

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I... I am ready. Uh, let me share my screen. Can everyone see my screen? Is that a yes or no? Okay. Sounds good. Uh, and I'll try to keep within the allotted time. Um, hopefully I have a bunch of... too many slides but, um, I'm hoping to go maybe 20 minutes at most and then we can have some time for questions and conversation.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Uh, as Paula said uh, our group focused on promotion [inaudible] associate and full professor. I want to thank Paula for the opportunity to, you know, work with or for her. It was an honor, but it was also really a joy to tap colleagues and ask them to participate in this, all of these people are our friends. I guess that's how you get people in working groups. And every, you know, these are exceptional scholars with deep insight and they all said yes and I'm deeply appreciative. And just to highlight one of the issues about promotion, uh, Matthew Nelson was a postdoc, um, on a project that I was working on and he is now an assistant professor at the University of Miami. So he said he learned a lot in terms of his negotiations, uh, when he became an assistant professor.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Just briefly: our charge. So our charge was... we were kind of tasked with exploring what we call, kind of, two important moments in a faculty member's career: hopefully their promotion to, uh, associate professor from assistant professor with tenure, right, and then their promotion to full professor. And we were especially focused on, as we say here, the ways in which categories, identities, positionalities of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and institution-type, right, shape someone's ability to, we might say, move smoothly through the ranks. And instead, what we find of course is that there are kind of these leaky pipelines along the process that disproportionately impact certain, uh, certain groups and certain people.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: So we, uh, adopted a mixed methodological approach to kind of examine these topics and let me just say a little bit about the data projects and I'll say more about the quantitative analysis in a moment. Part of this, uh, the reason we adapted these two approaches has to do with the kind of limited nature of the data that was available through APSA. And both Kim and Steve have heard me say this before, and I think they're attentive to this, which is, we just need a different type of data project and you'll hear that in the recommendations to really get a sense of how people are progressing, right. So cross-sectional data is great, but it doesn't really tell us how someone who's starting as an assistant professor when they end up being promoted and what their experience was. So, we need longitudinal data and we would argue we also need really kind of fine qualitative analysis so we can hear the kind of layered, nuance experiences of people's promotion, um, journeys we might call them.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: So we try to attack this by really kind of generating the most exploratory, right, this is not representative data in many ways, but exploratory data so that we could begin to identify possible questions and trends that a more extensive data set might answer, right. So for the quantitative methodology, since there was... were no kind of longitudinal panels that we could, um tab, we tried to become creative and we use what is the way back machine, right. The archiving of websites, um, since I think maybe 1996 or possibly earlier.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: What we did was we generated a list of 50 educational institutions, 21 of the largest MA and PhD granting institutions that are part of the P-WAM dashboard, and then an additional 29 institutions that were randomly selected from a list. It says it here, from our two institutions liberal arts colleges, minority serving institutions, and community colleges. Um, we then went to those political science departments, right, and we basically scraped all of the individuals in 2010 who were listed and then followed them over the next 10 years to see if they were promoted, when they were promoted, if they left an institution, uh, and things of that sort.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Now I'll show you the data: we ended up with 100... [inaudible] 100, 602 individuals in the data set, right. Um, and it says here again that we use kind of publicly available CV's, personal websites, LinkedIn pages. So in a kind of weird way we were stalkers of these individuals, but only for a good reason. Um, and we can show you the data from that.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I just want to point out and some of the sampling challenges again, right, that lots of community colleges don't have distinct political science departments and so, there were no websites. Um, and some of these schools that we targeted, liberal arts, community colleges, minority serving have much smaller and fewer faculty and thus, faculty of color so those numbers are especially small. Um, and they're... you know... there are just all kinds of other issues for example like being able to code for sexuality. We could code for if someone studies sexuality, but often it was incomplete information that would allow us to say this person, uh, identifies as gay or lesbian or trans or something like that. So again, as the... as APSA builds out a different type of data set, we'll want to be attentive to those issues.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: All right, so very quickly that's what the demographics of our kind of way-back sample looked like and we compared it to the APSA 21st century report. Um, and generally you know it looked similar we might say. And you all should stop me if you want, if you have questions, but we'll hopefully have some time at the end to talk about this. Just really quickly so that you can see areas of study, we did make sure that we had some people, right, only 81, but 13 percent of those who studied race and those who studied gender, as well as sexuality.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Uh, also there was a public, private analysis that we tried to do to see if there were differences in the kind of journey to promotion for those individuals at public institutions versus those at private, and I'll point out some of that data. And then R1, R2, liberal arts, community colleges, and minority-serving institutions. Alright.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: So, just so you know, the first... kind of, I wouldn't even say analysis, right, the the bar chart I'm going to show you, uh, will look at career paths. Did someone leave the academy? Did they move to a new institution? Did they move to a new department in the same institution? Um, and did

they just stay at the same institution and department, right? Um, and then we're gonna show some data on promotion paths, right. How many people were not promoted, right? Again, just trying to highlight some of the big trends that [inaudible] in this very exploratory data.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Um, were they... did they move from a non-tenure track position to an assistant position and again, because we [inaudible] action in 2010 and we have a list of where everyone was at in 2010 when we traveled over time to 2020, we can see did they move from associate to associate... um, to assistant to associate with tenure, right. So we're able to look at how they're, at least their career, their promotion paths progressed over this time period.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Um, and I'm just going to point out that analysis from the 2009 APSA survey demonstrates that men of color are nearly 50 percent less likely than White men to be promoted to associate professor and you're going to see this in our [inaudible] also. So again, I think we're finding, um, many of the same insights that should be troubling to all of us. All right, so I'm sure my colleagues who are on the panel are gonna have much prettier slides than I do. I apologize... like yucky colors, it's not like animated, but okay the basic data.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: So I think the thing that's kind of most alarming... most alarming for our working group was the salmon pink color, right, "Left Academia". And here we find that about 24 percent of our Black respondents or the Black individuals, Black scholars that we were tracing, um, left the academy. Now again, because we are just generating data from CV's and websites, we don't know why they left the academy, but that number is, you know, twice that of White scholars that we were following. And for us, it just signals a trend or a finding that APSA has to dive into with better data, right. Are people being pushed out of the academy? Are they deciding to exit because they have better opportunities? Are they finding that their departments are kind of hostile to the work that they want to do? Don't know, but in fact, we think the the number is troubling.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: And then when we break it down by both race and gender, right, we find that 30 percent, almost a third of Black men, um, end up leaving the academy, right. So that has to be a question that we want to answer why. What is happening to Black man and, I would argue, to Black women, um, that are kind of pushing them, and I'm saying push, they're leaving the academy, um. One quick question that... um, so when we look at this just to see if in fact there's a statistically significant difference, we do see that if we look at the proportion of Whites versus Blacks leaving the academy that that is statistically significant.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Alright, now the question about kind of paths to promotion or promotion paths. Again, if you look at the kind of pink, salmon color, "Not Promoted", um, what we see is that 42 percent of Black people that... Black scholars that we were following were not promoted during this tenure period. And 34... 38 percent of Latinx, um, scholars were not promoted. The other thing is if you look at

assistant to associate with tenure, so that's a kind of a different kind of green, not the green, but I don't know... but again, bad color choices, but um.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: It's that, you know, it looks generally about 27 percent of blacks, so if you think about, uh... no no no, wait, what was the one I wanted to show you? ...Assistant, yes, without tenure. It was really more of a non-promotion, but what I wanted to say is assistant to associate with tenure, the numbers generally look similar to other groups, right. It is, um, associate to full where we see smaller numbers, um, this blue here for African Americans in particular.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Again, if we break it down by race and gender, it's... again it's not easy. Um, if you look at those who were not promoted, uh, among both Black men and Black women we're in the 40 percent, right. Um, among Latinx men, 42 percent. Again, you know, there are... you know I was surprised that 27 percent of Asian women are not promoted or 29 percent of White women in our sample are not promoted. Um, but the numbers for, um, African American men and women are substantially larger and again, suggest to us that there has to be an investigation of what is going on.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I'll also point out if you look again at associate to full where people promoted from associate and, you know, they were at the associate status in 2010 were they promoted to full? Uh, for Black women, only 13 percent. So we want to know what's going on there. Alright, uh, time to promotion by gender, this says propor... proportion leaving the academy, that's wrong. It's supposed to be time to promotion and the two areas where in fact we see statistically significant differences is that assistant to associate, there's a year added on for women and almost a year and a half or a little over a year and a half for women from associate to full. And they're... in the report we talk about all the kind of many reasons that that might exist. I'm sure, uh, folks in the room can... can begin to list out the possibilities of why we see those differences.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Just really quickly, um, there's a significant difference in terms of average years to promotion for assistant to associate with private... individuals at private institutions having an additional year and then assistant to full, which is rare, right um, being much... a much longer process at, um, private institutions. Alright. So those were just some of the quantitative analyses and I want to move quickly through the qualitative methodology. It was much smaller, um, it was intentional kind of sampling if we would say that. There was a focus group and a series of individual interviews, as well as written reflections that we asked a small group of people to engage in. I just want to go through the highlights of the themes of the qualitative. One was that the promotion processes were overwhelmingly discussed in negative terms. And maybe no one is surprised at that, but you could imagine, uh, a tenure process or promotion process where people felt nervous but informed and cared for during the process. That was not a part of the, uh, information that we received from the qualitative, uh, interviews and focus groups.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: And I... I love this idea of, "I had 28 passive aggressive bosses," right. "...barely paying attention to anything except their own petty grievances." Um, and this is someone who was denied tenure, but felt like no one really cared about the tenure process for him. Instead it was really kind of trying to get back at the chair through a vote on... on his tenure process. Uh, the second was that formal and informal mentorship are critical. We heard it over and over again, um, and I think the other thing that we heard was that there were non-traditional ways in which mentoring happened that a lot of individuals talked about, um, the important role of grad school mentors and grad school colleagues that could... who had gone through the tenure process who could tell folks of what was in store for them.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: So it wasn't necessarily individuals in their own department. Um, the third theme of the, uh, qualitative work was that joint appointments were enriching, but they doubled the workloads and made it difficult to pursue research. And so, I want to be clear about what we heard. We heard people say I really appreciate the different perspectives I get in terms of my thinking through my research, but there is no agreement between my chairs, right, about my service. And so it might be beneficial at one level, but it really does feel like it is doubling my workload and making it almost [inaudible].

Dr. Cathy Cohen: So I don't think the idea is to stop with joint appointments as we'll say in the recommendations, but in fact to detail how service will be handled by those that have joint appointments. Okay. Um, and then you know, Paula talked about this, also that marginalized areas of study, and we're calling them marginalized areas of study, right, not... not incomplete areas of study, but areas such as race, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality, um, can shape trajeer... uh... shape career trajectories, right. Um, and that in certain departments, for example, those are considered niche areas, they're considered as Paula said, "Me-search". They are, um, not thought of as rigorous, um, and so what does it mean to say that this is the work I want to do? One of the things we also heard from people and we noted in the report is that, uh, departments will say the expectation for tenure is that you publish in the top three journals and we know that, at least in the past, the top three journals were much less likely, right, to include articles on race, ethnicity, uh, sexuality. Uh, and so what does it mean to be committed to doing that work and then have a tenure, uh, expectation of publishing in those journals.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Alright. Let me just get quickly to the recommendations and then we can chat. Um, the number one recommendation if you... is for APSA, really, and it is about a data project. Um, you know, we recommend a large, sustained quantitative and qualitative longitudinal data project that will actually be able to answer some of the questions that we, um, I guess identified through our data, right. Are Black men leaving the profession at much higher rates and why? Are they choosing to leave or are they being pushed out and what is, you know, what does the environment feel like for them? Why are Black women less likely than other groups possibly to be promoted from associate to full? What are the obstacles, um, that they face?

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Uh, the other thing that we say is that a longitudinal data project must include adequate measures of the complexity of identities. So how do we think about the expansive nature of gender, of sexuality, right, of ethnicity? How do we construct, and think about, and identify race? And how do we have enough individuals that we have those, uh, identities intersecting so that the cells are not too small? And that we really have to be more intentional about LGBTQ+ identified scholars, including, um, both those scholars and their issues in the data that we collect.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Alright, mentoring. Um, we have some ideas about an expansive way of thinking about mentoring, right. That we often think about assigning colleagues, often senior colleagues to junior... junior faculty, that is one way I guess of mentoring. I think many of us who've been in institutions long enough know that not all of our colleagues should be mentoring. Um, [laughs].

Dr. Cathy Cohen: The danger to some people to have certain people as mentors. Are there other ways we can think about mentoring? Can we identify funds to allow scholars of color, for example, to attend identity-based conferences and working groups where they have articulated to us they feel seen and embraced? Can we facilitate a convening of junior faculty in departments and across departments to share information about the promotion process? Um, and can mentoring occur across institutions, right? So if in fact I don't have experts in my working area in my department or maybe even at my university, is there money to bring in kind of scholars from other institutions? They might be locally, um uh, geographically in proximity, to... to help with some of the mentoring and of course, providing those scholars... those mentors with some incentive and compensation. Alright, so we just have to think differently about mentoring.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Um, recommendation three is about promotion metrics, transparency, and communication. And here it's just that, you know, if we take something basic like we know that there is bias in teaching a value. We've know that now for 20 years and I don't know a department that doesn't still include teaching evaluations, including at the UFC even though I keep screaming about this. Uh, as part of the teaching... as part of the tenure evaluation, right, at least at UFC, we now have a footnote that says we know that these can be biased, but people still rely on them. So we're suggesting that departments engage in a kind of equity evaluation of their tenure process. Just take a look at the tenure process and say, are there parts of the process where we are introducing bias, um, and systematically disadvantaging certain faculty over others?

Dr. Cathy Cohen: And it, you know, the tenure... I mean the teaching evaluations... it's one area it might be, again, this idea about which journals are the right journals, but some, uh, analysis and evaluation should go on. And then we say that they should post their equity evaluations on the departmental websites for transparency. Um, that they should have meetings with individual and cohort meetings with junior faculty. Um, and when possible, put things in writing so that younger scholars have, um, kind of written analysis and written, uh, statements and notes about what the tenure process is meant to be.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Okay, finally. Recommendation four is really about departmental culture and practices, um, and these are, I think, at times much more difficult. We know that there are all kinds of informal service that scholars, uh, of color, women, uh, queer scholars engage in. Is there a way to make that more transparent? And is there a way again to... for these scholars to receive, for example, course load reductions that offset the time that they're spending on committees, advising additional students? And often, you know, we say well we're going to take, um, we're gonna have a sense of the advising that's happening in the department. We know that faculty of color are often advising students outside of their department. So how do we make that, um, visible?

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Um, you know, make the expectations regarding joint appointments more transparent, I talked about that. Conduct a climate evaluation to monitor and track resource allocation. Here we mean of course, you know, how do you feel about, you know, the the environment in the in the department, but also for example, if you take look at the American Workshop, who's coming to the American Workshop? How are those resources being spent and do they extend to scholars who are studying race, ethnicity, politics, sexuality, things of that sort? Um, and again the last thing is to establish an equity and inclusion committee. Not comprised of folks of color, right. But that says that the department is thinking about these issues and thinking about them both at the departmental level, but also, um, through the subfields where we are always kind of evaluating our work through a lens of equity and inclusion.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Alright. I think... yes! That's it and we got, what? Two minutes... two minutes for questions. Sorry, it was too many slides. Thank you. Questions, comments, concerns? Lester, I know you got something to say. [laughter]

Audience Member: Yeah I do, uh.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Robbie too?

Audience Member: He's supposed to be here, um. This is kind of a different question. Do you... do you have a sense of how many people may not be leaving the, uh, the academy but actually leaving the discipline? You know, so a number of people that you've actually trained as political scientists they're not in political science anymore. Now that's a different set of... that's a different set of questions, which is actually kind of related.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Right. You know, um, so in my own experiences, I've only had couple of students decide to leave, well actually leave the department. So I've had a few students, for example, who are

doing work on gender take positions in gender and women's studies or I just recently had a student who had lots of offers, but decided to go into a sociology department. Some of that is about, um, believing that those other kind of spots, right, those other departments or programs are more supportive of the work of race or, you know, the study of race, the study of gender, than a political science department would be. Um, so yeah I have seen students that I've trained, not a lot of them, right um, decide to take positions in other departments. I think most of the students I've trained feel like I'm gonna... I'm gonna do the work I wanna do in political science and believe in fact that the discipline is a little more open, um, to the work they want to do. I pulled up this slide because I was trying to think about moved to a new institution or moved to a new department. Moved to a new institution could be for any number of reasons, but you know, very few people in again the sample we constructed were moving to new departments in the same institution. So, yeah.

Audience Member: Oh and then a second... a second question, um, I'm... I'm not... I feel a little bit surprised at the the gendered differences within, uh, within Black populations that is, uh um, it seems that I've seen a lot fewer Black men just in the discipline, um but, I don't know if I would have expected to see far more of them leaving than Black women.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Right, um. Now here's the thing Lester, you and I have been trained and worked primarily at what are considered to be elite institutions, right. This is a much broader swath of individuals at differently positioned institutions and so it could be again we don't know, right, and I guess we could do this analysis. Are people... are Black men leaving primarily from community colleges or R2s versus R1s? And I think that's a place where we could probably look at institutional type and see if there are specific types of trends. But again, I think the data is meant to just raise these questions and to say okay we have to have... the discipline has to commit to being able to answer questions about... right, promotion. I mean that is at some level, right, we are knowledge producers you know that is the work we do, but we do it in a system where people are structured to get promotion. If we can't answer questions about who's getting promoted and the conditions under which they're being promoted, I think we are, um, doing a disservice to kind of shaping the discipline in the future.

Audience Member: Cathy, I appreciate the work you've [inaudible] that sounds like it was very valuable. I am concerned... the number of Black faculty... [inaudible] Can you hear me?

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I can kind of... I can hear parts. Um, I heard the part where you said we did a good job and then you dropped out when you said...

Audience Member: Okay, so where is the microphone?

Audience Member: Right here.



Audience Member: I appreciate the work [inaudible] you did ... faculty populations..." [inaudible] It's really a question about data collection. I totally support this idea that we need good data. As the chair I worry... [inaudible] So do you think, how are we doing to do this well? Do you suggest that we get money? Is APSA going to put money behind a big data collection project?

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Yes, yes. I'm suggesting that APSA... [laughter]

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Yes, sorry Steve. That is exactly... I mean, I feel like maybe Steve should answer this question. Which is I think there has to be a massive data collection project in the discipline, not just members, right um, and I know that becomes more difficult but that might involve kind of using departments as your sampling unit. Um, but to answer these questions with big ends I mean I would say, at some level ignore our data because the n's are too small other than to say these are kind of interesting and concerning trends. Let's see if that is replicated in a kind of real data project, um, which this is not.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: But... and and I will say when we started this, our intention was to just use APSA data and then there wasn't APSA data that we could answer these questions with. So this is not to say that APSA is bad you know I'm a political scientist, I believe in APSA, um, but it is to say this is a kind of glaring issue that has to be addressed. I'm wondering Steve wants to say anything. Sorry, Steve, to put you on the...

Steve Smith: Well, I I think that... I certainly support the idea that we need better data. So I'm... I, you know, as you said you and I corresponded about this and I know you corresponded extensively with [name] about it, so we certainly need better data about this and I'm certainly very supportive of trying to figure out ways that we can move forward with this. Um, but it... and we have certainly invested more in our [inaudible] capacity here at APSA in recent years so we... we are now have better capacity to move forward with something like this and so, you know, I... I... we look forward to continuing to work with you and Paula and Kim and our research department on how we can do this.

Audience Member: Yeah, I was just, um, agreeing with Steve and thanking Cathy for this important recommendation. Um, I agree we need better data and all my colleagues at the other associations often say they need better data. I think this is not only a political science issue, um, it's a question for more broadly higher education, for organizations that have, uh, members that they need to track. As all of us know, there sometimes is, um, a fear about giving out your information or if you're asked about your personal demographic information on a survey, there are questions why do you want this data? What would you do the data? So it is incumbent upon organizations and associations to explain why we need the data, and how it will be used, and how it will be used to advance the efforts of towards the equity

and inclusion. And I think, Cathy, you referenced earlier the... task force that was done for the leadership of Dianne Pinderhughes, um, 21st century scholars, and so one of the main recommendations for that report was also that we need more data and as a result as students mentioned, we immensely updated our ability to collect membership data. Um, so right now we do have the ability to collect demographic data through the membership forms, um, but I...

Audience Member: ...questions and so, um, I wholeheartedly... I can't hear you, Kim.

Audience Member: ...what we may need to do while we have... [inaudible]

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I don't know if anyone's talking but I can't hear.

Audience Member: ...the presentation I'm... I'm very excited to bring it back to my department but, um, of small n's and data, um...

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I don't know what's going on you're, uh, yeah I hear something you're hitting maybe the microphone...

Audience Member: Now? Okay. [inaudible]

Audience Member: I'm so sorry, I'm so... one I'm so sorry. [inaudible]

Audience Member: Let's try the chat maybe. We have the remotes now so if you wanna try...

Audience Member: I can hear now, yeah. I think... [inaudible]

Audience Member: Can you hear me?

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I can, I think.

Audience Member: Okay, I'll try again. On the issue of small n's and the need for better data, uh, I'm just noticing there's no representation currently on American Indian, Native American, Indigenous scholars. Um, and I always advocate, I mean it's usually the response as well, there's very small n's but I usually advocate on my own campus even if it's zero, to put it on the list. Because that's also an important thing for us to see visually is if it's zero zero zero zero then, rather than just have the category missing.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I... I think you're absolutely right. [echo]

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I hear myself in the room. [echo]

Dr. Cathy Cohen: So yes, I think you're right and I think we're doing this differently we could try to pay attention to those departments and be more intentional in those departments where we think there would be indigenous or native scholars in a political science department. So, for example, if... if we couldn't fund the big big big survey, if we did this just a little differently with much bigger... a much bigger sample let's say thousands of political scientists we'd have to figure out the the sampling, right uh, strategy and, um, stratification but you could even have much bigger numbers for this but it would take a kind of group of scholars to figure all that out. But I feel like you could... you could at least get a mapping of what the discipline looks like outside of APSA membership just using the methodology we use with these 602.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Again, it won't tell us why people left or why people, you know, why it took longer to be promoted, but um we could be again innovative and use all of those individuals because they're online and then contact them specifically which we thought about doing and... and providing those individuals with a survey. So I just feel like there are ways to get better data before we even get the big data set that hopefully, is NSF in the room? That NSF will pay for.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Can anyone hear me? Hello?

Audience Member: Hi Cathy. Yeah, they could hear you, um, I had to mute the uh their microphone for a bit just to make sure you couldn't hear your echo while you were responding. Uh, whenever you guys have the time to, um unmute, uh, from their ad app to headquarters um everything should be back to normal.

Audience Member: Um, I'm... great. Okay.

Audience Member: Don't worry we got you.

Audience Member: All right, can you...

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I think I'm over my time.

[inaudible]

Audience Member: We're okay. Cathy, Cathy can you hear me okay? Can you hear me?

Dr. Cathy Cohen: I can. Yes, yes.

Audience Member: What I was going to say is that particularly in the last year we have found a big surge in requests for data from departments and... and a lot of departments are interested in getting more data for many of the same reasons that you're articulating, but they want to benchmark themselves against other departments and... and we're finding that a big surge in data so I mean it's something that's paramount on our mind these days because, again, the demand is really escalated substantially in the last... particularly in the last year, so.

Audience Member: Um. [inaudible]

Audience Member: I'm just curious, there was mention of lower response rates. Like what is the typical response rate for an APSA sponsored survey that is sent out?

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Uh, we don't have our research team here, but I believe it's between 30 and 40 percent. Um, we've seen that, uh, I'll just kind of preface it or you know contextualize it by... by saying depending on when the survey goes out, so if it's a spring survey or a summer survey or a fall survey we do see varying response rates. Um, the departmental surveys go to departments chairs, but because of the increasing requests for more data on more metrics within each department the surveys have gotten longer. So then you'll see, um, fatigue, people not really being able to complete it, or in some cases the chair may not have all the information you know themselves they send it to their colleagues or to the administrative person in their department, which we encourage because that person may have all the data. So it is a complex endeavor when we send out a departmental survey we also do surveys on placements and so in that sense you'll see the same thing where we're asking a lot of information. So,

how many people did you have out on placement? Um, what were the demographic... what is the demographic makeup of those on placements? So it might also be that we need to prepare departments a little better in terms of what we will be asking of them, where they can find this data, encouraging them to talk to their colleagues to get the data. So I don't know if that answers your question but. Alright, one more question on this topic.

[inaudible]

Audience Member: So one thing I was gonna say is this might be... it might be useful for APSA to help coordinate, uh, departments collecting the data because I'm at Maryland, we're in the Big Ten, and so the chairs get together and it's often the case that the chairs are reaching out to each other asking about what the data are in their department. So it seems like instead of APSA making all the effort about doing the survey you could coordinate across departments and across kind of organizations like the Big Ten to say these are the data we would like and the Big Ten chairs can then have a conversation about the data they collected in their department and then it would go up to APSA. So instead of a top-down you know all of the money is coming from APSA it could be kind of like a synergistic back and forth.

[inaudible]

Audience Member: Uh, Howard University just went through a big assessment and I'm blanking on... Mid-Atlantic... Middle States, thank you, thank you! Um, so Middle States might be able to coordinate and then all the other assessing organizations would be another type of way to cross-pollinate for data collections.

Audience Member: Okay, so I think, um, let's thank Cathy again for her presentation.

Audience Member: Thank you.

Audience Member: And there will be more...

Audience Member: Thank you, Cathy.

Audience Member: There will be more time to talk about these issues when we have the breakout sessions and when we join back into the large group.