



A Guide to  
**Professional  
Ethics** in  
**Political Science**

Second Edition, Revised 2008

APSA Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms

**apsa**  
the american  
political science association



# **A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science**

Second Edition, Revised 2008

The American Political Science Association  
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-1206  
[www.apsanet.org](http://www.apsanet.org)

Copyright © American Political Science Association 2008  
ISBN 1-878147-05-6



## Preface

Political scientists share problems in common with practitioners of other scholarly disciplines. They also frequently encounter ethical problems unique to their professional concerns. The purpose of this Guide is to provide an authoritative statement of ethical principles for political scientists, particularly for those newly entering the profession.

In 1967 the APSA created a committee with a broad mandate to explore matters “relevant to the problems of maintaining a high sense of professional standards and responsibilities.” That committee, chaired by Marver H. Bernstein<sup>1</sup>, published its report, “Ethical Problems of Academic Political Scientists,” in the summer 1968 issue of *PS*. An enduring contribution of this committee was the development of a written code consisting of twenty-one rules of professional conduct. The Bernstein Report, as it came to be called, also recommended the appointment of a Standing Committee on Professional Ethics and such a committee was duly created in 1968.

The title, the work, and the jurisdiction of the Standing Committee have been in a process of continuous evolution since that time. Its original jurisdiction, for example, did not include individual cases. The Committee was at first envisaged as an educational body to “protect the rights of political scientists” by the issuance of advisory opinions to guide the professional behavior of political scientists. Twenty-three advisory opinions have been adopted since the Committee was established.

In 1989, after some twenty years of experience, the APSA again created a committee to review the charter of what has come to be called the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms.

The Charter Review Committee, chaired by Lawrence J. R. Herson<sup>2</sup>, has incorporated the advisory opinions into the basic code of the Association, revised and reorganized the statement of ethical principles, and brought other materials up to date. This newly revised Guide remains the charter of the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms, and provides a statement of ethical principles fundamental to the practice of

---

<sup>1</sup>Its formal title was the Committee on Professional Standards and Responsibilities. The other 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.

<sup>2</sup>The other members of the Committee were Gayle Binion, John C. Wahlke, and Nancy H. Zingale. Michael Brintnall served as Committee coordinator.



political scientists.

# Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b> .....	i
<b>I. Grievance Procedures</b> .....	1
A. Individual Grievances.....	1
B. Reporting Grievances .....	2
C. Procedures Involving Human Rights of Scholars in Other Countries.....	3
E. Advisory Opinions .....	3
<b>II. AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics</b> .....	5
<b>III. Principles of Professional Conduct</b> .....	7
A. Freedom and Integrity of Research by Academic Political Scientists.....	7
Principles for Funding Agencies and Universities .....	7
Principles for Individual Researchers .....	8
B. Responsibilities in the Classroom and to Students.....	10
C. Political Activity of Academic Political Scientists .....	11
D. Restrictions on the Use of the APSA Name or Office .....	12
E. Ethics in the Publication Process.....	13
F. Ethics in the Recruitment and Hiring Process.....	15
G. Ethics in Tenure and Promotion.....	18
Joint AAUP and AAC Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure .....	20
H. Principles Governing Research on Human Subjects .....	26
I. Principles Concerning Sexual Harassment.....	27
J. Principles Governing Graduate Scholars, Fellows, Trainees, and Assistants.....	28





**Appendix**..... 29

# **I. Grievance Procedures**

The APSA's Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms is concerned about any ethical problem or personal abuse experienced or caused by political scientists acting in their professional capacity. The primary responsibilities of the Committee fall into three major areas: (1) handling individual grievances and complaints, (2) writing ethical guidelines for the Association, usually in the form of advisory opinions, and (3) helping protect human rights of scholars in other countries.

## **A. Individual Grievances**

Political scientists acting in their professional capacities who face challenges to professional ethics, academic freedom, or human rights. The Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms stands ready to be of assistance, and will respond to all grievances that fall within its jurisdiction. The Committee attempts to give wide latitude to persons and issues coming before it.

The Committee cannot help until it receives a formal request. Political scientists who feel they have been mistreated must take the first step and inform the Committee of the nature of the problem. After the initial contact is made the aggrieved political scientist should be ready to provide the Committee with as much detail and documentation of the alleged abuse as possible.

The Committee encourages political scientists to approach it as soon as they begin to feel that they are the victims of mistreatment, discrimination, lack of due process, or other violations of the ethical standards of the discipline. The Committee is prepared to be of help in what might be termed "anticipatory situations." If mediation and resolution of a problem can be achieved at its inception, so much the better for all concerned.

The Committee always acknowledges and responds to serious allegations of unethical action.

The Committee will not consider disputes in litigation or disputes being reviewed by another professional review body such as the American Association of University Professors. 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> However, APSA does list annually in PS the institutions which have been censured by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT).

Political scientists and departments of political science are obliged to respond to the informational needs of the Ethics Committee and its representatives. During its fact-finding, the Ethics Committee does not publicize its involvement, and the information it receives is treated with complete discretion. In turn, it is the professional obligation of all parties to a dispute to keep the Committee's involvement in strict confidence.

When the occasion warrants, the Committee, after completing its preliminary investigation, will appoint a Special Representative having the judgment and sensitivity necessary to win the confidence of those involved to conduct a comprehensive inquiry into the case.

A Special Representative's first duty is to try to resolve the complaint. A Special Representative always approaches a dispute as a fact-finder and mediator, not as an advocate for either side. Special Representatives compile a thorough report of their investigation for the use of the Committee.

At the completion of the fact-finding done by the Committee and its representatives, the Ethics Committee will take any actions it can to support those individuals it concludes have been treated unfairly by other persons or institutions.

The Committee does not have the power to censure individuals, departments or institutions. It does make every effort to use persuasion and vigorous protest to rectify situations that violate ethical principles.

Inasmuch as the Committee aims for mediation, 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 or to adopt another course of action.

## **B. Reporting Grievances**

A simple and basic part of the process should not be overlooked: the Committee cannot help until it receives a formal request. Political scientists who feel they have been mistreated must take the first step and inform the Committee of the nature of the problem. After the initial contact is made the aggrieved political scientist should be ready to provide the Committee with as much detail and documentation of the alleged abuse as is possible.

The Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms encourages political scientists to approach it as soon as they begin to feel that they are the victims of discriminatory or arbitrary actions. The Committee is prepared to be of help in what might be termed "anticipatory situations." If mediation and the resolution of a problem can be achieved at its inception, so much the better for all concerned.

Political scientists who wish to get in touch with the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms should write or phone its chairperson or the APSA at its Washington D.C headquarters. For contact information for the Committee chair, visit the governance pages of APSA's website ([www.apsanet.org](http://www.apsanet.org)).

## **C. Procedures Involving Human Rights of Scholars in Other Countries.**

According to guidelines established in 1982, the Committee will become involved in cases involving the human rights of scholars in other countries brought to its attention by reputable sources. All requests for action are first cross-checked through the Clearinghouse on Science and Human Rights of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The Committee will respond to cases of human rights violations involving scholars whose fields correspond to those subsumed under the phrase "political science" in the United States. It will also take up cases that do not directly involve political scientists but have broad implications for all social scientists.

Given the limited time and resources of the Committee, it will consider only what appear to be the most egregious cases of human rights violations (the Committee will take up no more than six cases at a time). The standard to be used in making this choice is the International Declaration of Human Rights and the two accompanying covenants.

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, if necessary. Other activities such as visits to embassies and site visits may also be considered by the Committee.

## **D. Advisory Opinions**

Unlike the individual cases that it considers, which must remain confidential, the results of the work of the Committee in constructing ethical standards are published in *PS*. These advisory opinions usually grow out of individual complaints that are received by the Committee. If an individual case appears to be indicative of a larger problem, an advisory opinion is the Committee's means of trying to prevent such occurrences in the future.



## **II. AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics**

As a guide to political scientists teaching and carrying out research in universities and colleges, the American Political Science Association endorses the principles set forth in the "Statement on Professional Ethics" adopted by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The Statement is reprinted here. The AAUP's Introduction to the *Statement* is reprinted in an appendix.

### **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. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. 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 decision 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 any citizen. 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.

## **III. Principles of Professional Conduct**

These principles, adopted by the Council of the American Political Science Association, embody in systematic form the principles established by the Association, the advisory opinions of the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms, and other governing decisions adopted by the Association.

### **A. Freedom and Integrity of Research by Academic Political Scientists**

#### **Principles for Funding Agencies and Universities**

1. Openness concerning material support of research is a basic principle of scholarship.
  - 1.1 In making grants for research, government and non-government sponsors should openly acknowledge research support and require that the grantee indicate in any published research financed by their grants the relevant sources of financial support.
  - 1.2 Where anonymity is requested by a nongovernmental grantor and does not endanger the integrity of research, the character of the sponsorship rather than the identity of the grantor should be noted.
  - 1.3 Financial sponsors of research should avoid actions that would call into question the integrity of American academic institutions as centers of independent teaching and research. They should not sponsor research as a cover for intelligence activities.
  - 1.4 Political science research supported by government grants should be unclassified.
  - 1.5 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.
  - 1.6 The grantor should assume no responsibility for the findings and conclusions of the researcher and should impose no restrictions or carry any responsibility for publication.
  - 1.7 Funding agencies should include in grants a stipulation that data gathered under the grants be made available to scholars at cost after a specified time, e.g., after a year has passed following the completion of the data-gathering process, or after the first substantial research report by the chief researcher has been completed.
  - 1.8 Members of public institutions or agencies should not interfere with disinterested

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. (Approved by APSA Council, September 2, 1998)

1.9 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. (Approved by APSA Council, September 2, 1998)

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

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

2.2 A university or college should not administer research funds derived from contracts or grants whose purpose and the character of whose sponsorship cannot be publicly disclosed.

2.3 In administering research funds entrusted directly to its care, a university or college 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.

## **Principles for Individual Researchers**

3. In applying for research funds, the individual researcher should:

3.1 clearly state the reasons for applying for support and not resort to stratagems of ambiguity to make the research more acceptable to a funding agency;

3.2 indicate clearly the actual amount of time the researcher personally plans to spend on the research;

3.3 indicate other sources of support of the research, if any; and

3.4 refuse to accept terms and conditions that the researcher believes will undermine his or her freedom and integrity as a scholar.

4. In conducting research so supported, the individual bears sole responsibility for the procedures, methods, and content of research. The researcher:



4.1 must avoid any deception or misrepresentation concerning his or her personal involvement or the involvement of respondents or subjects, and must avoid use of research as a cover for intelligence work or for partisan political purposes;

4.2 must refrain from using his or her professional status to obtain data and research materials for purposes other than scholarship;

4.3 with respect to research abroad, should not concurrently accept any additional support from agencies of the government for purposes that cannot be disclosed;

4.4 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

4.5 should avoid commingling project funds with personal funds, or funds of one project with those of another.

5. With respect to any public scholarly activity including publication of the results of research, the individual researcher:

5.1 bears sole responsibility for publication;

5.2 should disclose all relevant sources of financial support;

5.3 should indicate any condition imposed by financial sponsors or others on research publication, or other scholarly activities; and

5.4 should conscientiously acknowledge any assistance received in conducting research.

5.5 Authors are obliged to reveal the bases of any of their statements that are challenged specifically, except where confidentiality is involved.

5.6 When statements that are challenged are based on reproducible data authors are obliged to facilitate replication. They may expect the challenger to pay the costs of reproducing the relevant data.

5.7 Challenges are to be sufficiently precise to indicate to the author what documentation or data are needed. Challengers are themselves in the status of authors in connection with the statements that they make.

6. Scholars have an ethical obligation to make a full and complete disclosure of all non-confidential sources involved in their research so that their work can be tested or replicated.

6.1 As citizens, they have an obligation to cooperate with grand juries, other law

enforcement agencies, and institutional officials.

6.2 Conversely, scholars 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 in the present state of American law they run the risk of suffering an applicable penalty.

6.3 Scholars must, however, exercise appropriate restraint in making claims as to the confidential nature of their sources, and resolve all reasonable doubts in favor of full disclosure.

7. Political scientists, like all scholars, are expected to practice intellectual honesty and to uphold the scholarly standards of their discipline.

7.1 Plagiarism, the deliberate appropriation of the work of others represented as one's own, not only may constitute a violation of the civil law but represents a serious breach of professional ethics.

7.2 Departments of political science should make it clear to both faculty and students that such misconduct will lead to disciplinary action and, in the case of serious offenses, may result in dismissal. Institutional rules and expected standards of conduct should be published in advance and distributed through such means as faculty and student handbooks.

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

## **B. Responsibilities in the Classroom and to Students**

8. Academic political scientists must be very careful not to impose their partisan views, conventional or otherwise, upon students or colleagues.

9. Teachers have an ethical obligation to choose materials for student use without respect to personal or collective gain.

9.1 Publishers are strongly discouraged from offering inducements for textbook choice apart from making examination copies available and lowering the suggested retail price of a book.

10. Faculty members must not expropriate the academic work of their students.

10.1 Teachers cannot represent themselves as authors of independent student research; and research assistance, paid or unpaid, requires full acknowledgement.

10.2 As advisers, faculty members are not entitled to claim joint authorship with a student of a thesis or dissertation.

11. Political science departments have an obligation to protect the procedural rights of graduate students.

11.1 Students should be advised at the time of their admittance as to the departmental and institutional requirements of the degree program they will be entering. If a department of political science changes the requirements of a program, students already enrolled and making normal progress toward their degrees should have the right to be governed by the requirements in force at the time of their entrance if they so desire.

11.2 Students should be advised at the time of their admittance under what conditions written or oral major examinations (“prelims,” “comprehensives,” etc.) are given and whether such examinations, if failed, may be retaken.

11.3 After submitting a proposal for a thesis or dissertation, a student should be informed by the chairperson of his or her committee of its action with regard to the acceptability of the proposal. Action on a proposal should be taken within a reasonable time and communicated to the student in writing.

11.4 If, in the opinion of the supervising faculty, a student’s thesis or dissertation does not show satisfactory progress and should there arise questions of the acceptability of the final product, the student should be put on notice as soon as possible and in writing that his or her candidacy for the degree may be terminated.

11.5 Students should be advised of any changes in the composition of their thesis or dissertation committee. Faculty members should not participate in a thesis or dissertation examination unless they have had sufficient time to read the thesis or dissertation.

11.6 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.

11.7 Students should be informed upon entering a graduate program about any departmental 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 are urged to develop such rules and to 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.

## **C. Political Activity of Academic Political Scientists**

12. The college or university teacher is a citizen, and like other citizens, should be free to engage in political activities insofar as this can be done consistently with obligations as a teacher and scholar.

12.1 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, he or she should, as a rule, seek a leave of absence from the institution. 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.

12.2 A faculty member who seeks a leave to engage in political activity should recognize that he or she has a primary obligation to the institution and to grow as a teacher and scholar. The faculty member should consider the problems that a leave of absence may create for the administration, colleagues and students, and should not abuse the privilege by asking for leaves too frequently, or too late, or for too extended a period of time. A leave of absence incident to political activity should not affect unfavorably the tenure status of the faculty member.

12.3 Special problems arise if departments or schools endorse or sponsor political activities or public policies in the name of the entire faculty of the department or school. One of the purposes of tenure to shelter unpopular or unorthodox teaching is in 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 binding their colleagues. Departments as such should not endorse political positions.

## **D. Restrictions on the Use of the APSA Name or Office**

13. When officers, members, or employees of the Association 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, and 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 APSA 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.

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

15. Officers or employees of the Association should not knowingly participate in transactions involving the Association, if they have a substantial economic interest in them. Under such circumstances, they should disqualify themselves from participating in transactions involving the Association.

## **E. Ethics in the Publication Process**

16. Appraising manuscripts and reviewing books are serious scholarly responsibilities.

16.1 Those invited to make appraisals or 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 or of a departmental colleague.

16.2 Insofar as possible, editors and book-review editors should themselves act in conformity with the above principles. Moreover, in connection with the appraisal of manuscripts, editors should take all reasonable precautions to avoid revealing the names of the author and the reader to each other.

17. 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.

17.1 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.

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

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

19.1 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.

19.2 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.

19.3 The copyright holder and the author are each entitled to a flat fee or a share of royalties in connection with permissions to reprint, specific terms depending on agreement with the party seeking permission. Either the copyright holder or the author may waive his or her right. Each may act on his or her own behalf, or by mutual consent one may act on behalf of both.

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

19.5 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 his or her work is reprinted.

## **20. Responsibilities of Editors and Contributors to Edited Volumes**

20.1 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.

20.2 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.

20.3 Along with any other guidelines established by the editors, contracts and instructions to contributors should include clear specification of (1) manuscript length for the individual contributor; and (2) number of days for authors to respond to editors' alterations or suggestions for revision to the manuscript.

20.4 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.

21. When a thesis or dissertation is published in whole or in part, the following rules apply:

21.1 Authors are not ordinarily under an ethical obligation to acknowledge its origins.

21.2 Authors are free to decide what acknowledgment, if any, to give to the professor under whose supervision they worked.

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

## **F. Ethics in Recruitment, Hiring and Personnel Practices Process**

22. Open Listing Policy

It is the professional obligation of all political science departments to list in *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*.

23. Nepotism Rules.

Institutions employing political scientists should abolish nepotism rules, whether they apply departmentally or to an institution as a whole. Employment and advancement should be based solely on professional qualifications without regard for family relationships, subject only to appropriate rules governing conflict of interest.

24. Part-time Positions.

Institutions employing political scientists should make more flexible use of part-time positions for fully qualified professional women and men, just as is now done for those professionals with joint appointments or part-time research positions. Part-time positions should carry full academic status, equivalent rank, promotion opportunities, equal rates of pay, commensurate departmental participation and commensurate fringe benefits, including access to research resources. The policy of flexible part-time positions is not intended to condone any practice such as moonlighting or any practice by employers used to circumvent normal career-ladder appointments.

25. Equal Employment Opportunities.

It is Association policy that educational institutions not discriminate against job candidates on the basis of gender, gender identity, race, color, national origin, sexual

orientation, marital status, physical handicap, disability, or religion except in those cases in which federal laws allow religious preference in hiring.

25.1 The guiding principle is that employment decisions should be based on only those criteria that relate directly to professional competence.

25.2 It is Association policy that educational institutions not discriminate in any condition of employment (including the provision of domestic partner benefits) on the basis of gender, gender identity, race, color, national origin, sexual orientation, age, marital status, physical handicap, disability, or religion except in those cases in which federal law allow religious preferences in hiring.

25.3 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 with regard to African Americans, Latinos, women, minorities based on self-identified sexual orientation, and other minorities. (Appropriate strategies may differ for each group.)

25.4 The Association will not indicate preference, limitation, or specification based upon the categories in paragraph 25.2 in job listings, except that religious preferences may be indicated when allowed by federal law.

## **26. Fraud in Claiming Advanced Degrees**

26.1 If a person who seeks an academic position falsely claims to have an advanced degree, and if the falsity of the claim becomes known to the department or other appointing authorities of the institution in which the position is located, the chair or other appointing authorities ordinarily have an ethical obligation to report the fraud to the institution alleged to have granted the degree.

26.2 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 ordinarily include an appropriate description of the fraud, especially if there is reason to believe that the person may persist in it.

## **27. Recommending a candidate for faculty appointment calls for honest and responsible judgment.**

27.1 The scholarly achievements and promise of the candidate should be assessed as fairly as possible.

27.2 Also to be assessed are the characteristics of the candidate that relate to his or her probable effectiveness in the classroom and to the development of a stimulating rapport with professional colleagues.



27.3 Should there be clear basis for question about the compatibility of the candidate's past behavior with legitimate expectations of the employing institution, the fact may be mentioned. It is permissible for the employing institution to expect that members of its faculty will abide by institutional rules that do not violate principles of academic freedom or political rights of citizenship. A candidate should be informed if references to such matters are in his or her record and should have an opportunity to place in the record a statement relating to such matters. Matters pertaining to the candidate that have no bearing on the legitimate expectations of the employing institution should not be mentioned.

27.4 When an academic 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 will be placed in an open file, then it is proper to exercise the option of not writing such a letter. Furthermore, the refusal to write a letter should not be a matter of record.

27.5 Letters of recommendation for political scientists who are still candidate 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.

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

## 28. The Appointment Process.

28.1 Once an employing institution clearly indicates that it is giving serious consideration to an applicant for a faculty appointment, e.g., by interviewing him or her, it should inform the applicant of the status of his or her application, and of any change in status, within a reasonable time.

28.2 Once an employing institution offers a faculty appointment, the individual to whom the offer is made should respond within a reasonable time either with the decision or with a statement concerning his or her situation.

28.3 In connection with both points above, two weeks is to be considered a reasonable time unless the parties specifically agree otherwise.

28.4 An employing institution that offers a faculty appointment orally should immediately communicate the offer in writing.

28.5 The employing institution has an obligation to inform fully a candidate for employment concerning the terms and procedures used in making of offers of appointment.

29. Once an individual accepts an offer of employment from an institution, it is incumbent upon the individual not to seek or accept further employment for the same initial contract year unless a prior release is secured from the hiring institution.

## **G. Ethics in Tenure and Promotion**

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

30. As a matter of principle, a department should use the same procedures and, insofar as possible, similar criteria for all candidates under review for tenure and promotion.

31. The candidate being reviewed has a professional right to know the motivating principles, customary standards, and principal procedures of the assessment process of his or her department.

31.1 The department is obligated to provide in writing to the candidate being assessed a statement that: (i) sets out the principal parts of the assessment process; (ii) explains the instructions under which external reviewers will operate; and (iii) provides an account of the process which the department and university will follow in coming to a decision on tenure or promotion.

31.2 The department is obligated (i) to inform the candidate, in writing, if procedures to be used depart in any way from the department's customary procedures; and (ii) to detail how and explain why procedures may differ in his or her case.

31.3 The department has a specific obligation to inform the candidate of the materials (e.g. manuscripts, proposals, publication) that are being 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 judges indispensable to an assessment of his or her case.

32. 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 reviewer. All three parties share certain values; these include a commitment to fairness, dispatch, and mutual respect. But obligations and rights are not the same for all parties; each may give these values differing weight, even conflicting interpretations.

Guidelines, necessarily, must concern general principles. Guidelines for external review are not intended to be and should not be read as a uniform code to be applied to all universities and colleges 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. The proper procedure for one department or institution may not be the same for others.

## **Rights of the Candidate**

32.1 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 external reviews that are expert, disinterested, and timely.

## **Obligations of the Department**

32.2 Departments and universities have an obligation to select reviewers who have appropriate professional competence, and who would provide a fair assessment of the candidate.

32.3 Departments and universities are encouraged to ask candidates being reviewed to suggest names of external reviewers who know their work well, and to give the candidates under review an opportunity to call to the departments and universities' attention potential reviewers that the candidate believes should be excluded on the grounds of personal bias.

32.4 Solicitation of outside letters of recommendation for promotion and tenure should always be phrased as an invitation which recipients are free to reject. No presumption should be expressed that there is an obligation to perform service, but rather that it is a professional courtesy of assistance to the department making the request. Refusal to perform this service should not be regarded as a negative statement about the candidate.

32.5 Departments and universities should exercise restraint in soliciting external reviews because it imposes an obligation upon other scholars. Ordinarily, no more than six reviews should be solicited for promotion and/or tenure cases or senior appointments. No reviews should be solicited for decisions that do not warrant them (for example, in entry-level and adjunct appointments, renewals of junior appointments, and special increments at the senior level).

32.6 The department conducting an external review is ordinarily obliged: (i) to provide external reviewers a copy of the candidate's curriculum vita and the principal materials on which the assessment is to be based; (ii) to ensure external reviewers sufficient time for a competent and conscientious assessment, as a rule not less than six (6) weeks; (iii) to protect confidentiality to the extent legally possible; (iv) to state whether the assessment is a confidential one, and if it is not,

the terms of departure from confidentiality; (v) to explain to external reviewers the relative importance of external reviews to the overall review process; and (vi) to inform the external reviewers of the final decision without elaborating on the reasons for the decision.

## **Obligations of the External Reviewer**

32.7 Once they assume responsibility for serving as a reviewer, external reviewers are ordinarily obliged: (i) to make an assessment that is candid and fair, based solely on professionally relevant criteria and first-hand knowledge; (ii) to disclose to the department or institution conducting an external review any personal relationship with the candidate being evaluated; and (iii) to honor any deadline to which they have agreed.

33. In 1947 APSA formally endorsed as Association policy the *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* jointly developed by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges (AAC). The Statement is reprinted here with AAUP's later interpretive comments.

## **Joint AAUP and AAC Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure**

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to assure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher<sup>4</sup> or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.[1]<sup>5</sup>

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

## **Academic Freedom**

---

<sup>4</sup>The word "teacher" as used in this document is understood to include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties.

<sup>5</sup>Numbers in brackets refer to Interpretive Comments which follow.

(a) Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

(b) Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.[2] Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.[3]

(c) College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not an institutional spokesman.[4]

## **Academic Tenure**

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice: (1) The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.

(2) Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank,[5] the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years.[6] Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.[7]

(3) During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all

other members of the faculty have.[8]

(4) Termination for a cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges against him and should have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon the case. The teacher should be permitted to be accompanied by an adviser of his or her own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from the teacher's own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.[9]

(5) Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.

## **Interpretive Comments**

### **1940 Interpretations**

At the conference of representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges on November 7-8, 1940, the following interpretations of the *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* were agreed upon. The numbers below correspond to the numbers in brackets in the *1940 Statement*.

1. That its operation should not be retroactive.
2. That all tenure claims of teachers appointed prior to the endorsement should be determined in accordance with the principles set forth in the *1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.
3. If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of Paragraph (c) of the section on *Academic Freedom* and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under Paragraph (a)(4) of the section on *Academic Tenure*. In pressing such charges the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American

Colleges are free to make an investigation.

## **1970 Interpretive Comments**

*Following extensive discussions on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with leading educational associations and with individual faculty members and administrators, a Joint Committee of the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges met during 1969 to reevaluate this key policy statement. On the basis of the comments received, the discussions that ensued, the Joint Committee felt the preferable approach was to formulate interpretations of the Statement in terms of the experience gained in implementing and applying the Statement for over thirty years and of adapting it to current needs.*

*The Committee submitted to the two Associations for their consideration the following "Interpretive Comments." These interpretations were approved by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in April, 1970, and endorsed by the Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting as Association Policy.*

In the thirty years since their promulgation, the principles of the *1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure* have undergone a substantial amount of refinement. This has evolved through a variety of processes, including customary acceptance, understandings mutually arrived at between institutions and professors or their representatives, investigations and reports by the American Association of University Professors, and formulations of statements by that Association either alone or in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges. These comments represent the attempt of the two Associations, as the original sponsors of the *1940 Statement*, to formulate the most important of these refinements. Their incorporation here as Interpretive Comments is based upon the premise that the *1940 Statement* is not a static code but a fundamental document designed to set a framework of norms to guide adaptations to changing times and circumstances.

Also, there have been relevant developments in the law itself reflecting a growing insistence by the courts on due process within the academic community which parallels the essential concepts of the *1940 Statement*: particularly relevant is the identification by the Supreme Court of academic freedom as a right protected by the First Amendment. As the Supreme Court said in *Keyishian v. Board of Regents* 385 U.S. 589 (1967), "Our Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom."

The numbers refer to the designated portion of the *1940 Statement* on which interpretive comment is made.

1. The Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University

Professors have long recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. Both Associations either separately or jointly have consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in their utterances as citizens, in the exercise of their responsibilities to the institution and to students, and in their conduct when resigning from their institution or when undertaking government-sponsored research. Of particular relevance is the *Statement on Professional Ethics*, adopted in 1966 as Association policy. (A revision, adopted in 1987, was published in *Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP* 73 [July-August 1987]: 49.)

2. The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is "controversial." Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject.

3. Most church-related institutions no longer need or desire the departure from the principle of academic freedom implied in the *1940 Statement*, and we do not now endorse such a departure.

4. This paragraph is the subject of an Interpretation adopted by the sponsors of the *1940 Statement* immediately following its endorsement which reads as follows:

If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of Paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under Paragraph (a)(4) of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases, the administration must assume full responsibility and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

Paragraph (c) of the *1940 Statement* should also be interpreted in keeping with the 1964 "Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances" (*AAUP Bulletin*, Spring, 1965, p.29) which states inter alia: "The controlling principle is that a faculty member's expression of opinion as a citizen cannot constitute grounds for dismissal unless it clearly demonstrates the faculty member's unfitness for his or her position. Extramural utterances rarely bear upon the faculty member's fitness for his or her position. Moreover, a final decision should take into account the faculty member's entire record as a teacher and scholar."

---

<sup>6</sup> For a discussion of this question, see the "Report of the Special Committee on Academic Personnel Ineligible for Tenure," *AAUP Bulletin*, Autumn, 1966, pp. 280-282.



Paragraph V of the *Statement on Professional Ethics* also deals with the nature of the “special obligations” of the teacher. The paragraph reads as follows:

As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of other 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.

Both the protection of academic freedom and the requirements of academic responsibility apply not only to the full-time probationary as well as to the tenured teacher, but also to all others, such as part-time and teaching assistants, who exercise teaching responsibilities.

5. The concept of “rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank” is intended to include any person who teaches a full-time load regardless of the teacher’s specific title.<sup>6</sup>

6. In calling for an agreement “in writing” on the amount of credit for a faculty member’s prior service at other institutions, the *Statement* furthers the general policy of full understanding by the professor of the terms and conditions of the appointment. It does not necessarily follow that a professor’s tenure rights have been violated because of the absence of a written agreement on this matter. Nonetheless, especially because of the variation in permissible institutional practices, a written understanding concerning these matters at the time of appointment is particularly appropriate and advantageous to both the individual and the institution.<sup>7</sup>

7. The effect of this subparagraph is that a decision on tenure, favorable or unfavorable, must be made at least twelve months prior to the completion of the probationary period. If the decision is negative, the appointment for the following year becomes a terminal one. If the decision is affirmative, the provisions in the *1940 Statement* with respect to the termination of services of teachers or investigators after the expiration of a probationary period should apply from the date when the favorable decision is made.

The general principle of notice contained in this paragraph is developed with greater specificity in the *Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment* endorsed by the Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors (1964). These standards are:

---

<sup>7</sup>For a more detailed statement on this question, see “On Crediting Prior Service Elsewhere as Part of the Probationary Period,” *AAUP Bulletin* 64 (1978): 274-75.

Notice of nonreappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment to the governing board, should be given in writing in accordance with the following standards:

- (1) Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
- (2) Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
- (3) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

Other obligations, both of institutions and individuals, are described in the *Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members*, as endorsed by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors in 1961.

8. The freedom of probationary teachers is enhanced by the establishment of a regular procedure for the periodic evaluation and assessment of the teacher's academic performance during probationary status. Provision should be made for regularized procedures for the consideration of complaints by probationary teachers that their academic freedom has been violated. One suggested procedure to serve these purposes is contained in the *Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members: Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, prepared by the American Association of University Professors.

9. A further specification of the academic due process to which the teacher is entitled under this paragraph is contained in the *Statement of Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, jointly approved by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1958. This interpretive document deals with the issue of suspension, about which the *1940 Statement* is silent.

The *1958 Statement* provides: "Suspension of the faculty member during the proceedings is justified only if immediate harm to the faculty member or others is threatened by the faculty member's continuance. Unless legal considerations forbid, any such suspension should be with pay." A suspension which is not followed by either reinstatement or the opportunity for a hearing is in effect a summary dismissal in violation of academic due process.

The concept of "moral turpitude" identifies the exceptional case in which the professor may be denied a year's teaching or pay in whole or in part. The statement applies

---

<sup>9</sup> The common Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects is based on and replaces 1981 regulations of the Department of Health and Human Services. Those regulations were examined by the AAUP in 1981: "Regulations Governing Research on Human Subjects: Academic Freedom and the Institutional Review Board," *Academe*, December 1981: 358-370.

to that kind of behavior which goes beyond simply warranting discharge and is so utterly blameworthy as to make it inappropriate to require the offering of a year's teaching or pay. The standard is not that the moral sensibilities of persons in the particular community have been affronted. The standard is behavior that would evoke condemnation by the academic community generally.

## **H. Principles Governing Research on Human Subjects**

34. The methodology of political science includes procedures which involve human subjects: surveys and interviews, observation of public behavior, experiments, physiological testing, and examination of documents. Possible risk to human subjects is something that political scientists should take into account. Under certain conditions, political scientists are also legally required to assess the risks to human subjects.

34.1 A common Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects became effective on August 19, 1991, adopted by 15 major federal departments and agencies including the National Science Foundation (45 CFR Part 690) and the Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46). The Policy has been promulgated concurrently by regulation in each department and agency. While the federal policy applies only to research subject to regulation by the federal departments and agencies involved, universities can be expected to extend the policy to all research involving human subjects. <sup>8</sup>

## **I. Principles Concerning Sexual Harassment**

35. Sexual harassment is an unethical and unprofessional activity involving persons of unequal power, authority or influence. Sexual harassment is, furthermore, illegal under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and Title IX of the 1972 Educational Amendments. It is the policy of the American Political Science Association to condemn sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment is a gross violation of professional ethics comparable to plagiarism or falsification of research and should be regarded and treated as such by members of the profession.

35.1 Sexual harassment is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, request 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.

35.2 Sexual harassment that involves coercive sexual conduct, including suggestions that academic or employment reprisals or rewards will follow the refusal or granting of sexual favors, constitutes moral turpitude or gross misconduct in the sense these terms are used in university tenure regulations, and therefore constitutes grounds for dismissal.

36. The American Political Science Association encourages universities to define coercive sexual conduct as a form of moral turpitude or gross misconduct and to utilize university dismissal procedures to deal with such behavior.

36.1 The Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms does not and should not have the power to censure individuals. The Committee relies on employing institutions as well as judicial and quasi-judicial bodies to operate by procedures that provide due process.

36.2 However, when a political scientist is dismissed, not reappointed or suspended from employment by a university, college or other employing institution for the stated reason of coercive sexual harassment, or is legally adjudged to have committed such acts, the Association, upon recommendation of its Ethics Committee, shall inform its members through PS.

36.3 The Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms stands ready to respond to complaints of sexual harassment. If at the completion of its fact finding, the committee finds such complaints to be valid, it will take all supportive action it can to restore the dignity and professional well-being of the victim, including preparation of letters and documents to university administrators or others which dispel any cloud of blame from the sexually harassed person.

## **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.*

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.

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.

## **Appendix**

### **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*.



**American Political Science Association**

1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW | Washington, DC 20036-1206

p: 202.483.2512 | f: 202.483.2657

w: [www.apsanet.org](http://www.apsanet.org) | e: [apsa@apsanet.org](mailto:apsa@apsanet.org)