforms
- the purpose and roles of teaching evaluations
- issues arising from intellectual property and open access
- identity protection
- the importance of respect towards others

The updated guide also includes a section detailing the new member revocation policy and the inclusion of gender-neutral terms along with additional reminders that all individuals, regardless of personal demographic characteristics or real and perceived identity should always be treated with respect.

Gibson, Erik S. Herron, Noah Pickus, Justin Wert and Deborah Yashar. Special acknowledgement goes to the APSA staff for their support and guidance, in particular, Steve Smith, executive director, Betsy Super, deputy director, and Kimberly Mealy, senior director of diversity and inclusion and the lead staff support for the Ethics Committee.

Table of Contents

Preface ……..…. i

I. Introduction and Purpose ……..……..... 1

II. AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics 2

III. Principles of Professional Conduct ……..… 3

A. Research Protocols for Political Science ……..3

1) APSA Human Subjects Research Principles & Guidelines …….. .3

2) Maintaining Professional Integrity in Political Science Research …. 10

B. Scholarship Protocols for Political Science …..... 15

1) Academic Integrity 15

2) Manuscript Protocols 15

3) Edited Volume Protocols and Editorial Responsibilities..... 16

4) Dissertation Protocols 17

C. Publication Protocols for Political Science 17

D. Protocols for Teaching and Mentoring Students…….18

1) Responsibilities to Students 18

2) Graduate Students and Programs 20

3) Habit of Professional Development 21

E. Netiquette Protocols for Political Science 22

F. Political Activity by Political Scientists 24

G. Restrictions on the Use of the APSA Name or Office 25

H. Recruitment, Hiring, Promotion and Tenure, and

Other Personnel Protocols..... 26

1) Recruitment and Hiring Guidelines ..... .26

2) Tenure and Promotion Guidelines 31

I. Sexual Misconduct, Harassment, and Discrimination Guidelines …….. 34

J. Principles Governing Graduate Scholars, Fellows, Trainees, and Assistants...37

K. AAUP Joint Statement Rights & Freedoms of Students…….. 38

IV. APSA Grievance Procedures 38

A. Individual Grievances 38

B. Reporting Grievances 41

C. Procedures Involving Human Rights of Scholars in Other Countries …... 43

V. Member Revocation Policy…….44

VI. Notification 44

VII. Appendix

A. Introduction to the Statement on Professional Ethics of the AAUP 46

B. APSA Ombuds 46

C. APSA Intake Adviser 48

D. APSA RESPECT 48

I. INTRODUCTION

What is the purpose of this guide?

The Ethics Guide seeks to provide a series of ethical principles that are particularly valuable for political scientists—including faculty, students, administrators and practitioners. In each section, it first identifies an underlying ethical principle (e.g., integrity, consent, due compensation, transparency, objectivity, human dignity, timely communication, academic freedom, etc.), then discusses the ethical issue(s) underlying it, then indicates how that principle can be applied in specific cases, to guide behavior. Proceeding in this fashion, the Ethics Guide provides practical guidance for consideration when dealing with specific ethical problems in our profession. It also explains the rationale behind that guidance.

What the Guide is:

- First, the Ethics Guide can be viewed as a training manual and reference — both for students in the discipline and for faculty and administrators — about best practices and crucial ethical issues, to help with thinking through hard issues at the local level.
- Second, the Guide offers a template for consideration of ethical issues in departments of political science, and highlights the important roles that individual faculty members and students, as well as departments and institutions, play in pursuing ethical behavior.
- Third, the Ethics Guide provides information about APSA policies and procedures regarding professional misconduct.
- Fourth, the Ethics Guide provides instruction on APSA grievance procedures (see Section IV), the types of cases the association and the Ethics Committee are able to review or investigate, and which cases are outside of the purview of the association and the Committee.

What the Guide is not:

- The Ethics Guide is not a “code” in a legal sense, and it does not seek to govern the adjudication of matters proper to governments and other institutions (such as the home academic institutions or local governments in which individual political scientists operate).
- The Ethics Guide does not establish a system of sanctions or punishments for the discipline. It looks to universities and departments, and local governments as the primary institutions for redress when misconduct occurs, (unless that misconduct occurs in association with an APSA meeting, conference, workshop, or entity)
- The Ethics Guide does not establish the Ethics Committee to adjudicate matters beyond the specific APSA-related matters described herein.
- This Ethics Guide is not the final say on the many complex and important ethical issues addressed here. Instead, it is a foundation offering guidance in the ongoing conversation, debate, and adaptation to twenty-first century ethical issues in the profession. It remains open to revision and expansion in the future.

In general, the Ethics Guide serves as a foundational statement of best ethical practices for addressing the numerous challenges faced by political scientists today. During this period of great division, widespread discontent, rapid change, heightened concern for racial equity

and social justice, this third edition of the Ethics Guide is animated by an effort to bring together concerns for due process and fairness with these reinvigorated efforts for justice.

In addition, it seeks to ensure that forms of misconduct—especially sexual harassment, discrimination, and favoritism—are not ignored or condoned.

In short, the third edition of the Ethics Guide is our best effort to provide guidance and to suggest best practices that can protect the rights of APSA members, while also promoting accountability, inclusiveness, diversity, equity, inclusion, and respect among political scientists.

II. AAUP STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

As a base set of ethical guidelines for political scientists teaching and conducting research at universities and colleges in the US and internationally, the American Political Science Association (APSA) adopts the following "Statement on Professional Ethics" by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The Statement is reprinted here. The AAUP's Introduction to the *Statement* is reprinted in the Appendix.

Statement on Professional Ethics (Excerpt from AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics)

I. *"Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end, professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.*

II. *As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper role as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.*

III. *As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Professors acknowledge academic debts and strive to be objective*

in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. *As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of the work done outside of it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decisions upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.*

V. *As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom."* [5]

This marks the end of the AAUP Statement.

III. PRINCIPLES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

A. Research Protocols for Political Science

Like all scholars, in their research endeavors, political scientists are expected to be intellectually honest and uphold the highest standards of their discipline.

1) APSA Human Subjects Research Principles and Guidelines

As developed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Human Subjects Research and adopted by the APSA Council in 2020, below are the principles concerning human subjects research. The detailed guidance for each principle can be found at the following website: (https://connect.apsanet.org/hsr/principles-and-guidance/)

Preamble

Political science research uses a variety of distinctive philosophical and methodological approaches to study a wide range of topics. Political scientists seek to produce knowledge of value to broader society, in the course of their research they may encounter ethical issues. These issues can be

[5] AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. (https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics). O*riginally adopted in 1966. Revisions were made and approved by the AAUP's Council in 1987 and 2009.*

multidimensional and complex; they can differ across disciplinary sub-fields and settings; and in many cases they can differ from those faced by other disciplines.

Given this complexity, it is especially important for researchers to think through the possible effects, intended and unintended, of research projects. Such thinking involves consulting one's conscience, colleagues both inside and outside the researcher's most immediate circle, and the APSA ethics principles and guidance detailed below. Because ethical issues, perspectives, and priorities may vary according to methodological approaches and research settings (e.g., surveys versus field experiments versus ethnographic research), researchers should consider a range of ethical perspectives. Discussing ethical issues with colleagues outside of one's specialty is especially important to thinking more deeply and broadly about the potential effects on research participants, members of research teams, communities, and polities.

These principles and guidance express values shared across the many sections and sub-fields that comprise political science. They are general statements of what researchers should do, but recognize that differences in methodology and research setting may lead to differences in how these values relate to the ethical conduct of research. These principles are not intended to be rules, requirements, or prohibitions, and they are not presented as a checklist for ethical research. Instead, these principles and guidance are intended to promote reflection and help researchers consider the ethical issues that arise in the design, execution, and dissemination of their research. In situations where the application of the principles is unclear, or the principles appear to conflict, researchers should use their best judgement in deciding whether and how to proceed.

These principles are also intended to promote openness and broader discussion about ethical dimensions of political science research. Importantly, they are not intended to be tools for obstructing research or issuing sanctions. When editors, peer reviewers, institutional administrators, funders, and other parties in positions of power have concerns about the ethicality of a research project, they should encourage discussion within the research community and beyond about whether the research violates a principle; if so, whether the research constitutes a justifiable exception to the principle; and the way in which the research project relates to the values expressed in these principles. In this way the principles and guidance can evolve to become more representative of the values of the discipline, more informative, and more useful.

These principles are intended to apply to political science researchers and political scientists serving as journal editors as they conduct their research

related activities. Researchers should engage the principles in the design, implementation, and dissemination of their research projects, and journal editors should be careful to not impose conditions for publication that require political science researchers to violate these principles. These ***principles do not apply*** to political science researchers or journal editors in their non-research related activities or in their private lives.

General Principles:

1. Political science researchers should respect autonomy, consider the well-being of participants and other people affected by their research, and be open about the ethical issues they face and the decisions they make when conducting their research.

2. Political science researchers have an individual responsibility to consider the ethics of their research related activities and cannot outsource ethical reflection to review boards, other institutional bodies, or regulatory agencies.

3. These principles describe the standards of conduct and reflexive openness that are expected of political science researchers. In some cases, researchers may have good reasons to deviate from these principles (for example, when the principles conflict with each other). In such cases, researchers should acknowledge and justify deviations in scholarly publications and presentations of their work.

Power

4. When designing and conducting research, political scientists should be aware of power differentials between researcher and researched, and the ways in which such power differentials can affect the voluntariness of consent and the evaluation of risk and benefit.

> a. When conducting research with low-power or vulnerable participants and communities, researchers should be especially careful to respect their autonomy, protect them from harm, and treat them fairly.
>
> b. When conducting research with powerful parties, including some public officials, other actors, institutions, and corporations, covert or deceptive research with more than minimal harm may sometimes be ethically permissible. (See guidance for further discussion of this principle and its application.)

Consent

5. Political science researchers should generally seek informed consent from individuals who are directly engaged by the research process, especially if research involves more than minimal risk of harm or if it is plausible to expect that engaged individuals would withhold consent if consent were sought.

a. Researchers should ensure that consent is informed and voluntary; they should not use coercion or undue influence to secure consent. Researchers should be especially careful to respect participants' autonomy when conducting research with low-power or vulnerable participants and communities.

b. Researchers should seek continuing consent in research settings where risks of harm change during a study.

c. Observation of public behavior does not usually directly engage subjects and so does not invoke this principle of consent.

d. There are some cases in which it might be appropriate for researchers to alter or forgo the consent process. Relevant considerations include when the research is minimal risk, when seeking consent increases the risks for participants, when the research design requires the use of deception or misrepresentation, or when researchers are studying powerful actors and institutions. In each case, researchers should use their best judgment, and explain and justify their decisions in publications and presentations. (See guidance for further discussion of this principle and its application.)

e. In publications and presentations, researchers should disclose from whom they sought consent, why consent from these parties was meaningful and sufficient, and whether and how consent was documented. If consent was not obtained, researchers should explain that decision.

Deception

6. Political science researchers should carefully consider any use of deception and the ways in which deception can conflict with participant autonomy.

a. Relevant considerations for researchers contemplating the use of deception include whether deception is necessary for the integrity of the research, whether the research involves more than minimal risk of harm, whether it is plausible to expect that engaged individuals would withhold consent if fully informed consent were sought, whether debriefing of

subjects is possible, and the relations of power between subject and researcher.

b. In publications and presentations, researchers should disclose if deception was used, explain that decision, and describe steps taken to respect participant autonomy.

Harm and Trauma

7. Political science researchers should consider the harms associated with their research.

a. Researchers should generally avoid harm when possible, minimize harm when avoidance is not possible, and not conduct research when harm is excessive.

b. When assessing possible harms, researchers should not limit their concern to physical and psychological risks to the participant. Researchers should also recognize social and economic harms; harms to other parties affected by the research, and harms to research assistants and staff. (See guidance for further discussion of this principle and its application)

8. Political science researchers should anticipate and protect individual participants from trauma stemming from participation in research.

a. Researchers should avoid traumatization and re-traumatization when possible, minimize traumatization and re-traumatization when avoidance is not possible, and not conduct research when the potential for traumatization or re-traumatization is excessive.

b. Researchers should not intentionally induce traumatization and re-traumatization, and should not expose participants to traumatization or re-traumatization without participants' informed consent. (See guidance for further discussion of this principle and its application.)

Confidentiality

9. Political science researchers should generally keep the identities of research participants confidential; when circumstances require, researchers should adopt the higher standard of ensuring anonymity.

a. Researchers should clearly communicate assurances of confidentiality or anonymity to the participant during the consent process.

b. In some cases, it might be appropriate for researchers to not promise confidentiality (for example, research on powerful elites or oral histories in which the participants prefer to be identified). In these cases, researchers should clearly communicate the lack of confidentiality to the participants, and acknowledge and justify their decisions in scholarly publications and presentations of their work.

c. Even when researchers have not promised confidentiality or anonymity, they should assess possible risks and harms to participants and bystanders when deciding whether or not to identify participants and their responses in scholarly publications and presentations of their work.

d. When confidentiality or anonymity is promised, the researcher must remain attentive to these guarantees. If research materials are shared, researchers should ensure that the material is sufficiently redacted so that even well-informed parties cannot infer the identity of any person to whom specific statements or information can be attributed. In cases where the risks to participants are particularly high, researchers should decline to share any material. The researcher bears ultimate responsibility if they decide to share materials and cannot transfer accountability for this decision to editors, reviewers, or any other party.

e. Researchers who determine that it would be unethical to share materials derived from human subjects should be prepared to justify their decision to journal editors, to reviewers, and in oral and written reports of their research findings. (see guidance)

Impact

10. Political science researchers conducting studies on political processes should consider the broader social impacts of the research process as well as the impact on the experience of individuals directly engaged by the research. In general, political science researchers should not compromise the integrity of political processes for research purposes without the consent of individuals that are directly engaged by the research process.

a. There are some cases in which research that produces impacts on political processes without consent of individuals directly engaged by the research might be appropriate. Relevant considerations include when the research presents minimal risk of negatively affecting individual experience or impacting political outcomes, when researchers are studying powerful actors or institutions, or when deception or misrepresentation is otherwise justifiable.

b. Studies of interventions by third parties do not usually invoke this principle on impact. Researchers who partner with third parties – for example with governments, electoral commissions, or political parties to learn about their interventions – should understand, however, that partnerships do not obviate all ethical considerations. In particular, researchers should consider the broader social impacts of the research process when deciding whether to engage in the partnership. Researchers should be transparent with the partner about the researcher's objectives and likely risks and benefits arising from the research partnerships.

c. This principle is not intended to discourage any form of political engagement by political scientists in their non-research activities or private lives. (See guidance for further discussion of this principle and its scope and application.)

d. In publications and presentations, researchers should report likely impacts on the experiences of participants, any impacts on broader political processes, and whether and from whom they sought consent.

Laws, Regulations, and Prospective Review

11. Political science researchers should be aware of relevant laws and regulations governing their research related activities. Political scientists should be aware of relevant laws and regulations as they apply to both the research process and any activities associated with the research. This includes laws and regulations regarding prospective review and permitting as well as laws and regulations related to the activities of the research project. When a research project is conducted in more than one jurisdiction, or when a scholar is based in one jurisdiction and conducts research in another, the researcher should be aware of relevant laws and regulations in each setting.

a. Researchers should acknowledge whether their research related activities complied with relevant laws and regulations and provide a reasoned justification for any deviations in scholarly publications and presentations. Researchers conducting research in settings that require regulatory review should explain whether they sought and received regulatory approval for their studies in scholarly publications and presentations of their research. Additionally, researchers conducting research in settings that have local review or permitting requirements should explain whether they complied with these requirements in scholarly publications and presentations of their research. (See guidance for further discussion of this principle and its application.)

b. Researchers should understand that compliance with the law and approval by a review or permitting body is not always sufficient for ethical research. The requirements for ethical research may go beyond what the law, IRBs, U.S. regulatory criteria, and other review and regulatory bodies may require. Researchers should understand that they are responsible for the ethicality of their research. (See guidance for further discussion of this principle and its application.)

c. Researchers should be aware that in some cases prospective review or regulatory bodies, journal editors, or other parties might require researchers to engage in practices that are disrespectful or potentially harmful to their participants or otherwise unethical. In these cases, researchers should not proceed with the research project or disseminate activity. (See guidance for further discussion of this principle and its application.)

Shared Responsibility

12. The responsibility to promote ethical research goes beyond the individual researcher or research team.

a. Mentors, advisors, dissertation committee members, and instructors should help students and subordinates identify and address ethical issues related to research;

b. Graduate programs in political science should include ethics instruction in their formal and informal graduate curricula;

c. Editors and reviewers should encourage researchers to be open about the ethical decisions they made in conducting their research; encourage research on research ethics; and provide editorial expressions of concern or solicit independent commentaries when publishing ethically troubling research; and

d. Journals, departments, and associations should incorporate ethical commitments into their mission, bylaws, instruction, practices, and procedures.

This marks the end of the Human Subjects Guidance Section

2) Maintaining Professional Integrity in Political Science Research
(In the sections below, some ethical principles may repeat across sections and sub-sections, indicating that these principles are relevant in multiple challenges and scenarios).

Guidelines for Individuals

Integrity

1. Regarding **scholarly activity** including publication of the results of research, the individual researcher:

a. bears sole responsibility for publication,

b. should disclose all relevant sources of financial support and potential conflicts of interest,

c. should indicate any condition imposed by financial sponsors or others on research publication or other scholarly activities,

d. acknowledge any assistance received in conducting research from other individuals, groups or organizations, and

e. is obliged to facilitate replication when results of research are challenged and, if possible, the data should be reproducible or made publicly available.

Transparency

2. Researchers have an ethical obligation to **facilitate the evaluation** of their research or empirical results.

a. Researchers should be explicit about the data sources and methods used, including data sampling, weighting, research design, etc.

b. Researchers should reference the data sources used. If the data were generated or collected by the scholar, researchers should provide access to those data or explain why they cannot.

c. Researchers working with commercial data, big data, text or audio data, social media data, biometric data, digital media archives, geo-located data or confidential data sources that cannot be made publicly available in raw form should provide summary statistics of the data at the finest granulation possible, and clear coding and replication documentation. Attempts to allow others to replicate the analysis should be undertaken.

d. Whenever possible, researchers should provide access to the raw data.

e. Researchers should follow scientific standards for making evidence-based knowledge claims by providing a detailed account of how they draw their analytic conclusions from the data.

Human Dignity

3. Researchers working with **human subjects** bear responsibility for the safety and protection of their subjects, as explained in the APSA Human Subjects Research Principles and Guidelines above (Part III, Section A1). Additionally, researchers are obligated to:

a. put protection of their subjects over the sharing of data, should such sharing pose a threat at present or in the foreseeable future (even if they have permission to share data),

b. comply with relevant and applicable laws, including copyright. Decisions to withhold data and a full account of the procedures used to collect or generate them should be made in good faith and on reasonable grounds.

Proprietary Rights

4. Researchers who collect or generate data have the right to use those data first. Hence, scholars may postpone data access and production transparency after publication of evidence-based knowledge claims relying on those data, as specified by:

a. the journal or press publishing the claims, or

b. the funding agency supporting the research through which the data were generated or collected.

5. Nothing in this section shall require researchers to transfer ownership or other proprietary rights they may have.

Professional Integrity

1. In applying for research funds, the researcher should:

a. clearly state the purpose of the experiment or other type pf research and reasons for applying for support,

b. indicate other sources of support of the research (if any), and

c. consider refusing to accept restrictions, terms and conditions that the researcher believes will undermine freedom and integrity as a scholar, including limitations on scholarly publication of the results

2. In conducting research supported by funding agencies external to the researcher's home institution, the individual bears sole responsibility for the procedures, methods, and content of research. The researcher:

Human Dignity

a. should prioritize the safety of human subjects at all stages, including research design, research implementation, and publication, in accordance with this guide's Research with Human Subjects Principles and Guidelines above (Part III, Section A1);

(1) As **citizens**, researchers have an obligation to cooperate with grand juries, other law enforcement agencies, and institutional officials. Conversely, researchers also have a **professional duty** not to divulge the identity of confidential sources of information or data developed in the course of research, whether to governmental or non-governmental officials or bodies, even though they run the risk of suffering an applicable penalty under state or federal law.

b. Should secure IRB approval at the home institution prior to beginning the research project if human subjects are involved;
c. Should consider seeking pre-registration for their experiment when proposing experimental research whether involving IRB approval or not;

Timely Communication

d. Should carefully comply with the time, reporting, accounting, and other requirements set forth in the project instrument, and cooperate with institutional grant administrators in meeting these requirements; and

Fiscal Responsibility

e. Should avoid mixing project funds with personal funds, or funds of one project with those of another

Conflict of Interest

f. Should avoid apparent, potential and actual conflicts of interest. An apparent or potential conflict of interest exists whenever an individual (an interested person, researcher or investigator) faces competing interests between their personal/private interests and their professional/official interests or duties. In such cases, pursuing the personal/private interest might influence the interested person's actions and judgment. A potential conflict of interest exists if the research could possibly personally benefit the individual or an interested person's actions may be influenced by a competing interest or duty. A conflict of interest exists whenever an interested person's competing interest is substantial enough that the interested person cannot reasonably be expected to exercise independent judgment.

Funding Acknowledgement

3. All funding should be explicitly acknowledged by those granting and receiving financial and/or material support.

a. In making grants for research, government and non-government sponsors should explicitly acknowledge research support and require that the grantee indicate in any published research financed by their grants the relevant sources of financial support.

Guidelines for Funding Agencies

Human Dignity

1. Concern for the safety of scholars and subjects takes precedence above all else.

a. Governmental and nongovernmental officials and agencies that fund scholarly research, should understand that scholars have a professional obligation to protect the identity of confidential sources of information or data that is developed in the course of researching institutions, agencies, or persons. Funding entities should help scholars fulfill their obligations, not impede them [6]

Selling Data

2. Funding agencies can include in grants a stipulation that de-identified quantitative data gathered under the grants be made available to scholars at cost after a specified time, e.g., two years after publication of research based on this data.

Noninterference

[6] APSA Council Reaffirms Freedom and Integrity of Research. (1998). PS: Political Science & Politics, 31(4), 812-813. doi:10.2307/420725

3. Those funding the research should not interfere with scholarly investigations of their actions, processes, or functions. Public institutions should recognize the value of scholarship and acknowledge that interference with bona fide scholarship is contrary to the core values on which our democratic institutions are predicated.

4. After a research grant has been made, the grantor shall not impose any restriction on or require any clearance of research methods, procedures, or content (unless it speaks to point 1 above, about the safety of scholars and subjects or unless it has been established that professional misconduct on behalf of the researcher has been verified and or the researcher has been sanctioned by another entity for said misconduct.[7]

Guidelines for the College or University

Prioritize Research

1. The college or university should administer research funds according to principles of the funding agency, and in a manner that protects the integrity of the research and subjects.

a. A college or university should strive to *minimize* the administrative fee or percentage of the grant that it receives for administrative purposes. As much of the grant money as possible should be provided to the scholar for the purposes or associated costs of their research as outlined in the grant.

b. A college or university that administers research funds provided through contracts and grants from public and/or private sources should act to assure that research funds are used prudently and honorably.

Transparency

2. A college or university should not administer research funds derived from contracts or grants whose sponsorship cannot be publicly disclosed. Recipients of funded research should be publicly acknowledged by the university or college and open for review as is appropriate.

Professional Custodianship

3. In administering research funds entrusted directly to its care, a college or university should do its best to ensure that no restrictions are placed on the availability of evidence to scholars or on their freedom to draw their own conclusions from the evidence and to share their findings with others.

B. Scholarship Protocols for Political Science

Political scientists are held to the highest standards of academic integrity and are expected to comply with the scholarship protocols established by the discipline.

[7] Ibid.

Academic Integrity

1. **Academic integrity.**

As writers, political scientists must:

a. **Provide appropriate citations**. Scholars should cite all relevant scholarly work and seek to avoid citation bias, which can underrepresent the work of historically underrepresented, excluded, disadvantaged or minoritized groups.

b. **Not plagiarize**. Plagiarism is the deliberate or unintentional appropriation of the work of others represented as one's own. It not only may constitute a violation of the civil law but also represents a serious breach of professional ethics.

Political Scientists should be particularly wary of the possibility of contributor or co-author plagiarism resulting from ongoing or discontinued collaborative efforts. Proper attribution and acknowledgement should be made at all times. Scholars who begin a collaborative research project, but later withdraw, may have concerns that their contribution has been integrated into the published scholarship of their previous collaborators without proper acknowledgement or citation. Although this poses a difficult situation with many nuances, scholars are encouraged to reach a mutual understanding of the intended nature and scope of each collaborator's contribution and attribution before beginning collaborative projects and to cite and acknowledge the contributions of previous collaborators in published work.

(1) Political science departments should make it clear to both faculty and students that plagiarism will lead to disciplinary action and, in the case of serious offenses, may result in dismissal or other sanctions. Institutional rules and expected standards of conduct should be published in advance and distributed through such means as faculty and student handbooks and IRB guidelines.

(2) Disciplinary proceedings should conform to norms of fairness and academic due process as formulated in relevant AAUP statements.

2. Manuscript protocols

Professional Integrity

a. Authors who submit manuscripts to more than one professional journal at the same time are obligated to inform each editor of the fact.

Consent

b. Political scientists seeking to reprint the previously published work of others have an ethical obligation to make sure that consent is obtained.

c. The copyright holder should consent to the inclusion of previously published work only if the author consents. The copyright holder should either obtain the consent of the author or require that this be done by the party seeking permission to reprint.

d. In cases where the copyright holder or the publisher of previously published work has not taken steps to obtain consent, the political scientist involved, as compiler and editor of the book, should secure the consent of the author of the material. Political scientists are encouraged to include in contracts with publishers a provision that the publisher must obtain the consent of the author or authors before allowing reprinting of the work and ensure payment of any fees or costs associated with permissions.

Due Compensation

e. The copyright holder and the author may each be entitled to a flat fee or a share of royalties in connection with permissions to reprint any copyrighted work, depending on agreement with the party seeking permission. Either the copyright holder or the author may waive their right. Each may act on their own behalf, or by mutual consent one may act on behalf of both.

f. Permission must be renewed, and financial arrangements are subject to renegotiation, whenever a book goes into a new edition.

g. Any work reprinted may be changed only with the specific consent of the author. An author ordinarily is entitled to a complimentary copy of any publication in which their work is reprinted.

h. When a work is translated, the same obligations concerning consent apply.

3. Edited volume protocols and editorial responsibilities

Consent

a. Prospective editors shall not use the names of any individuals as contributors to an edited volume unless and until they have received permission of the contributors for use of their names.

Clear Expectations

b. Once contracts are signed for an edited volume, and solicitations of manuscripts are made, editors have an obligation to include the solicited work in the publication if it conforms to the standards of scholarship previously established by the editors or the publisher.

c. Along with any other guidelines established by the editors, contracts and instructions to contributors should include clear specification of:

(1) manuscript length or word count for the individual contributor;

(2) suggestions for revision to the manuscript and

(3) number of days for authors to respond to editors' alterations.

d. Editors will normally have responsibility and authority for decisions on acceptability of manuscripts, and should clearly communicate this understanding, or any departure therefrom, to the contributors.

4. Dissertation Protocols: The following apply to dissertations when a thesis or dissertation is published in whole or in part.

Author Rights

a. Authors are not ordinarily under an ethical obligation to acknowledge its origins as a dissertation.

b. Authors are free to decide what acknowledgment, if any, to give to the professor under whose supervision they worked. If the dissertation adviser is mentioned, it should be the faculty member who actually served in this role.

Funding Acknowledgement

c. Any financial support for the dissertation should be acknowledged in a manner consistent with principles for all published research.

C. Publication Protocols in Political Science

Authorship Rights

2. Because researchers bear ultimate responsibility for the safety and security of their subjects, editors and reviewers (or others involved in the funding and publication process) should defer to authors in determining which data should or should not be made available in conjunction with publication.

3. When a piece of writing is jointly authored, it is presumed to be the intellectual product of the authors collectively, not individually, and this fact should govern its further use including its use by any of the original authors.

a. Readers should presume equal contributions of coauthors (regardless of rank, actual or perceived gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, disability, etc.) unless otherwise indicated by authors (e.g., by the non-alphabetical order of the names) in the relevant publication.

b. The contributions of coauthors should not necessarily be evaluated in the order in which they are listed. The order of authors' names may not reflect the relative weight of the contributions, unless otherwise indicated by the authors themselves.

4. Passages of text and major themes and ideas used in subsequent work by any of the authors should be attributed to the original source following accepted standards for quotation and citation. Exceptions to this practice should occur only if a portion of the jointly authorized work has been clearly attributed in the original work to one of the authors.

1. Reviewing manuscripts and reviewing books are serious scholarly responsibilities. The following protocols apply to such activities.

Objectivity and Conflict of Interest

a. To avoid potential conflicts of interest due to lack of objectivity, those invited to write reviews should disqualify themselves if they have a reasonable doubt about whether they can exercise the responsibility with scholarly detachment. Such doubt might be raised, for example, by an invitation to appraise the manuscript or review the book of a close personal friend, former student, coauthor, or a departmental colleague.

b. Insofar as possible, editors and book-review editors should themselves act impartially, in conformity with the above principles. Moreover, in connection with the appraisal of manuscripts, editors should take all reasonable precautions during the review process to avoid revealing the names of the author and the reader to each other, unless explicitly agreed upon prior to beginning the review.

D. Protocols for Teaching and Mentoring in Political Science

1) Responsibilities to Students

Political scientists may interact with students as teachers, advisors, co-researchers**,** and mentors, providing classroom instruction and academic and career counseling. In these roles, political scientist should strive to exemplify the highest academic and ethical standards of the profession and teach them to ***their*** students.

This section of the Ethics Guide addresses responsibilities in their interactions with prospective students, enrolled undergraduate and graduate students. It also outlines the obligations of political science departments to their students.

Human Dignity

1. Commitment to the highest ethical standards requires that political scientists respect all students regardless of actual or perceived gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, national origin, disability, socioeconomic status, age, genetic information, religion, any other protected characteristic, or political opinion. Political Scientists should strive to create an inclusive classroom that fosters their full development.

a. Faculty should evaluate the quality of student work or case based upon its merit and NOT actual or perceived gender, gender identity, sexual

orientation, race, color, national origin, ability, socioeconomic status, age, genetic information, religion, any other protected characteristic, or political opinion.

Power

2. As teachers, mentors, advisers, co-researchers, and practitioners, political scientists have an obligation to avoid any form of discrimination, harassment, or personal relationship that could result in undue pressure or influence upon any student—graduate or undergraduate—and any mentee or advisee over whom they exercise supervisory responsibility. Supervisor responsibilities include, but are not limited to classroom instruction, Graduate Assistant (GA), Research Assistant, (RA) or Teaching Assistant (TA) supervision, thesis or grant supervisor, and graduate committee membership.

Objectivity

4. Political scientists must be careful not to impose their partisan views, conventional or otherwise, on students, colleagues, or staff. During class instruction, students should be encouraged to express their views without regard to relevant ideological considerations. In this way political science instructors support academic freedom and freedom of expression.

Fiscal Responsibility

5. Faculty should provide students with the most relevant, important and affordable learning materials possible without respect to personal or collective financial gain. Faculty should never allow royalties or other inducements from publishers to influence their selection of texts or other teaching materials.

Student Authorship Rights

6. Advisors are not entitled to claim joint authorship with a student on a thesis or dissertation or work submitted per an assignment for one of the student's classes.

Due Process

7. Political science departments have an obligation to uphold and protect the procedural rights of students, staff and faculty. If they do not do so, students, staff and faculty should seek redress with the college or university grievance process, or consult an objective resource such as an ombudsperson.

Transparency

8. Students should be advised upon admittance, as to the departmental and institutional requirements for completion of their degree. If a program changes its requirements in a substantial manner, students already enrolled should have the option of being governed by the requirements in force at the time of their entrance to the program.

2) Graduate Students and Programs

Transparency

1. Doctoral or, if applicable, Masters students should be advised upon admittance of the character and extent of examinations or theses required for successful degree completion. Students should be advised as to whether these examinations will be written and/or oral, how many will be required, the appropriate timeline of their completion, and whether or not they may be retaken if failed. The existence of an appeals process should be clearly designated.

2. Students should be informed upon entering a graduate program about any departmental or college or university grievance procedures for handling disputes that may arise between faculty and graduate students pertaining to the interpretation of degree requirements or the administration of the graduate program. Departments without an established grievance procedure should develop such rules and distribute them in writing to all their graduate students. Universities should provide an appeals process beyond the department level to insure adherence to proper procedural standards.

Timely Communication

3. Thesis and dissertation committees should provide students with a timely decision about the acceptance or rejection of their proposals. The committee's decision should be conveyed in writing by the committee chair and/or supervising faculty. In cases when the committee rejects a proposal and another attempt is possible, students should be advised as to other possible advisers that might be willing to supervise a new project.

4. If, in the opinion of the principal supervising faculty adviser, a student's thesis or dissertation project does not show satisfactory progress or, once completed, does not meet required academic standards, the student should be notified in writing as soon as possible about degree status. At the time, the chair of the department should advise the student of options, such as selecting a different adviser, if they are so inclined.

5. Faculty members should not participate in a thesis or dissertation examination unless they have had sufficient time to read the thesis or dissertation and unless they have actually read the manuscript. Students should circulate manuscripts in a timely manner, well in advance of the defense.

6. A student who fails a written or oral major examination ("prelims," "comprehensives," etc.) or has a thesis or dissertation required for the degree rejected, should be informed by the examiners or readers as to the reasons for such failure or rejection. Upon request, this explanation should be rendered in writing in a timely manner.

3) Habit of Professional Development

Promoting the growth of political scientists as educators is a core value of the discipline. This is demonstrated by the APSA's various professional development activities in the area, including seminars, conferences and/or tracks within conferences, publications, online pedagogical resources, etc. The following ethical values are offered to promote the growth of political scientists as teachers.

Habit of Professional Development

1. College and university administrators, departments and faculty should value and support the on-going habit of professional development as educators, which entails attending seminars and/or conferences on teaching and learning, pursuing additional educational certifications and degrees, contributing to the scholarship of teaching and learning, etc.

Methodological Pluralism

2. Effective teaching can be demonstrated through a variety of mechanisms. College or university administrators, departments and other faculty should value the variety of mechanisms (from observation by peers to qualitative and quantitative studies of classroom effectiveness, to awards for teaching excellence to student evaluations, etc.) that can be used to demonstrate effective pedagogical practices.

3. Evaluation of teaching for purposes of promotion, tenure, and hiring should include in-class observations preferably by two or more senior faculty. Such qualitative written assessments should accompany other quantitative materials generated by colleges and universities, departments, or other private companies.

Fair Assessment

4. Student evaluations are most effective at helping faculty improve their classroom instruction and should not be the *sole* or a *primary* source for externally assessing pedagogical practices of faculty by college or university administrators, departments and other faculty. Student evaluations are only ONE of many tools for improving and assessing teaching.

5. As students may sometimes show unconscious, implicit, or actual bias toward specific groups, such as women, minorities and historically underrepresented individuals, care in reviewing teaching evaluations should be exercised to detect possible bias in the evaluations. Discrimination of any kind, including that on the basis of accents, nationalities, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, color, national origin, socioeconomic status, age, disability, genetic information, religion, any other protected characteristic, or political opinion.

6. Faculty have the right to request that students complete teaching evaluations after the course has been completed. In this way, students have the full experience of the semester.

7. Although universities and colleges are increasingly contracting with outside vendors to do online evaluations, they should not send the evaluations to all

those enrolled. Only those students who have attended class regularly and not dropped the course should receive teaching evaluations to complete.

Due Process

8**.** When performance in class appears to jeopardize the employment status of a faculty member, they should receive written warning prior to universities, colleges or departments making any final decision. The chair of the department should advise the instructor about mentoring and other teaching support and resources available to the instructor.

Timely Communication

9. If departments and colleges and universities change their methods of evaluating faculty, they should communicate this at least a full semester before the policy change is instituted.

E. Netiquette Protocols for Political Science

Principles Concerning Internet Usage

The 21st century demands a new code of conduct covering interactions online and in cyberspace. APSA wishes to acknowledge the aspects of netiquette (the etiquette governing communication on the internet) that may adversely affect the health and well-being of faculty and students.

Virtual Netiquette

1. Political scientists should adhere to the following for online relationships:

a. Faculty and graduate instructors should avoid personal connections online with undergraduates that would interfere with the professional relationships. This is based on the need to avoid showing favoritism and the appearance of bias. In some instances, this may also be considered sexual harassment.

b. Similarly, faculty should not pursue relationships with students in college or university sponsored online communications or private email exchanges.

Posting Netiquette

2. Faculty and students should avoid posting personal material that would affect the reputation of their departments, colleges and universities, and the APSA.

3. Faculty and students should avoid making statements about colleagues and political figures that might be considered defamatory, inflammatory, or vulgar.

E-mail Netiquette

4. As the use of email is widespread, faculty and students should recognize that this mode of communication is not private. Confidential matters should not be communicated via email or other means on the Internet. If necessary to convey

material in this manner, it should be encrypted and require a password to open the document.

5. In instances where individuals receive communications that violate the Ethics Guide, they are encouraged to print these out to retain them in the event they decide to seek redress of grievance with the institution that has jurisdiction over the matter.

Academic Freedom

6. While colleges and universities may reasonably expect faculty to show good judgment in their online netiquette, *administrators* should not restrict the legitimate exercise of freedom of speech and freedom of association.

a. Use of university email for proselytizing may be considered inconsistent with campus policy.

b. Political campaigning may constitute a violation of campus policy.

Intellectual Property Rights

7. Increasingly colleges and universities are requiring faculty to post course materials online. ***Course materials, including syllabi, belong to faculty*** whether located on Blackboard, Zoom or various other platforms. The teaching materials, in all forms, whether PowerPoint slides, essays, recordings of lectures, and other documents are the intellectual property of the faculty members unless the documents are the copyright of other individuals.

a. Sale or other unauthorized redistribution of faculty materials such as exams or course handouts to other students, whether at the home institution, other colleges and universities, students, or private companies is a serious violation of ethics.

b. Sometimes faculty post sample term papers as an example. Sale or other unauthorized redistribution of such course term papers is also a serious violation of ethics.

Identity Protection

8. Colleges and universities are common targets for identity theft. As such, colleges and universities should routinely review reported identity breaches.

a. If the college or university learns any of their faculty have had their personal information compromised by a data breach and if it is the fault of the university, the university has a duty to offer support and protection to affected faculty, staff, and students.

b. If the college or university learns any of their faculty have had their personal information compromised and the university is not at fault, the university ethically should communicate this to the affected faculty and refer them to appropriate resources for protecting their identity from theft.

9. College and university websites are essential resources for students, faculty, staff and community members to learn about the institution and its faculty. Faculty webpages are an essential tool for learning about the faculty and some faculty share course materials and resources through them. However, due to identity protection concerns, threats of spam and malware, etc., faculty have the right to deny colleges and universities posting their picture or other identifying information.

Health Information Custodianship

10. Faculty and students are compelled to share information about their personal health for purposes of obtaining health insurance, medication, school health care resources, and appointments with physicians.

a. Colleges and universities must protect the privacy rights of all those who are employed by them.

b. Employment decisions should not be taken based on private medical histories or pre-existing conditions, unless the faculty is unable to perform the duties of their job and no suitable accommodations can be made.

c. If the *health* of an *instructor* or *student* substantially interferes with the academic performance, then accommodations should be made. If the individual cannot resume their usual work, then arrangements should be made in consultation with the leadership of the college and university. ***It is unethical to terminate employment without due process.***

F. Political Activity by Political Scientists

Citizenship Rights

1. The college or university teacher is a citizen, and like other citizens, academics should be free to engage in political activities insofar as this can be done consistent with obligations of serving as an effective teacher and scholar. Academic freedom includes the exercise of freedoms of expression and assembly within and beyond the college or university, in any venue including online. APSA supports and protects the rights of all social scientists to communicate their research and advocate for adoption and reform of public policies. In addition, students should be able to conduct research and engage in advocacy regardless of the scholar's identity, political affiliation, country of origin, or the nature of the issue involved.

2. Effective service as a faculty member is often compatible with certain types of political activity, for example, holding a part time office in a political party or serving as a member of a governmental advisory board. Where a professor engages in full-time political activity, such as service in a state legislature, they should, as a rule, seek a leave of absence from the institution, which the college or university should grant. Since political activity by academic political scientists is both legitimate and socially important, universities and colleges should have institutional arrangements to permit such activity, including reduction in the faculty member's work-load or a leave of absence subject to equitable

adjustment of compensation. The faculty member's position should be preserved, so that they can resume teaching when the political work has ceased. If colleges and universities do not have policies of this kind included in faculty handbooks, APSA strongly recommends that they be devised and incorporated in them.

Academic Leave

3. A faculty member who seeks a leave to engage in political activity should recognize that they have a primary obligation to the institution and to develop as a teacher and scholar. The faculty member should consider any potential problems that a leave of absence may create for the administration, colleagues and students. Whenever possible, the instructor should provide advance notice to the college or university. A leave of absence related to political activity should not affect the tenure status of the faculty member. If a faculty member believes that the political activity has had an adverse effect on tenure or promotion, the faculty member should consult college or university-based offices and resources that provide assistance for faculty members.

Department Etiquette

4. Special problems arise if departments or schools endorse or sponsor political activities or public policies in the name of the entire faculty, the department or the school. One of the purposes of tenure is to shelter unpopular or unorthodox teaching. This is to some degree vitiated if the majority of a departmental faculty endorses or sponsors a particular political position in the name of the faculty of the department. Departments should adhere strictly to the rule that those faculty members who wish to endorse or sponsor a political position or activity do so in their own names without pressuring their colleagues or students to join them. Departments as such should not endorse political candidates or policies that could be construed as promoting discrimination in any form.

G. Restrictions on the Use of the APSA Name or Office and Conflict of Interest

1. When officers, members, or employees of the Association, in their personal capacity, speak out on an issue of public policy, endorse a political candidate, or otherwise participate in political affairs, they should make it as clear as possible that they are not speaking on behalf of the Association, unless they are so authorized by the Association. They should not encourage any inference that they act for the Association unless so authorized by the Association. The use of the title of the office held in the Association in political advertisements, even if labeled "for identification purposes only", may well be seen by others as an endorsement of a political position by the Association and should be avoided.

2. Officers and employees of the Association are free to engage in activities outside their obligations to the Association provided such activities are consistent with their duties and responsibilities to the Association. When doubts arise about the activities of staff members, they should be resolved by the Executive Director in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Association. Similarly, when doubts arise about the activities of the Executive Director, they should be resolved by the Executive Committee.

3. Officers, council members, committee members and employees of the Association should act at all times in the best interests of APSA, and no individual associated with the association should use their position for personal benefit, for the benefit of friends or relatives, or to further any outside interests or personal agenda. They should not knowingly participate in transactions involving the Association, if they have a substantial economic interest in them which constitutes a conflict of interest. Under such circumstances, they should disqualify themselves from participating in transactions involving the Association.[8]

H. Recruitment, Hiring, Promotion and Tenure, and Other Personnel Protocols

1) Recruitment and Hiring Guidelines

Due Diligence

1. Open Listing Policy: It is the professional obligation of all political science departments to advertise all positions in a public fashion for at least one month and to list in APSA *eJobs,* APSA's online job database, all positions for which they are recruiting at the Instructor, Assistant, and Associate Professor levels. In addition, the listing of openings at the Full Professor level are strongly encouraged. It is also a professional obligation for departments to list temporary and visiting positions on *eJobs and a wide-ranging collection of diverse platforms to better reach a broader and diverse pool of applicants*.

a. Hiring Departments should widely advertise job searches, seeking a diverse pool of candidates. They should post in a variety of outlets, especially those outlets that reach women and minority candidates.

b. Positions posted on *eJobs* should include the hiring department's college or university's diversity and inclusion statement and equal employment opportunity (EEO) statement. Departments will also be asked to agree with a non-discrimination statement.

Transparency

3. When, for the purposes of evaluation for hiring, promotion or tenure decisions, a department requests from a scholar outside the institution an evaluation regarding a political scientist, the normal expectation in the profession is that the letter of evaluation will be treated as confidential. If it is the department's policy to place such matters in an open file, or otherwise make these letters available to those who may desire to see them, then the department has an ethical obligation to inform the individual from whom a letter is requested that the letter will not be regarded as a confidential document. If one who is requested to write a letter of evaluation is informed in advance that the letter

[8] To learn more about APSA's Conflict of Interest Policy for Officers, Council members, and committee members, please refer to the Board Policy Manual located on the APSA website Governance Documents page. (see https://www.apsanet.org/portals/54/goverance/july%202020%20board%20policies%20manual.pdf?ver%3D2020-08-13-174516-040).

will be placed in an open file and the individual prefers not to do so, then it is proper to exercise the option of not writing such a letter.

a. Letters of recommendation for political scientists who are still candidates for a degree, placed in files at their own or at other institutions, are by law open for inspection by them, unless they have waived this right of access. If they have not waived this right, the department has an obligation to inform the individuals from whom letters are requested that the confidentiality of their letters cannot be assured.

b. Letters of recommendation placed in files for postsecondary students are open for inspection by them unless they have waived this right of access.

4. To be assessed are the characteristics of the candidate that relate to their probable effectiveness in the classroom, scholarship, public scholarship, professional activities, conference presentations or public performances, advisement, service on faculty committees and commitment to service and community service. Increasingly, an expressed commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion is also seen as important to consider. These criteria should be publicized in advance and not changed without consultation with the faculty involved.

a. If there is basis to question the compatibility of a candidate's past behavior with legitimate expectations of the employing institution, the fact could be brought to the candidate's attention if an explanation is desired.

b. A candidate should be informed if references to such matters are in their personnel records and they should have an opportunity to place a response in the record. Matters pertaining to the candidate that have no bearing on the legitimate expectations of the employing institution should not be mentioned in personnel records.

Authenticity

5. Fraud in Claiming Advanced Degrees: If a person who seeks an academic position falsely claims to have an advanced degree, or misrepresents their credentials, the chair or other appointing authorities where the position is located should report the fraud to the institution alleged to have granted the degree and should be reported by said universities to APSA.

6. If those who know of fraud are asked by a potential academic employer for an oral or written statement concerning the qualification of a person falsely claiming an advanced degree, the statement should include an appropriate description of the fraud.

7. Assessing or recommending a candidate for faculty appointment calls for honest and responsible judgment and ethical efforts.

a. The scholarly achievements and promise of the candidate should be assessed fairly and consistently across applicants and candidates, taking into consideration the stated criteria for the position.

b. Departments and/or colleges and universities should take intentional steps to educate and provide training on how to professionally and ethically conduct searches, hire candidates, and operate retention or promotion committees free of

discrimination or bias. Examples of education or training may include but are not limited to seminars, workshops, evidence-based research on bias, and counseling.

Impartiality

8. Spousal/Partner Hiring and Retention:[9] Departments regularly encounter spousal/partner issues in hiring and retention cases. Faculty members frequently differ on how to face these issues. APSA strongly encourages conducting wide searches and considering all qualified candidates equally. This policy has resulted in greater equity in hiring decisions, both in regard to women and individuals from historically underrepresented groups as well as to the relative reputations of doctoral granting institutions. Nonetheless, institutions do make spousal/partner hires.

a. What follows are recommendations of best practices that obviate some of the risks potentially associated with such appointments.

(1) In any openly advertised search, the individual scholarly merits and potential of a candidate and the departmental need should be the principal criterion for making a hiring decision, without consideration of the marital status or personal commitments of the candidate. Inquiring about a candidate's familial status is inappropriate and is strongly discouraged as it may be a sign of intent to discriminate. In some cases it is illegal. However, it may be discussed after an offer has been made if the information is needed "for insurance or other legitimate business purposes".[10]

(2) Once the candidate has been selected for recruitment through a search, spousal/partner issues may arise at that time. These considerations may be crucial for successful recruitment and retention. Moreover, the presence of a spouse or partner may present an unanticipated exceptional hiring opportunity for the department or for another department or program at the same institution.

(3) Consideration of spousal/partner issues should occur *only* at the initiative of the candidate.

(4) To ensure equity with regard to gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, color, national origin, ability, socioeconomic status, age, genetic information, religion, any other protected characteristic, or political opinion in the initiation of such considerations, departments and institutions of higher education generally should adopt public and explicit non-discrimination policies with regard to spouses and partner recruitment and employment.

(5) Under no circumstance should a spousal/partner appointment jeopardize current or prospective affirmative action searches/lines or strategic hiring initiatives intended to increase diversity.

[9] Based upon the American Historical Association's policy and guidance. https://www.historians.org/jobs-and-professional-development/statements-standards-and-guidelines-of-the-discipline/best-practices-on-spousal/partner-hiring

[10] US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, https://www.eeoc.gov/pre-employment-inquiries-and-marital-status-or-number-children (2022).

Conflict of Interest

9. Nepotism Rules: Former academic advisers and those with familial relationships with an individual who is applying for a job or promotion should recuse themselves from hiring and promotion decisions involving former students and family members. Employment and advancement should be based solely on professional qualifications, subject to appropriate rules governing conflict of interest and spousal/partner hires.

Human Dignity

10. Equal Employment Opportunities: It is APSA policy that educational institutions should not discriminate against job candidates on the basis of actual or perceived gender, gender identity, sexual orientation. race, ethnicity, national origin, disability, socioeconomic status, marital status, age, political opinion, or religion except in those cases in which federal laws allow religious preference in hiring. For further explanation, (see Federal EEOC laws).

a. Hiring departments should consult with their college or university's Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and/or Equal Employment Opportunity Office well in advance of conducting a faculty search for guidance and best practices for ensuring a fair and equitable search, and recruitment and hiring process that avoids implicit and explicit bias from impacting the recruitment, interviewing, and hiring processes.

b. The guiding principle is that employment decisions should be based on only those criteria that relate directly to professional competence and qualifications for the job in question.

c. It is APSA policy that educational institutions not discriminate in any condition of employment (including the provision of domestic partner benefits) on the basis of actual or perceived gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, color, national origin, age, socioeconomic status, ability, age, genetic information, political opinion, or religion except in those cases in which federal law allow religious preferences in hiring.

d. In pursuit of the objective of ending discrimination, it is Association policy to support the principles of affirmative action and urge political science departments to pursue aggressively affirmative action programs and policies, where permissible, with regard to individuals from historically underrepresented or marginalized groups, women, minorities based on race, ethnicity, religion, country origin, self-identified sexual orientation, sexual identity, real and perceived, and other minorities. (Appropriate strategies may differ for each group.)

e. APSA job listings will not indicate preference, limitation, or specification based upon the categories in paragraph 10 above on Equal Employment Opportunities except that religious preferences may be indicated when allowed by federal law.

Equity in Treatment

11. Contingent Faculty: The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has noted the high – and increasing – share of instruction that is conducted by faculty in non-tenure or non-tenure track positions in United States colleges and universities. These faculty tend to have lower salaries, poorer benefits, limited (to no) research support, higher teaching and service workload, little input into institutional or departmental governing decisions, and often experience greater threats to their academic freedom. As such, institutions employing political scientists should prioritize reducing their dependency on part-time and contingent positions in favor of tenure-track positions or positions with multi-year contracts. When faculty are hired into contingent positions, they should carry full academic status, commensurate rank, promotion opportunities, rates of pay, departmental participation and fringe benefits, including access to research resources. The policy of flexible part-time or contingent positions should not perpetuate any unfair practices such as moonlighting or any practice by employers used to circumvent normal career- ladder appointments.

Timely Communication

a. Faculty should not be released from employment without timely notification. As laid out in the AAUP's 1940 Statement, to which APSA is a signatory, faculty members, even those working on a year-to-year or part-time contracts, should receive notification of their non-renewal no later than: March 1st if they have less than a year of institutional service; by December 15 with less than two years of service; and a full year's notice of non-renewal after they have worked at an institution for two or more years. Furthermore, every faculty member should have the opportunity to receive notice of their non-renewal in writing and to appeal this decision before the relevant committee.

Academic Freedom

b. Contingent faculty also often face considerable threats to their academic freedom. Contingent faculty should have the same rights as their tenure-line colleagues, including their right to decide upon the texts to read and grades to assign, their freedom to conduct research without fear of institutional retaliation, and their freedom to speak freely as a public citizen or even on issues of institutional governance.

Professionalism

12. It is a violation of professional ethics to condition an assessment or recommendation on the performance of any professional or personal services for the recommender, including unwanted social or sexual contact.

Timely Communication

13. The Appointment Process: Once an employing institution clearly indicates that it is giving serious consideration to an applicant for a faculty appointment, e.g., by interviewing them, it should inform the applicant of the status of the application, and of any change in status, within a reasonable time (typically within one month).

14. Once an employing institution offers a faculty appointment, the individual to whom the offer is made should respond within a reasonable time (typically within two weeks) either with the decision or with a statement concerning their situation.

Contractual Protocols

15. An employing institution that offers a faculty appointment orally should communicate the offer in writing within a week. In large institutions requiring multiple levels of approval, a "soft offer" may be prepared to document the oral understanding, with a clear indication it is not legally binding until fully vetted by college or university authorities.

16. The employing institution has an obligation to inform a candidate for employment of the contractual terms and institution's procedures that are relative to the offer of appointment. Any deviations from the standard offer should be explicitly mentioned.

17. It is unethical to accept more than one offer of employment at the same time. Once an individual has accepted an offer, the individual should treat the decision to accept the position as binding until the next hiring cycle.

2) Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Among the most important responsibilities in the academic community is the assessment of colleagues for tenure and promotion.

1. In 1947 APSA formally endorsed as APSA policy the *1940 Statement* of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure jointly developed by the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges (AAC). The statement and the AAUP's later interpretive comments establish a minimum set of guidelines for the discipline. To access them, see https://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure/. Below are additional ethical standards to consider.

Transparency

2. As a matter of principle, a department should use the same procedures and criteria for all candidates under review for tenure and promotion.

a. The candidate under review has a right to know the motivating principles, customary standards, and principal procedures of the assessment process of the department and the role department assessment plays within the larger college or university process. This information should be provided to the candidate well in advance of the review, ideally at the hiring stage. The department is obligated to provide to the candidate being assessed in writing (typically in a college or university or departmental faculty guide or handbook) a statement that:

(1) sets out the principal parts of the assessment process,

(2) explains the instructions under which external reviewers will operate, and

(3) provides an account of the processes and timing which the department and college or university will follow in coming to a decision on tenure or promotion.

b. The department is obligated to in writing:

(1) inform the candidate if procedures to be used depart in any way from the department's customary procedures and

(2) detail how and explain why procedures may differ in this case.

3. The department has a specific obligation to inform the candidate as to which materials (e.g., manuscripts, publications etc.) are to be sent out for review. The materials to be reviewed need not include all of the candidate's work but should not exclude material the candidate deems indispensable to an assessment of the case.

In the event the department does not meet the standards, the candidate may want to consult the Dean or other faculty resource.

Due Process

4. The department should establish and communicate to the candidate a clear timeline for the process that sets out:

a. the time when their application file should be presented and

b. when and how the final decision will be communicated. If circumstances require a modification in the timing, this should be conveyed in writing to the candidate.

5. External reviews are governed by a triad of rights and obligations: those of the department conducting the review, those of the candidate under review, and those of the external reviewers. All of those involved in the review process should adhere to the professional standards to ensure integrity of the process. These include fairness, expeditious response to requests, confidentiality, and mutual respect.

a. Guidelines for external review are not intended to be and should not be read as a uniform code applicable to all colleges and universities alike. Academic departments differ, for example, in educational mission, institutional resources, access to external reviewers and size as well as in the administrative and legal constraints under which they operate. Given their differing missions, what constitutes proper procedure for one department or institution may not be the same for others.

Rights of the Candidate

b. Where external reviews are used in tenure and promotion decisions and if they are used in reappointment decisions, faculty members under review have a right to receive external reviews that are expert, disinterested, unbiased, and timely. To avoid bias, institutions may permit candidates to

designate a limited number of prohibited reviewers who may be biased by prior interaction, position, or status vis a vis the candidate.

Obligations of the Department

c. Departments and colleges and universities have an obligation to select reviewers who have appropriate professional expertise and will provide a fair assessment of the candidate.

d. Departments and colleges and universities are encouraged to ask candidates being reviewed for tenure and promotion to suggest names of external reviewers familiar with their scholarship, and to give the candidates an opportunity to indicate reviewers whom the candidate believes should be excluded due to personal bias or professional conflicts. Ideally the candidate should be permitted the right to exclude two or three potential reviewers.

e. Solicitation of outside letters of recommendation for promotion and tenure should specify that recipients are free to decline. Refusal to perform this service should not be construed as a negative statement about the candidate.

f. Departments and colleges and universities should exercise restraint in soliciting external reviews because it imposes an obligation upon other scholars. Reviews should not be solicited for employment decisions that do not warrant them.

g. The department conducting an external review is ordinarily obligated to:

(1) provide external reviewers a copy of the candidate's curriculum vita and the principal materials on which the assessment is to be based;

(2) ensure external reviewers have sufficient time for an in-depth and conscientious assessment; as a rule, this means not fewer than six (6) weeks;

(3) protect confidentiality to the extent legally permissible;

(4) state explicitly whether the assessment is a confidential one, and if it is not, the precise terms of departure from confidentiality;

(5) explain the relative importance of external reviews for the overall review process; and

(6) inform external reviewers of the final decision, without elaborating on the reasons for the ultimate decision.

Obligations of the External Reviewer

h. Once they assume responsibility for serving as a reviewer, external reviewers are ordinarily obligated to:

(1) make an assessment that is candid and fair, based solely on professionally relevant criteria and first-hand knowledge;

(2) disclose to the department or institution conducting an external review any personal or professional relationship with the candidate being evaluated; and

(3) to honor any deadline to which they have agreed.

I. Sexual Misconduct, Harassment, and Discrimination Guidelines

1. Sexual misconduct is a gross violation of professional ethics and scientific conduct. It includes a variety of forms, but generally involves sexual harassment, sexual violence, and/or sexual discrimination.

a. There are three forms of sexual harassment: (1) gender harassment (sexist hostility and crude behavior), (2) unwanted sexual attention (unwelcome verbal or physical sexual advances), and (3) sexual coercion (when favorable professional or educational treatment is conditioned on sexual activity).[11]

i. Sexual harassment is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when 1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic achievement or 2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions or academic decisions affecting such individuals, or 3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment. Sexual harassment is, furthermore, illegal under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and Title IX of the 1972 Educational Amendments.

ii. Sexual harassment is an unethical and unprofessional activity involving threats, demands, and/or actions of unwanted social and sexual contact between persons of unequal power, authority or influence. Harassment may directly undermine or affect the subordinate's professional or educational function, recognition, or advancement. This conduct thus constitutes a violation of the rights guaranteed in educational, labor, and civil rights laws. Even if there is no quid pro quo, a pattern of harassment by powerful individuals over time or in a workplace environment creates a discriminatory campus climate. The hostile work environment is illegal and jeopardizes initiatives designed to encourage the inclusion of historically underrepresented individuals. The failure to protect the individuals who are subject to sexual harassment is illegal and contrary to the important values of our profession.

[11] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2018. Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Report Highlights: https://doi.org/10.17226/24994.https://www.nap.edu/resource/24994/Sexual%20Harassment%20of%20Women%20ReportHighlights.pdf

b. Sexual violence is a particularly grievous form of a sexual misconduct, including but not limited to sexual assault and rape. Coercive sexual conduct is a criminal offense. When political scientists are accused of this behavior, departments and colleges and universities should act immediately to investigate these allegations.

c. Sexual discrimination or sex-based discrimination "involves treating someone (an applicant or employee) unfavorably because of that person's sex, including the person's sexual orientation, gender identity, or pregnancy. Discrimination against an individual because of gender identity, including transgender status, or because of sexual orientation is discrimination because of sex, in violation of Title VII."[12] "The law forbids discrimination when it comes to any aspect of employment, including hiring, firing, pay, job assignments, promotions, layoff, training, fringe benefits, and any other term or condition of employment."[13]

2. Unacceptable behavior that constitutes sexual misconduct (including examples of sexual discrimination, harassment, and violence) includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- prejudicial or discriminatory actions or comments related to actual or perceived gender, gender identity, or sexual orientation, that coerce others, foment broad hostility, or otherwise undermine professional equity or the principles of free academic exchange.
- persistent and unwelcome solicitation of emotional or physical intimacy
- accompanied by real or implied threat of professional harm
- intimidating, harassing, abusive, derogatory or demeaning speech or actions on the basis of gender, gender identity, or sexual orientation.
- deliberate intimidation, stalking or following because of one's gender, gender identity, or sexual orientation;
- harassing photography or recording; including pornography and revenge porn.
- verbal abuse, including online harassment, intimidation or abuse.
- physical assault (including unwelcome touch or groping)
- real or implied threat of physical harm
- sexually inappropriate emails or texts.

College and University Obligations

3. The APSA encourages colleges and universities to articulate its sexual misconduct policy, including defining and providing examples of what constitutes sexual conduct; clarifying options, procedures, and remediation for victim; outlining disciplinary procedures; and providing educational training and outreach for the college or university community as a whole.

a. Colleges and universities should communicate the institutional support and guidelines for addressing such issues – including Title IX offices and confidential, counseling resources. They should ensure that all members of the community know how to contact offices responsible for investigating misconduct.

[12] https://www.eeoc.gov/sex-based-discrimination
[13] Ibid.

Addressing Sexual Harassment and Misconduct

4. APSA encourages members of the community who may have experienced sexual misconduct in a professional setting to consider the full range of mechanisms available to address the misconduct. These include making reports to the institution or organization at which the offense occurred, such as using the available college or university Title IX offices and processes. It also may involve non-college or university options—especially since college or university and professional association processes might not always be effective or comprehensive means of accountability for sexual misconduct. College and university procedures, for example, do not replace criminal legal liability, and if deemed appropriate, individuals may also choose to contact the appropriate authorities.

5. Individuals who experience sexual misconduct may wish to consider seeking legal counsel and pursuing legal remedies.

Sexual Harassment and Misconduct at APSA Events

6. APSA Procedures Concerning Sexual Discrimination, Harassment and Misconduct: ***APSA condemns all forms of sexual misconduct.*** In 2017-2018, the APSA Council approved the anti-harassment procedures and norms applicable to attendance at APSA-related conferences, meetings and workshops.

7. APSA's procedures for addressing violations of the anti-harassment policy currently apply to all attendees at the APSA Annual Meeting & Exhibition, the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, and the APSA International Workshops, for the duration of the annual meeting and the particular workshop, and any other APSA conference, workshop or entity. Any attendee of an APSA meeting, conference or workshop, including the APSA Annual Meeting & Exhibition, the Teaching and Learning Conference or the APSA International Workshops may pursue a complaint of sexual harassment regarding an incident that has occurred within the last two years at one of the aforementioned events or meetings.[14]

8. APSA can only accept sexual harassment and sexual misconduct complaints and reports of incidents that take place at an APSA-related event or entity, such as a meeting, conference or workshop.

a. To report sexual misconduct claims that occur at an APSA meeting conference, workshop or entity, individuals should follow the guidance of the aforementioned policies and procedures. Reporting can be done by:

- emailing the report to ethics@apsanet.org,
- submitting a report to APSA EthicsPoint, or

[14] **Read the Procedures for Violations of the Sexual Harassment Provisions document**: https://www.apsanet.org/Portals/54/diversity%20and%20inclusion%20prgms/sexual%20harassment%20resources/FINAL%20Sexual%20Harass.%20Procedures%20Amended%205_7_18.pdf?ver=2018-05-07-093316-170

- speaking to the APSA Intake Advisor or an APSA staff member onsite at the event.

b. Complaints of sexual misconduct at APSA meetings, conferences and workshops are considered by the ad hoc sexual harassment committee (appointed by the Executive Director and APSA President) for resolution as provided in the Procedures for Violations of the Anti-harassment Meetings Policy. The Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms does not evaluate sexual misconduct cases or censure individuals who have engaged in sexual misconduct.

J. Principles Governing Graduate Scholars, Fellows, Trainees, and Assistants

Note: At its April 1992 meeting, the APSA Council adopted the following guidelines set forth by the Council of Graduate Schools on acceptance of an offer of financial support by graduate scholars, fellows, trainees, and assistants.

1. Acceptance of an offer of financial support (such as a graduate scholarship, fellowship, traineeship, or assistantship) for the next academic year by a prospective or enrolled graduate student completes an agreement that both student and graduate school expect to honor. In that context, the conditions affecting such offers and their acceptance must be defined carefully and understood by all parties.

2. Students are under no obligation to respond to offers of financial support prior to April 15; earlier deadlines for acceptance of such offers violate the intent of this Resolution. In those instances in which a student accepts an offer before April 15, and subsequently desires to withdraw that acceptance, the student may submit in writing a resignation of the appointment at any time through April 15. However, an acceptance given or left in force after April 15 commits the student not to accept another offer without first obtaining a written release from the institution to which a commitment has been made. Similarly, an offer by an institution after April 15 is conditional on presentation by the student of the written release from any previously accepted offer. It is further agreed by the institutions and organizations subscribing to this Resolution that a copy of the Resolution should accompany every scholarship, fellowship, traineeship, and assistantship offer.

K. AAUP Joint Statement Rights and Freedoms of Students

For a list of rights and freedoms for political science students, the APSA endorses the 1967 Joint Statement of Rights and Freedoms of Students from the AAUP (see https://www.aaup.org/report/joint-statement-rights-and-freedoms-students). **IV. APSA GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES**

The APSA's Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms is concerned with any ethical problem or professional or personal abuse experienced or caused by political scientists acting in their professional capacity. There are, however, limits upon the types of grievances the ethics committee has the authority and

ability to investigate and also limits on its ability to issue recommendations that can be enforced. The primary responsibilities of the Committee fall into three major areas: (1) handling individual grievances that have a direct relationship to an APSA meeting, conference, workshop or entity not related to sexual harassment[15], (2) writing ethical guidelines for the Association, usually in the form of informal advice and counsel for those cases that are not able to be investigated by the committee and (3) helping protect human rights of political science scholars in other countries.

A. Individual Grievances

Political scientists acting in their professional capacities face challenges to professional ethics and conduct, academic freedom, and human rights. The Ethics Committee is available for consultation and advice about any potential misconduct or ethics violations (other than sexual harassment) as provided below in the section on Committee recommendations and advisory opinions, but only investigates those individual complaints and grievances that directly relate to an APSA meeting, conference workshop or entity. Whether the committee is able to conduct an investigation regarding a particular complaint or grievance will depend upon the factors and criteria identified below (as well as other potentially relevant factors) in the Grievance Procedures section.

The Committee cannot act until it receives a formal request, report or complaint. Political scientists who feel that there has been an ethics violation or professional misconduct that has a direct relationship to an APSA meeting, conference, workshop or entity not related to sexual harassment (including other forms of harassment that are in violation of the APSA Anti-Harassment Annual Meeting Policy) must take the first step and inform the Committee of the nature of the problem. After the initial contact is made or grievance submitted, using the reporting processes provided by the association (see below section on reporting grievances), the aggrieved political scientist should be ready to provide APSA and the Committee with as much detail and documentation of the alleged ethics violation or misconduct as possible should they be asked to provide additional information as part of a preliminary or formal fact-finding investigation.

The Committee encourages political scientists to approach it as soon as they begin to sense that there are violations of the professional conduct and ethical standards of the discipline, or the annual meeting anti-harassment policy (code of conduct) that have a direct relationship to APSA, as stated above.

Once a report or grievance is received, and prior to or in lieu of conducting a formal investigation, the Committee may also offer help to resolve a problem. In anticipation of possible ethical violations, the Committee may propose alternative dispute resolution. If mediation can result in dispute settlement, in the early stages

[15] Sexual harassment reports received at an APSA meeting, conference or workshop are handled through the APSA Procedures for Violations of the Sexual Harassment Provisions at APSA Meetings. Through those procedures, the APSA president and executive director have the authority to assemble an ad-hoc committee to review the complaint and conduct an investigation, if necessary.

of a conflict and this approach is viewed as an agreeable option by the involved parties, such a course of action can be pursued.

The Committee always acknowledges and responds to formally submitted allegations of unethical action, professional misconduct, violations of the professional code of conduct (anti-harassment policy), or inappropriate behavior, even where the complaint is not accepted for formal investigation. See the section below on Preliminary Review. Complaints that deal with sexual harassment or assault at an APSA meeting, conference or entity will be referred to the APSA Intake officer (see description below) or the APSA Executive Director and President, as per the APSA policies and procedures for violation of the Anti-sexual harassment policy.

The Committee will usually not consider disputes in litigation or disputes being reviewed or investigated by another professional review body such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) or by a college or university. Parties to a dispute are free to bring their allegations to the Ethics Committee after a dispute has been litigated or after a professional review body has rendered its decision if the matter directly relates to APSA and otherwise satisfies the Preliminary Review criteria (set forth below), or through the member revocation policy discussed below.

Preliminary Review

Once a complaint or grievance is received, the APSA Executive Director and relevant staff member will review the report and will inform the Ethics Committee Chair of the complaint or grievance. After determining whether there exists any conflicts of interest, the Executive Director will ask the Committee chair or committee member representative, to conduct a preliminary investigation. The Executive Director will also name a subcommittee of committee members to assist the chair or committee representative in conducing the preliminary review.

During the preliminary review period, the Committee chair and the sub committee will conduct a preliminary review of the complaint/grievance to determine if the committee, in its discretion, should formally investigate or take up the case based upon a number of factors, including but not limited to the following two criteria:

- *Does the complaint or grievance pertain to or have some direct relationship to an APSA meeting, conference, workshop or entity?*

- *Is the complaint or grievance an issue or matter for which the association can reasonably seek meaningful remedy for the parties involved once an investigation is completed? (Does the association have enforcement power regarding remedies or sanctions?).*

Upon completion of the preliminary review, the Chair of the Ethics Committee or Committee Member Representative will report the preliminary findings and recommendations to the Executive Director. Upon review of the preliminary review findings and recommendations, the Executive Director will determine whether a full investigation is warranted. If a full investigation is warranted, the Executive Director

will appoint a Special Representative (who may be the Committee chair, a Committee member, or third-party investigator) and a subcommittee having the judgment, objectivity and sensitivity to conduct a comprehensive and full fact-finding investigation into the case.

A Special Representative always approaches a dispute as a fact-finder and mediator, not as an advocate for either side.

Investigation

In the event that a fact-finding investigation is deemed necessary, political scientists and departments of political science, and any other organizations where political scientists work, are obligated to respond to the request for information by the Ethics Committee and its representatives. During the investigation, the Special Representative, Sub-Committee, and Ethics Committee do not publicize their involvement, and the information received is treated confidentially to the maximum extent practical. In turn, it is the professional obligation of all parties and any witnesses to a dispute to keep the process confidential until its conclusion and not to interfere with the process or any witnesses. At the completion of the investigation, the Special Representative will prepare a report containing its findings and any recommendations to submit to the Executive Director. The Committee can make recommendations, however, it may not censure or sanction individuals. Although it does not censure or sanction individuals, departments or institutions, it may recommend these actions to the Executive Committee

After review by the Executive Director, the report is then shared with the full Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee will review the report and make any necessary inquiries of the Special Representative. Once all inquiries have been satisfactorily addressed, the Ethics Committee is asked to accept or reject the report.

If the Ethics Committee approves the report, then the report is formally submitted to the Executive Director and relevant staff. The Executive Director will review the report and make any necessary inquiries of the Special Representative or Committee Chair.

If the Ethics Committee rejects the report, it will provide the reasoning behind its decision to the Special Representative. The Special Representative and the subcommittee will address the concerns of the Ethics Committee as appropriate and then resubmit the report to the Ethics Committee in a timely fashion. At which time, the Ethics Committee will vote to accept or reject the report.

The Special Representative or Ethics Committee Chair will then submit the report and the committee’s decision to the Executive Director and relevant APSA staff, who will review the report and prepare it for submission to the APSA Executive Committee. The Executive Committee, as delegated by the Council, will review the report and then accept or reject it. The Executive Committee may also issue sanctions against the individual(s) named in the complaint or refer the matter to the APSA Council for the issuance of sanctions, as appropriate.

Informal advice

In the event that an individual submits a grievance, complaint, or report regarding an incident that does not have a direct relationship to an APSA meeting, conference, workshop or entity, but instead occurs within another entity's jurisdiction, the Ethics Committee does not generally investigate the report. Instead, the committee may decide to offer informal advice and suggestions for alternative venues to which the individual should consider bringing their allegation.

The Committee may also, at is discretion, provide guidance and mentoring to individuals who encounter difficult situations. It may also propose or recommend new policies to the association if the problematic issue is likely to recur.

Situations may arise when the Committee will advise the complainant that the best course is to pursue the matter through the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) or to adopt another course of action.

B. Reporting Grievances

How to submit a grievance

There are two ways to submit a grievance or complaint regarding a possible violation of professional ethics, or an alleged incident of harassment, discrimination, or misconduct to the APSA Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms:

1. **Email ethics@apsanet.org**

2. Submit a report via the APSA EthicsPoint incident reporting online platform or telephone hotline.

What is EthicsPoint? *EthicsPoint is a 24/7 comprehensive and confidential reporting tool created by NAVEX to assist APSA with managing reports of harassment (including sexual harassment) from meeting, conference, and workshop attendees, and individuals with professional ethics grievances, and general ethics inquiries, related to an APSA entity or event, from APSA members and non-members. EthicsPoint is also be used to address professional conduct and ethics grievances and complaints submitted by APSA meeting, conference and workshop attendees. Reports can be via telephone hotline, toll free 1-844-687-6579 or online using the direct link: https://apsanet.ethicspoint.com.*

Grievance reports or complaints submitted to the aforementioned APSA EthicsPoint online reporting form, the hotline, or the email address may be submitted anonymously or by identifying oneself. Please note: there may be limitations on the types of review and post-report actions that can be applied to anonymous reports.

How to Report a Sexual Harassment Complaint or Grievance at the APSA Annual Meeting or another APSA Event

The following guidance and procedure is excerpted from the "APSA FINAL PROCEDURES FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT PROVISIONS OF THE APSA ANTI-HARASSMENT POLICY"[16]

"There are two possible places to start for those who believe they have experienced sexual harassment or have concerns about violations of the sexual harassment provisions of the APSA anti-harassment policy [at an APSA meeting, event or workshop]. 1. The first is the Ombuds of the APSA, who is available for confidential consultation about a wide range of concerns, including but not limited to sexual harassment. 2. The second is the Sexual Harassment Intake Advisor (IA) [an APSA staff member who is] the point of first contact if you are considering pursuing the options the APSA offers for reporting and responding to incidents of sexual harassment."

"The Ombuds plays no role in APSA's sexual harassment procedures, but can provide you with invaluable guidance about what constitutes sexual harassment; help explain APSA options for reporting sexual harassment; and outline other avenues for pursuing such a complaint, such as state or local government, human rights or law enforcement agencies, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. (along with the deadlines for filing complaints with these agencies). The Ombuds cannot provide legal advice, but the Ombuds can offer support and guidance even if you elect to pursue no procedures whatsoever."

"It is strongly recommended that you first consult with the Ombuds for clarification about the entire range of your options. This consultation is confidential and the details of such a conversation will not be reported to any administrator, officer, or committee of the APSA, except as required by law. At all times, the role of the Ombuds is entirely independent of any sexual harassment complaint you may decide to pursue through the following APSA procedures."

Reports regarding sexual harassment at an APSA Annual Meeting, conference workshop or event can also be made by emailing ethics@apsanet.org or submission to APSA EthicsPoint online form or telephone hotline (as described in Section I. 8 above.

Additional information on the APSA Annual Meetings Ombuds and the APSA Intake Advisor can be found the appendix. To read more on submitting a sexual harassment complaint or grievance, or to review the annual meeting code of conduct and policies and procedures for violations of the anti-sexual harassment policy, visit the APSA's website (https://www.apsanet.org/divresources/policyprocedures).

A. **Procedures Involving Human Rights of Scholars in Other Countries**

[16] Online reference for the *APSA FINAL PROCEDURES FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT PROVISIONS OF THE APSA ANTI-HARASSMENT POLICY*. (Section I, p. 1). https://www.apsanet.org/Portals/54/diversity%20and%20inclusion%20prgms/sexual%20harassment%20resources/FINAL%20Sexual%20Harass.%20Procedures%20Amended%205_7_18.pdf?ver=2018-05-07-093316-170

According to guidelines established in 1982, the Ethics Committee may become involved in cases involving the protection of the human rights of political scientists in other countries brought to its attention by reputable sources. All requests for action are first cross-checked (to the best of our ability) through the Clearinghouse on Science and Human Rights of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Scholars at Risk, and/or the Academic Freedom Committees of parallel professional organizations (such as ISA, LASA, and MESA). Inquiries of those in the field and review of social media may also be used to cross-check or gather information. In particularly sensitive cases, the committee may also consult with scholars' home department or institution, as well as seek out other individuals who may have information on the matter. This will be done taking the utmost care not to jeopardize the wellbeing of the scholars.

The association will respond to cases of human rights violations involving scholars whose fields correspond to those subsumed under the term "political science".

Given the limited time and resources of the Committee, it may consider only what appear to be the most egregious cases of human rights violations that constitute threats to life or fundamental freedoms due to the peaceful exercise of scholarship, academic responsibilities, expression, or assembly. These protected freedoms are stated in the main United Nations human rights instruments including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the accompanying International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention Against Torture, the Refugee Convention, and the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders, inter alia.

The procedure the Committee follows in human rights cases is to write a letter of inquiry to the appropriate authorities and to follow up this letter with subsequent letters, calls and other forms of advocacy, if appropriate. Any committee action should be in keeping with APSA Advocacy Guidelines.

Other activities such as visits to embassies and site visits may also be considered by the Committee, after consultation with the Executive Director or relevant APSA staff. Human rights cases will be publicized through communications to the membership (e.g., online).

V. MEMBER REVOCATION POLICY

The following guidance and procedure is excerpted from the APSA Member Revocation Policy.[17]

"Members of the association, participants in the APSA Annual Meeting and the Teaching and Learning Conference, and individuals who hold association leadership positions (Council, Committees, and Fellowship and award/review committees) are expected to meet the commonly held standards of professional ethics and scientific integrity. In the rare case that an

[17] APSA Member Revocation Policy. https://www.apsanet.org/Portals/54/membership/APSA%20Member%20Revocation%20Policy_Web%20Version%20_%20Final.pdf?ver=lYQfc0DNy8acqj63kbRagA%3d%3d

APSA member, a meeting or conference attendee, or an individual in a leadership position no longer meets this expectation, as established through outside investigative proceedings and determinations, the APSA member revocation policy can be used to request revocation of an individual's APSA membership, meeting participation privileges, and/or their association leadership positions and privileges."

To learn more about the APSA Member Revocation Policy, visit: https://www.apsanet.org/ABOUT/Governance/Member-Revocation-Policy.

VI. NOTIFICATION

Colleges and Universities

1. Under extraordinary circumstances, colleges and universities are encouraged to notify APSA about egregious misconduct in departments of Political Science, Public Affairs, International Studies, American Studies, and any other unit likely to house political scientists. If a faculty member has, after a grievance has been filed and evaluated, been placed on leave at the university where the individual has an appointment, has had emeritus/a status rescinded, ordered not to appear on campus, or other serious sanctions, the Chair of the Political Science, Government, or Public Affairs, or other department should inform the Chair of the APSA Ethics Committee promptly, generally within two weeks. This will almost always be treated as a confidential matter until an APSA review process is undertaken or unless the conduct in question involves an imminent threat to the life or well-being of the individual or others.

APSA Members

1. After a college or university has completed its appeal process and rendered a final decision, members of APSA can submit a request for review to determine whether the faculty member should have APSA membership revoked or be subject to other sanctions. Please see the APSA member revocation policy here: https://www.apsanet.org/ABOUT/Governance/Member-Revocation-Policy.
2. The requestor will be notified of the Council's decision, independent of the decision regarding a public announcement.

APSA

1. If an APSA member has had their membership, annual meeting privileges and/or APSA leadership privileges revoked as per the APSA Member Revocation Policy, the policy states that the APSA Executive Office and APSA President may determine, in their sole and exclusive discretion, whether there should be an announcement or publication of the decision to revoke the Individual's membership status, annual meeting or teaching and learning conference participation privileges, or leadership positions and privileges.

    a. In such circumstances, the APSA Executive Office and APSA President may decide whether the background factors or bases for the revocation will be included in the announcement.

VII. Appendix

A. Introduction to the Statement on Professional Ethics of the AAUP

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The *Statement on Professional Ethics* which follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to ensure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning the propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee B, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the *1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, or the applicable provisions of the Association's *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

B. APSA Ombuds

The APSA Ombuds resource is available onsite at the APSA annual meeting and other major meetings and conferences of the association. The role of the Ombuds is as follows:

1. confidentially hear and discuss concerns with meeting attendees;
2. provide you with valuable guidance and resources for understanding what constitutes sexual harassment and other forms of harassment;
3. provide information on, and help explain, options for reporting sexual harassment to APSA;
4. outline other avenues and information for pursuing such a complaint; and
5. offer support and guidance even if you elect to pursue no complaint procedures or reporting whatsoever.

Please note: The APSA Meetings Ombuds plays no formal role in APSA's sexual harassment report or investigation procedures or in the filing of ethics complaints. The Ombuds does not provide legal advice and is not authorized to be an office of notice for APSA. The APSA ombuds resource adheres to the International Ombuds Code of Ethics and Standards detailed below. Individuals wishing to file individual grievances should do so via email to ethics@apsanet.org or through APSA EthicsPoint, as explained above, or

speak to the APSA Sexual Harassment Intake Adviser or the Chair of the Sexual Harassment Committee.

C. The Ombuds Code of Ethics and Standards

The following code is the International Ombudsman Association Code of Ethics.

Preamble

The International Ombudsman Association (IOA) is dedicated to excellence in the practice of Ombuds work. The IOA Code of Ethics provides a common set of professional ethical principles to which members adhere in their organizational Ombuds practice. Based on the traditions and values of Ombuds practice, the Code of Ethics reflects a commitment to promote ethical conduct in the performance of the Ombuds role and to maintain the integrity of the Ombuds profession.

The Ombuds shall be truthful and act with integrity, shall foster respect for all members of the organizations they serve, and shall promote procedural fairness in the content and administration of those organizations' practices, processes, and policies.

Ethical Principles

- *Independence*
  The Ombuds is independent in structure, function, and appearance to the highest degree possible within the organization.

- *Neutrality and Impartiality*
  The Ombuds, as a designated neutral resource, remains unaligned and impartial. The Ombuds does not engage in any situation which could create a conflict of interest.
- *Confidentiality*
  The Ombuds holds all communications with those seeking assistance in strict confidence, and does not disclose confidential communications unless given permission to do so. The only exception to this privilege of confidentiality is where there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm.

- *Informality*
  The Ombuds, as an informal resource, does not participate in any formal adjudicative or administrative procedure related to concerns brought to his/her attention.

For more information on the International Ombudsman Association Code of Ethics, please visit: http://www.ombudsassociation.org/

D. APSA Intake Advisor

The following guidance and procedure is excerpted from the "APSA FINAL PROCEDURES FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT PROVISIONS OF THE APSA ANTI-HARASSMENT POLICY"[18]

"If you are an attendee of the APSA Annual Meeting and Exhibition or of an APSA workshop or conference; if you believe you have experienced sexual harassment or have concerns about violations of the sexual harassment provisions of the APSA anti-harassment policy; and you want advice about whether to pursue one of APSA's options for reporting and responding to the incident, please contact the Sexual Harassment Intake Advisor (hereafter IA). The IA is a staff member trained in support and advising in relation to experiences of sexual harassment, and can provide detailed information about the options for pursuing a sexual harassment complaint within the procedures of APSA. The IA cannot provide legal advice, but can outline alternative venues for pursuing such a complaint, as needed. Should you decide to pursue one of APSA's two options, the IA can also guide and support you throughout the process, but contacting and meeting with the IA does not obligate you to report a sexual harassment incident through these APSA procedures."

E. APSA RESPECT

The APSA RESPECT Campaign encourages "professional respect" by and towards all political scientists, APSA members, and APSA annual meeting attendees and participants at all times. https://connect.apsanet.org/respect/. Respect stands for *Respectful, Equitable, Safe, Professional, and Ethical Conduct Towards All.*



[18] Online reference for the *APSA FINAL PROCEDURES FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT PROVISIONS OF THE APSA ANTI-HARASSMENT POLICY* https://www.apsanet.org/Portals/54/diversity%20and%20inclusion%20prgms/sexual%20harassment%20resources/FINAL%20Sexual%20Harass.%20Procedures%20Amended%205_7_18.pdf?ver=2018-05-07-093316-170